

Report of the Committee for Environmental Protection (CEP XVI)

Brussels, May 20–24, 2013

Item 1: Opening of the Meeting

- (1) The CEP Chair, Dr Yves Frenot (France), opened the meeting on Monday 20 May 2013 and thanked Belgium for arranging and hosting the meeting in Brussels.
- (2) The Committee noted that there were no new Members, and that the CEP comprised 35 Members.
- (3) The Chair summarised the work undertaken during the intersessional period, noting that all the planned work decided at the end of CEP XV had been achieved.

Item 2: Adoption of the Agenda

- (4) The Committee adopted the following agenda and confirmed the allocation of 46 Working Papers (WP), 57 Information Papers (IP), 5 Secretariat Papers (SP) and 7 Background Papers (BP) to the agenda items:
 1. Opening of the Meeting
 2. Adoption of the Agenda
 3. Strategic Discussions on the Future Work of the CEP
 4. Operation of the CEP
 5. Cooperation with other Organisations
 6. Repair and Remediation of Environment Damage
 7. Climate Change Implications for the Environment: Strategic approach
 8. Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA)
 - a. Draft Comprehensive Environmental Evaluations
 - b. Other EIA Matters

9. Area Protection and Management Plans
 - a. Management Plans
 - b. Historic Sites and Monuments
 - c. Site Guidelines
 - d. Human Footprint and Wilderness Values
 - e. Marine Spatial Protection and Management
 - f. Other Annex V Matters
10. Conservation of Antarctic Flora and Fauna
 - a. Quarantine and Non-Native Species
 - b. Specially Protected Species
 - c. Other Annex II Matters
11. Environmental Monitoring and Reporting
12. Inspection Reports
13. General Matters
14. Election of Officers
15. Preparation for Next Meeting
16. Adoption of the Report
17. Closing of the Meeting

Item 3: Strategic Discussions on the Future Work of the CEP

- (5) New Zealand introduced WP28 *Antarctic Environments Portal: Progress Report*, jointly prepared with Australia, Belgium, Norway and SCAR. It provided an update on the development of the Antarctic Environments Portal since introducing the concept at CEP XV, and addressed issues raised during informal intersessional discussions. It noted that the project aims to facilitate the link between Antarctic science and the CEP by providing ready access to independent, science based information on priority issues. New Zealand demonstrated a prototype of the Portal to the Committee, and outlined the next steps for the project.
- (6) Many Members and ASOC welcomed the progress that had been made and highlighted the value of the Portal as a tool which would provide ready access to scientific syntheses and high quality information to inform decision-making and support the effective implementation of the Protocol, and

thanked New Zealand for its efforts. They endorsed SCAR's demonstrated history of providing independent scientific advice.

- (7) Some Members also raised concerns and comments relating to: governance, decision-making, the composition of the Portal's editorial board, geographic and linguistic representation, assurance that data would be independent and apolitical, status of information published on the Portal, and long-term funding.
- (8) Argentina introduced WP 58 *Contributions to discussions on access to environment-related information and its management within the framework of the Antarctic Treaty System*. The paper emphasised the need for official initiatives concerning information management, such as the Antarctic Environments Portal, to be based on the ATS principle of consensus, particularly with respect to information selection, management and editing, and that it should be in the four Treaty languages. Argentina reiterated other Members' concerns regarding the possible dependence on private funding to support the Portal.
- (9) SCAR set out the system it uses to ensure that the science presented is up to date, accurate, expert, peer reviewed and independent. Stressing that science is constantly changing SCAR underlined the expectation that whatever was uploaded to the Portal would need to be subject to regular review.
- (10) Australia noted that the Portal was envisaged as a tool to assist decision making, and was not intended to make decisions on behalf of the Committee or Parties. It further noted that a possible future scenario was that the Portal would be managed by the Parties, and in that scenario it would be important to address questions regarding content management and funding. For the moment, the Portal project is being managed and resourced by New Zealand, and all interested Members are invited to participate in the ongoing work.
- (11) In order to better explain the aim of WP 58, Argentina made clear that its purpose was mainly to stress the need to set criteria, agreed by consensus, for the selection, editing and general management of information, and was not related to any evaluation of scientific research undertaken by SCAR.
- (12) New Zealand welcomed all the comments and reiterated that the Portal was not intended as an official CEP activity, that it was not intended as a decision-making or political tool, and encouraged feedback and input from interested parties to support the further development of the project.

- (13) The Committee welcomed the progress to develop an Antarctic Environments Portal, and encouraged further development on this initiative, asking that an update on progress be given at CEP XVII. Members agreed to provide comments and feedback to the proponents to support the Portal's further development.
- (14) ASOC presented IP 61 *Human impacts in the Arctic and Antarctic: Key findings relevant to the ATCM and CEP*, which reported on two international collaborative projects launched at the International Polar Year Oslo Science Conference, 2010, exploring human impacts and future scenarios for the Antarctic environment. It noted that the majority of the reports had concluded that existing environmental management practices and the current system of governance are insufficient today and in the future to meet environmental challenges and the obligations of the Environmental Protocol. ASOC urged Members to undertake full implementation of the Protocol, support global environmental initiatives and to guide their commitment to protect Antarctica with long-term vision and political will.
- (15) The Committee thanked ASOC for its contribution. Belgium noted that rapid changes were taking place at a large scale, and that ASOC's paper could be useful in assisting further discussions.
- (16) The Russian Federation urged Members to improve the level of implementation of Antarctic regulations in their domestic law, since it was difficult to advance other substantive issues without this. The United Kingdom endorsed the Russian Federation's concerns about effective domestic regulations, and confirmed that it had recently implemented the Liability Annex to the Environmental Protocol.
- (17) Argentina highlighted that during its more than 50 years of existence, the Antarctic Treaty had attained important achievements in environmental management and reached high levels of compliance, while preserving its principle of consensus.
- (18) The United Kingdom pointed out that the Committee and several of its Members were already engaged in many of the issues that ASOC had raised. While more could be done, the United Kingdom emphasised the importance of taking precautionary approaches, which was a well-embedded practice in the CEP.
- (19) The Committee revised and updated its Five-Year Work Plan (WP 7). (Appendix 1)

Item 4: Operation of the CEP

- (20) No papers were submitted under this agenda item.

Item 5: Cooperation with other Organisations

- (21) SCAR presented IP 4 *The Scientific Committee on Antarctic Research (SCAR) Annual Report for 2012/13*. In 2012 SCAR approved five new Scientific Research Projects : a) State of the Antarctic Ecosystem; b) Antarctic Thresholds – Ecosystem Resilience and Adaptation; c) Antarctic Climate Change in the 21st Century; d) Past Antarctic Ice Sheet Dynamics; and e) Solid Earth Response and Cryosphere Evolution. SCAR also introduced IP 19 *1st SCAR Antarctic and Southern Ocean Science Horizon Scan*, on an activity which would assemble the SCAR community and leading Antarctic experts to identify the most important scientific questions to be addressed over the next two decades. Further information was available in BP 20 *The Scientific Committee on Antarctic Research (SCAR) Selected Science Highlights for 2012/13* (SCAR).
- (22) Norway noted the useful approach SCAR was taking in focusing their new research programmes towards management needs and underscored the importance of disseminating results from these programmes in an appropriate manner. In response, SCAR noted that findings from their ongoing research activities would be presented at various events in 2013 onwards and later to the ATCM. The next major SCAR event was the SCAR Biology Symposium in Spain, 15–19 July 2013. Information on SCAR Meetings is available at www.scar.org/events.
- (23) Chile presented IP 105 *Report of the CEP Observer to the XXXII SCAR Delegates' Meeting*, providing a brief summary of the meeting, which is presented by SCAR in more detail elsewhere. It stated that the information generated by SCAR is relevant to decision-making processes in the CEP. Therefore, it is expected that the collaboration between the two organisations would be maintained in the future, on the same good terms as at present.
- (24) The SC-CAMLR Observer presented IP 6 *Report by the SC-CAMLR Observer to the Sixteenth Meeting of the Committee for Environmental Protection*. The paper focused on the five issues of common interest to the CEP and SC-CAMLR as identified in 2009 at their joint workshop: a) Climate change and the Antarctic marine environment; b) Biodiversity and non-native species in the Antarctic marine environment; c) Antarctic species

requiring special protection; d) Spatial marine management and protected areas; and e) Ecosystem and environmental monitoring. CCAMLR informed the Committee that the full report of the meeting was available from the CCAMLR website at: www.ccamlr.org/en/meetings/27.

- (25) Based on catch data reported to the CCAMLR Secretariat, krill fishing had occurred in ASPA 153 (Eastern Dallmann Bay) in 2010 and in 2012, although harvesting was not a permitted activity under the management plan. It was suggested that this was attributable to a lack of awareness of the designated protected area among those responsible for fishing vessels. The Scientific Committee therefore endorsed the need to improve communication, including by linking the management plans of relevant ASPAs and ASMAs to CCAMLR conservation measures, so that management plans could be readily accessed by fishing vessels (CCAMLR Conservation Measure 91-02 (2013)). The Scientific Committee also encouraged Members to be proactive in passing on information to fishing vessels under their jurisdiction.
- (26) ASOC expressed concern about harvesting events in areas specially managed or protected by the ATCM, expressing the view that protected areas should remain effectively protected.
- (27) Belgium presented IP 15 *CCAMLR MPA Technical Workshop*, which summarised the outcomes of a workshop held in Brussels in September 2012. The workshop concluded that there was a need for further systematic conservation planning work towards the development of MPAs. The workshop also recommended that further work should be submitted for consideration by CCAMLR's Scientific Committee and its Working Groups, and that those Members with considerable research history and scientific expertise in the individual domains could take the lead on such projects. The full report of the technical workshop (SC-CAMLR-XXXI/BG/16) was available at www.ccamlr.org. The SC-CAMLR Observer informed the CEP that the results of this workshop meant that analyses were now underway in all of the 9 planning domains in the CCAMLR Convention area.
- (28) The Committee nominated Dr. Polly Penhale (United States) as CEP Observer to SC-CAMLR-IM-I (Bremerhaven, Germany, 11-13 July 2013) and to SC-CAMLR-XXXII (Hobart, Australia, 23 October – 01 November, 2013).
- (29) SCAR presented IP 52 *Ocean Acidification: SCAR Future Plans*. The SCAR Ocean Acidification Action Group intends to: a) define our present

understanding of the contemporary rates and future scenarios of Southern Ocean acidification; b) document ecosystem and organism responses from experimental perturbations and geological records; c) identify present and planned observational and experimental strategies; d) identify gaps in our understanding of the rates and regionality of ocean acidification; and e) define strategies for future Southern Ocean acidification research. The final report would be launched at the SCAR Open Science Conference in August 2014 (www.scar2014.com).

- (30) Belgium introduced WP 49 *The Antarctic Treaty System role regarding the development of a comprehensive system of Marine Protected Areas*, jointly prepared with Germany and the Netherlands. It highlighted the responsibility of Parties for environmental protection and the conservation of marine living resources, referring to relevant international commitments. It further noted the work towards the establishment of a representative system of marine protected areas (MPAs) in the CCAMLR Convention area, and referred to IP 15 *CCAMLR MPA Technical Workshop*, which summarised the outcomes of a workshop, held in Brussels in September 2012. Belgium invited the Committee to acknowledge this work and encourage its prompt and positive conclusion.
- (31) Several Members acknowledged CCAMLR's efforts to establish a representative system of MPAs in the CCAMLR area, noting that the ATCM and CCAMLR shared a commitment to the protection of the Antarctic environment and associated ecosystems.
- (32) Japan reminded Members that CCAMLR had not yet reached a consensus on the details of a system of MPAs, and cautioned against pre-empting discussions to be held at the CCAMLR Special Meeting in Bremerhaven in July 2013.
- (33) China and the Russian Federation emphasised that CCAMLR was responsible for considering issues not addressed by the ATCM, such as the rational use of marine living resources, and it was important for the CEP to remain within its mandate in any discussions of this.
- (34) Australia agreed that the Parties have an important role in delivering comprehensive environmental protection in the Antarctic Treaty area, including in the marine environment. It recalled the 2009 CEP/SC-CAMLR workshop, which concluded that issues relating to spatial protection and management of Antarctic marine biodiversity were generally best led by

SC-CAMLR at this time, and considered that it was appropriate for the CEP to express its support for the ongoing work within CCAMLR.

- (35) South Africa reported that it had declared its first offshore Marine Protected Area around the Prince Edward Islands in the Southern Ocean.
- (36) ASOC encouraged the Committee's support for this joint proposal, noting that the CEP had taken similar action with respect to CCAMLR initiatives on Illegal, Unreported and Unregulated Fishing and the development of a Catch Documentation Scheme.
- (37) Belgium stated that the intention of its proposal was not to prejudice CCAMLR's Special Meeting or to stimulate discussion on the details of MPAs within the CEP, but rather to acknowledge and show support for CCAMLR's work on MPAs.
- (38) Belgium, Germany and Netherlands reminded the meeting of the responsibility of Parties to environmental protection and the conservation of marine living resources under the international agreements that comprise the Antarctic Treaty system and the connection between both. WP 49 noted the work carried out so far towards the establishment of a representative system of marine protected areas (MPAs) in the CCAMLR Convention area, and acknowledged this work and encouraged its prompt and positive conclusion. The CEP welcomed CCAMLR's on-going work on MPAs but in the time available was unable to reach agreement on the text of a resolution.
- (39) COMNAP presented IP 3 *The Annual Report for 2012 of the Council of Managers of National Antarctic Programs (COMNAP)*, noting that COMNAP would mark its 25th anniversary with the publication of the book "A story of Antarctic Cooperation: 25 Years of the Council of Managers of National Antarctic Programs". Highlights from the past year included its Sustainable Solutions to Antarctic Challenges Symposium and Innovations in Antarctic Communications Workshop in July 2012; its review of ATCM Recommendations on Operational Matters; its offer of a full COMNAP Antarctic Research Fellowship to Dr Ursula Rack and a half Fellowship to Mr Jenson George; and the development of tools and products such as Accident, Incident and Near-Miss Reporting (AINMR), a Ship Position Reporting System (SPRS), Antarctic Flight Information Manual (AFIM) and an Antarctic Telecommunications Operators Manual (ATOM).

- (40) Other papers presented under this Agenda item:
- BP 20 *The Scientific Committee on Antarctic Research (SCAR) Selected Science Highlights for 2012/13* (SCAR)

Item 6: Repair and Remediation of Environment Damage

- (41) New Zealand introduced WP 27 *Repair or Remediation of Environmental Damage: Report of the CEP intersessional contact group*, noting that this work had been undertaken in response to a request from the ATCM through Decision 4 (2010). The paper summarised the findings and recommendations of discussions on the practicality of repair or remediation of Antarctic environmental damage, in order to assist the ATCM in considering the resumption of negotiations on further rules relating to liability. The report listed a series of issues that would need to be taken into account when considering repair and remediation activities.
- (42) Members thanked New Zealand and congratulated the ICG for the importance and utility of the document.
- (43) The Netherlands felt that the precautionary principle should be observed especially as it would not always be possible to repair the damage.
- (44) Russia stated that it would not always be possible to disentangle naturally occurring damage from human impacts, and that repair and remediation would need to be site specific as there was no evidence that a single approach would fit all cases.
- (45) ASOC stressed that the objectives for repair and remediation should reflect the objectives and provisions of the Environmental Protocol.
- (46) Chile reported that, through its Ministry of the Environment, it had developed a methodological guide for the management of soils with potential presence of pollutants. Although it is presented only in Spanish, the guide could be of interest to the Committee, and it would be willing to provide a copy to the Secretariat. The guide considers that a human and an environmental risk assessment must be developed to determine if a place is contaminated, and using a cost/benefit analysis, the decision to remediate the area or not is taken depending on the risk.

- (47) The Committee endorsed the findings and recommendations of the ICG and agreed to forward the full WP to the ATCM for its consideration. Members of the New Zealand (Dr Neil Gilbert) and Australian (Dr. Martin Riddle) delegations were nominated to introduce the paper and respond to any questions.

CEP Advice to the ATCM

- (48) In response to the request from the ATCM contained in Decision 4 (2010) on the matter of repair or remediation of environmental damage, the Committee endorsed the findings and recommendations contained in WP 27 as its initial advice and stood ready to respond to any further requests from the ATCM.
-
- (49) Australia introduced WP 32 *An Antarctic Clean-Up Manual: report of informal intersessional discussion*, (Australia and the United Kingdom) which reported on the results of informal intersessional discussions to review and revise the draft Antarctic Clean-Up Manual considered by CEP XV. The contributions of several Members and one Observer during the intersessional period had been incorporated into the revised manual.
- (50) Australia and the United Kingdom recommended that the Committee:
- considers and endorses the Clean-Up Manual annexed to the draft Resolution presented at Attachment A to WP 32;
 - encourages Members and Observers to develop practical guidelines and supporting resources for inclusion in the manual in the future; and
 - agrees to convey the attached draft Resolution and annexed Clean-Up Manual to the ATCM for approval.
- (51) Australia and the United Kingdom also suggested that, if the Committee agreed with these recommendations, the Secretariat be asked to make the Clean-Up Manual available on the ATS website.
- (52) The Committee thanked Australia and the United Kingdom, endorsed the recommendations presented in WP 32, and agreed that the Clean-Up Manual should be made available from the ATS website.

CEP Advice to the ATCM

- (53) The Committee endorsed the Antarctic Clean-up Manual, presented in WP 32. It recommended that the ATCM approve the Manual by way of a Resolution.
-
- (54) France introduced WP 42 *The need to take into account the dismantling costs of stations in Comprehensive Environmental Evaluations (CEE) relating to their construction*, prepared jointly with Italy, which illustrated a theoretical cost assessment of deconstructing Concordia Station. The full removal of all the material and components of this station would require approximately 12 years, practically the time needed to construct it, and costs some 25 million euros, almost 75% of its construction costs. France and Italy suggested that a detailed estimate of decommissioning costs should be taken into account when a CEE is prepared for the construction of a new station.
- (55) The Committee welcomed the analysis and emphasised the importance of correctly calculating the costs of establishing stations by adopting a life-cycle approach and including the costs of decommissioning. Members drew attention to the possibilities of sharing stations and reopening closed stations rather than opening new ones, and suggested that the potential to decommission a station should be given serious consideration in the design phase. Thanking the authors, ASOC drew attention to the need to examine the environmental impacts of the whole life cycle of a station prior to construction.
- (56) In response to a suggestion from Australia the Committee also agreed to schedule a review of the *Guidelines for Environmental Impact Assessment in Antarctica* in the five-year work plan, including to further consider the recommendations contained in WP 42. It further underlined the role of COMNAP as a centre of expertise with regard to assessing the costs of decommissioning stations. China agreed to the importance of being aware of the cost and duration of dismantling a station in the CEE but pointed out the difficulty of providing a concrete number for the cost of an activity that will happen many years later, and questioned the substantive value of such a number.
- (57) France presented IP 36 *Clean-up of the construction site of unused airstrip "Piste du Lion", Terre Adélie, Antarctica*, which reported on the clean-up of the site in fulfillment of the commitments under Annex III, Article 2, of the Environmental Protocol. The work involved three partners: the Terres Australes et Antarctiques Françaises, the French Polar Institute (IPEV)

and a private sponsor, Veolia Environnement France. The total weight of waste was about 300 tons and the total cost of the operation was 305,000 Euro. France noted that the clean-up served as an example of a successful remediation measure, which demonstrated that such an operation is feasible with relatively limited human and financial resources. France, however, also called attention to two major operational constraints: a) this type of work is extremely weather dependent; and b) the limiting factor of the size of the national programme's vessel to remove the waste.

- (58) ASOC presented IP 68 *Reuse of a site after remediation. A case study from Cape Evans, Ross Island*, which illustrated how the reuse of a remediated site could undo the effects of remediation, using the case study of a small site at Cape Evans, Ross Island. This paper also made a number of suggestions relevant to assessing cumulative impacts, assessing the effectiveness of remediation, and managing remediated sites.
- (59) While thanking ASOC for its presentation, New Zealand noted that a study of the potential recoverability of the site had been undertaken by New Zealand scientists prior to an approval being granted for a multi-season camp site to be established.
- (60) Brazil presented IP 70 *Environmental Damage Repair: Disassembling of Ferraz Station, Admiralty Bay, Antarctica*, which outlined the plan for the disassembling of Comandante Ferraz station, which was destroyed by a fire in 2012. An Environmental Management Plan had been elaborated and implemented with the support of several specialised institutions, under the coordination of the Brazilian Ministry of the Environment. Brazil estimated the cost of this operation, excluding human resources, at 20 million USD and referred to IP 78 and IP 95 for more information. It also screened a video to present the Committee with more information on the operations conducted during the 2012-2013 summer.

Item 7: Climate Change Implications for the Environment: Strategic Approach

- (61) SCAR introduced WP 38 *The Antarctic Climate Change and the Environment (ACCE) Report: A Key Update*, which represented a major update of the original SCAR Antarctic Climate Change and the Environment (ACCE) report. It summarised subsequent advances in knowledge concerning how the climates of the Antarctic and Southern Ocean had changed, how it might change in the future, and the associated impacts on marine and terrestrial biota.

- (62) Members thanked SCAR for its ongoing efforts to update the CEP on the state of knowledge on climate change, and noted SCAR's recommendation to engage with other organisations such as the IPCC and UNFCCC. The Committee noted the pace of change reported in the update and recalled that the ATME on climate change had recommended that '*the CEP consider developing a climate change response work programme*' (Recommendation 19). The United States highlighted the quality of SCAR's peer-reviewed report which had already been published in a scientific journal. Norway remarked that the outcomes of the report might feed well into the Antarctic Environments Portal.
- (63) The Russian Federation raised questions regarding the absence in the report of the methods used to calculate sea level rise, and why the contributions of natural phenomena as well as anthropogenic causes to climate change had not been considered. In response, SCAR noted that its report was a review paper and that the individual publications mentioned within it would contain detailed information on specific methodologies.
- (64) Colombia, Malaysia and Turkey mentioned that scientists from their national Antarctic programmes were currently conducting research or planning to conduct research with relevance to climate change in Antarctica.
- (65) In endorsing SCAR's recommendations, the Committee decided to:
- i. Encourage SCAR and Treaty Parties to engage with the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change (UNFCCC) and the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (IPCC) to ensure that climate change issues in the Antarctic and Southern Ocean are fully considered and that both bodies are made aware of the outcomes of the ACCE report and associated updates;
 - ii. Focus efforts on implementing the recommendations outlined by the Antarctic Treaty Meeting of Experts (ATME) on climate change and implications for Antarctic management and governance (2010); and
 - iii. Convey the key points of the ACCE updated report more broadly to ensure awareness of the critical role of Antarctica and the Southern Ocean in the climate system and the importance of associated impacts on the region.

- (66) The Committee decided to establish an ICG on climate change with the following Terms of Reference:
1. Review progress made against ATME recommendations 18 to 29 drawing on SP 8 (CEP XV) and discussions at recent CEP meetings (cf: CEP report 2010 paras 351 - 386);
 2. Consider these ATME recommendations in light of recent papers and in particular SCAR's 2013 major update report in order to identify additional actions that may need to be addressed by the CEP;
 3. Consider how the recommendations might be addressed by developing a prioritised climate change response work programme;
 4. Provide an initial report to CEP XVII.
- (67) The Committee agreed that Rachel Clarke of the United Kingdom (*racl@bas.ac.uk*) and Birgit Njåstad of Norway (*njaastad@npolar.no*) would jointly coordinate and lead the ICG.
- (68) The Secretariat introduced SP 7 *Actions taken by the CEP and the ATCM on the ATME recommendations on Climate Change*.
- (69) COMNAP presented IP 32 *Cost/energy Analysis of National Antarctic Program Transportation*, which described the results of a case study of transport systems used by the Alfred Wegener Institute (AWI) in Germany. It focused on the analysis of air and sea transportation of people and cargo, using both financial and energy data, as one example of what National Antarctic programmes were doing to reduce costs and fuel use. COMNAP stated that it would share this analysis at its upcoming Annual General Meeting (AGM) in July 2013.
- (70) Italy noted that the results of COMNAP's study were similar to the results of a study it had conducted, with respect to the construction of a runway adjacent to Mario Zucchelli Station. The Russian Federation suggested that, while it supported efforts to reduce costs and emissions, future reports should also take into account the risks of national programmes becoming dependent on logistics provided by vessels of other countries. COMNAP agreed to discuss these risks at their AGM.
- (71) COMNAP presented IP 34 *Best Practice for Energy Management – Guidance and Recommendations*, which described national programmes' progress on voluntary implementation of the guidance and recommendations, noting that 24 out of 28 countries participated in the survey.

- (72) ASOC presented three interrelated Information Papers on climate change: IP 62, *An Antarctic Climate Change Report Card*, which described the recent findings of climate change research in the areas of environmental and ecosystem changes and indicated the action that Parties could undertake to mitigate their impacts; IP 65 *Black Carbon and other Short-lived Climate Pollutants: Impacts on Antarctica*, which described the potential importance to global warming of black carbon and other short-lived climate pollutants (SLCPs) and suggested that the analysis of the extent of SLCP emissions and impacts on Antarctica, especially from local sources, should be a priority; and IP 69 *Update: The Future of the West Antarctic Ice Sheet*, which updated information reviewed at the 2010 ATME on Climate Change and concluded that: the mass loss of Antarctic ice sheets was accelerating, widespread glacier retreat might have been set in motion, and changes to West Antarctic Ice Sheets were related to anthropogenic climate change. ASOC emphasised the importance of making Antarctica a carbon neutral continent and the role of the Parties in actively promoting the inclusion of Antarctic science in the global climate change dialogue.
- (73) Sweden recalled that ASOC has presented many good and relevant arguments for including work on Short-Lived Climate Pollutants (SLCPs) in the Strategic Work Plan. Sweden has been active in promoting actions to reduce emissions of SLCPs and participated in setting up the Climate and Clean Air Coalition to reduce emissions of SLCPs. Sweden supported the ideas presented by ASOC, and noted that it is important to look further into the impacts of SLCP in the Antarctic and also pay attention to local sources. It also suggested that it could be of interest to SCAR to look further into climate change and short-lived climate pollutants. The Committee noted that these issues could also be considered in the ICG on climate change.
- (74) IAATO presented IP 101 *IAATO Climate Change Working Group: Report of Progress*, which outlined the progress of IAATO's Climate Change Working Group, including additional efforts to raise awareness of climate change in Antarctica through the development of a publicly available powerpoint presentation, and a list of ways in which IAATO Member Operators manage their emissions. IAATO thanked SCAR for their review and comments of the presentation and expressed its commitment to continue to report on this work to the CEP. Other papers presented under this Agenda item were:
- BP 21 *Antarctic climate change and the environment: an update* (SCAR)

Item 8: Environmental Impact Assessment

6a) Draft Comprehensive Environmental Evaluations

(75) No papers were submitted under this Agenda item.

6b) Other EIA matters

- (76) The Russian Federation introduced WP 24 *Approaches to study of the water layer of sub glacial lakes in the Antarctic*, which explained the techniques used for drilling into subglacial lakes in Antarctica and the challenges that arise. The paper detailed the reasons for selecting the “kerosene-Freon mixture” instead of the “hot water” method to drill into Lake Vostok. The Russian Federation stated that it was impossible for the kerosene-Freon mixture to penetrate the water and impact the lake’s ecosystem, whereas it had some concerns over the potential impacts of hot water on microbial life.
- (77) In response to a request from Belgium for clarification on whether a permanently frozen layer of water would remain at the end of the borehole to prevent the penetration of kerosene-Freon into Lake Vostok, the Russian Federation confirmed that a standard operating procedure was to increase the thickness of the ice cork in the borehole after research work is concluded. In response to France’s request about an earlier SCAR suggestion to insert a silicon fluid interlayer at the end of the borehole to protect the water in the lake, which the Russian Federation had previously considered a possibility, the Russian Federation said that it had decided against this technique, due to concerns over potential cross-contamination between the fluids.
- (78) The Russian Federation presented IP 42 *To [sic] discovery of unknown bacteria in Lake Vostok*, which reported the discovery of an unknown group of bacteria (phylotype) in the first small sample of Lake Vostok water to be laboratory tested. The bacteria could not be identified according to existing data bases and classification methods. Acknowledging the concern about this issue, the Russian Federation stressed that the unknown microbial organism posed no threat to humankind, since it could not survive outside of its natural environment.
- (79) The Russian Federation also presented IP 49 *Results of studies of subglacial lake Vostok and drilling operations in deep ice borehole of Vostok station*

in the season 2012-2013, which gave a technical overview of the drilling activities. France thanked the Russian Federation for sharing this information and encouraged it to continue to provide updates on the work to the Committee in the future.

- (80) China presented IP 21 *Initial Environmental Evaluation for the Construction of Inland Summer Camp, Princess Elizabeth Land, Antarctica*. The main purposes of the camp are to provide logistics support and emergency rescue protection, and to support local observation. China stated that the camp construction would have no more than minor or transitory environmental impact.
- (81) In thanking China for the information, France, Belgium and Germany raised questions on the environmental impacts of the new camp, estimated by China as no more than minor and transitory despite the size, number of people hosted and planned duration of activity. In response to a question from Germany about why it had not undertaken a comprehensive environmental evaluation, China stated that an IEE is sufficient for the construction of a summer camp. China replied to the question from France and Belgium that it was willing to exchange opinions in respect of the results of its IEE, and that it would present further information on the camp construction progress at CEP XVII. Spain recalled Article 8 of the Environmental Protocol and stated that China appeared to have acted in accordance with its obligations.
- (82) The Republic of Korea presented IP 24 *Progress of the Jang Bogo Station during the first construction season 2012/13*, which described the Jang Bogo Station construction activities. Construction started in December 2012 and would continue for two Antarctic summer seasons. Korea reported on material transportation, construction activities, waste management and environmental monitoring, and outlined its response to incidents. An informative presentation on the station construction was shown to delegates. Korea also referred to IP 25 *Mitigation measures of environmental impacts caused by Jang Bogo construction during 2012/13 season*, which explained the implementation of the mitigation measures proposed in the CEE presented in 2011 and suggested by the Parties, to reduce the impacts of construction.
- (83) Korea informed the Committee of the steps it had taken to apply environmental management standards in the construction of its new base: by conducting a comprehensive Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA),

training all expedition members in environmental education, and strictly applying the Non-Native Species Manual. Further, all necessary measures had been taken to address a fuel spill accident which had occurred during bad weather at the construction site, according to the “Jang Bogo Station Fuel Spill Prevention and Contingency Plan”. The majority of the total of 1,100 litres of spilled diesel was recovered and the site would continue to be monitored.

- (84) Korea expressed its gratitude to the Russian Federation, Italy, the United States, Australia and New Zealand, for sharing their knowledge and experience and for providing logistical and technical support.
- (85) Several Members congratulated the Republic of Korea for its comprehensive report on such a challenging project, and the Committee expressed its sincere condolences regarding the fatal accident that occurred last season during the station’s construction. India was very impressed by the way the whole structure was pre-constructed in Korea. In response to a query from New Zealand regarding external environmental audits, the Republic of Korea said that it would provide further information to CEP XVII.
- (86) The Russian Federation presented IP 48 *Permit for the Activity of the Russian Antarctic Expedition in 2013-17*, on the legal requirements and permits granted by the Russian Federation for the declared activities. The paper described in particular the IEE prepared for the activities planned for the five-year period from 1 January 2013 to 31 December 2017. The IEE covers all types of activity planned for the Russian Antarctic Expedition for the next five years. Separate IEEs will be prepared for any new types of activity not covered by the present IEE.
- (87) Brazil presented IP 58 *Terms of Reference of the Initial Environmental Evaluation (IEE): Reconstruction and Operation of Ferraz Station (Admiralty Bay, Antarctica)*, which provided an update on Brazilian efforts to rebuild its station, including the selection of a conceptual project for the station construction from amongst the 74 entrants in an international competition and preparations for a forthcoming IEE. Brazil pointed out that, during the 2012-2013 summer, representatives of Brazilian environmental institutions collected samples for environmental analysis. The results of such analysis will guide the implementation of the Remediation Plan for the area, which will be implemented prior to reconstruction works.

- (88) The Committee commended Brazil for its transparency and willingness to cooperate with other partners, and for upholding high environmental standards. Several Members acknowledged that the recovery of Comandante Ferraz station was consistent with necessary requirements under the Environmental Protocol.
- (89) India presented IP 75 *Initial Environmental Evaluation for Establishment of the Ground Station for Earth Observation Satellites at the Indian Research Station Bharati at Larsemann Hills, East Antarctica*, noting that this ground station would help with communication and remote sensing, and would contribute to global research on climate change.
- (90) Italy presented IP 80 *First steps towards the realization of a gravel runway near Mario Zucchelli Station: initial considerations and possible benefits for the Terra Nova Bay area*. Italy began by noting that increasing difficulties with its present fast ice runway, required a more reliable longterm solution. Reiterating points raised by COMNAP in IP 32, regarding transport costs and energy use, Italy remarked that it intended to share the runway with other national Antarctic programmes, which would lower costs as well as the overall human footprint. While building the runway would only have a temporary impact over a period of four years, Italy acknowledged that the facility would likely result in a more than minor or transitory impact, and would therefore be subject to a CEE.
- (91) Germany appreciated the Italian conclusion that building such a permanent infrastructure would be subject to a CEE. It noted that the runway would also be of advantage for the Parties who have facilities in this area, like Germany which has a summer hut in the locality, and could lead to enhance cooperation and scientific research. In addition, Germany stated that cumulative impacts should be taken into account when carrying out a CEE. In response to a question from Germany, Italy stated that the runway would not be used for tourism.
- (92) In view of the IEEs discussed, the Netherlands raised several issues, including: the assessment of cumulative impacts; the lack of common agreement on the EIA process; the prospect of operating joint scientific facilities; the need to assess gaps in knowledge; assessing impacts on wilderness; and the possibility that facilities established for science would later be used for other activities, for example tourism. The Netherlands commended China for taking wilderness values into account in the preparation of their IEE (IP 21), and encouraged other Members to do the same.

- (93) IAATO stated that it did not support the building of permanent infrastructures for tourism purposes as this would contradict the organisation's vision and mission of having a no more than minor or transitory impact.
- (94) Ukraine mentioned recent improvements to Vernadsky Station, including the installation of more environmentally friendly generators, and a larger fuel tank.
- (95) ASOC registered its concern over the increased human footprint and reduction of Antarctic wilderness as a result of the expansion of human activities in Antarctica. It also said that there is a lack of common agreement on the criteria to determine if an IEE or CEE is necessary for a particular activity, that there was generally a poor level of follow-up on these, and that inspection reports have shown that there was a lack of knowledge of the EIA process at research stations. Referring to SP 5, ASOC observed that only 14 Parties had submitted EIAs to the Secretariat for inclusion in the list.
- (96) Other papers submitted under this agenda item included:
- *SP 5 Annual list of Initial Environmental Evaluations (IEE) and Comprehensive Environmental Evaluations (CEE) prepared between April 1st 2012 and March 31st 2013*
 - *BP 2 Assessing the vulnerability of Antarctic soils to trampling (New Zealand).*

Item 9: Area Protection and Management Plans

9a) Management Plans

- i) Draft Management Plans which have been reviewed by the Subsidiary Group on Management Plans*
- (97) Norway introduced WP 56 *Subsidiary Group on Management Plans – Report on 2012/13 Intersessional Work*, on behalf of the Subsidiary Group (SGMP). The Group had in the intersessional period reviewed eight revised management plans, and recommended that the Committee approve three of these revised management plans.
- (98) With respect to ASPA No 132: Potter Peninsula (Argentina) and ASPA No 151: Lions Rump, King George Island, South Shetland Islands (Poland),

the SGMP advised the Committee that the final revised management plans were well written, of high quality and adequately addressed the key points raised during the review.

- (99) Accordingly, the SGMP recommended that the Committee approve these revised plans.
- (100) With respect to the proposal for a new ASPA at Cape Washington and Silverfish Bay (USA and Italy), the SGMP advised the Committee that the plan adequately addressed the provisions of Annex V and relevant CEP guidelines, and was likely to be effective in achieving the stated aims and objectives for management of the Area. Accordingly, the SGMP recommended that the Committee approve the management plan for this new ASPA.
- (101) In addition, the SGMP advised the Committee that further intersessional work would be conducted with regards to five management plans submitted for intersessional review:
- i. ASPA No 128: Western Shores of Admiralty Bay, King George Island, South Shetland Islands (Poland/USA)
 - ii. ASPA No 144: “Chile Bay” (Discovery Bay), Greenwich Island, South Shetland Islands (Chile)
 - iii. ASPA No 145: Port Foster, Deception Island, South Shetland Islands (Chile)
 - iv. ASPA No 146: South Bay, Doumer Island, Palmer Archipelago (Chile)
 - v. New ASPA: High altitude geothermal sites of the Ross Sea region (New Zealand)
- (102) In response to a question raised by the Russian Federation on the possibility that during a revision the elements requiring protection might need to be changed, Norway stated that the SGMP had reviewed all revised management plans in accordance with the “Guide to the Preparation of Management Plans for Antarctic Specially Protected Areas.”
- (103) The Committee endorsed the SGMP’s recommendation and agreed to forward the revised management plans for ASPA 132, ASPA 151 and a new ASPA at Cape Washington and Silverfish Bay to the ATCM for adoption.

(104) IAATO thanked Italy, the United States and the SGMP for taking the views of IAATO into consideration while developing the ASPA at Cape Washington and Silverfish Bay and showed its appreciation for the effort to amend the boundary to allow for some visitation within the general vicinity of the colony. Nonetheless, IAATO expressed its disappointment that visits from responsible tourism would no longer be possible, particularly as the levels of this visitation were very low and there were few realistic alternative options for visits to emperor penguin colonies in the area. IAATO noted that visits to Franklin Island, which was provided as an alternative visitor site for emperor penguins, are for viewing Adelie penguins, not emperor penguins. IAATO further suggested to the Committee that, given the level of activity in the area, there would be value in considering an ASMA for the region.

ii) Draft revised Management Plans which had not been reviewed by the Subsidiary Group on Management Plans

(105) The Committee considered revised management plans for 12 Antarctic Specially Protected Areas (ASPAs) and two Antarctic Specially Managed Areas (ASMAs) under this category:

- *WP2 Revised Management Plan for Antarctic Specially Protected Area No 137 Northwest White Island, McMurdo Sound (United States)*
- *WP 3 Revised Management Plan for Antarctic Specially Protected Area No 123 Barwick and Balham Valleys, Southern Victoria Land (United States)*
- *WP 5 Revised Management Plan for Antarctic Specially Protected Area No 138 Linnaeus Terrace, Asgard Range, Victoria Land (United States)*
- *WP 6 Revision of the Management Plan for Antarctic Specially Protected Area No 141 Yukidori Valley, Langhovde, Lützow-Holm Bay (Japan)*
- *WP 11 Revised Management Plan for Antarctic Specially Protected Area No 108 Green Island, Berthelot Islands, Antarctic Peninsula (United Kingdom)*
- *WP 12 Revised Management Plan for Antarctic Specially Protected Area No 117 Avian Island, Marguerite Bay, Antarctic Peninsula (United Kingdom)*

- WP 13 *Revised Management Plan for Antarctic Specially Protected Area No 147 Ablation Valley and Ganymede Heights, Alexander Island* (United Kingdom)
- WP 14 *Revised Management Plan for Antarctic Specially Protected Area No 170 Marion Nunataks, Charcot Island, Antarctic Peninsula* (United Kingdom)
- WP 29 *Revision of Management Plan for Antarctic Specially Protected Area No 154 Botany Bay, Cape Geology, Victoria Land* (New Zealand)
- WP 30 *Revision of Management Plan for Antarctic Specially Protected Area No 156 Lewis Bay, Mount Erebus, Ross Island* (New Zealand)
- WP 36 *Review of Management Plans for Antarctic Specially Protected Areas (ASPAs) 135, 143 and 160* (Australia)
- WP 54 rev.1 *Review of the Management Plan for ASMA No 1: Admiralty Bay, King George Island, South Shetland Islands* (Brazil, Ecuador, Peru, Poland)
- WP 59, *Revised Management Plan for Antarctic Specially Protected Area No 134 Cierva Point and offshore islands, Danco Coast, Antarctic Peninsula* (Argentina)
- WP 60, *Revision of Management Plan for Antarctic Specially Protected Area No 161 Terra Nova Bay, Ross Sea* (Italy).

(106) The Russian Federation recalled its proposal from 2012 (ATCM XXXV WP 35), that the Committee should consider the Revised Management Plans of ASPAs and ASMAs for which fauna or flora were the main values, only when information was submitted on the results of monitoring of the state of values that were a cause for designating such an area. The Russian Federation underlined its belief in the need for a scientifically justified approach to the choice of the ASPAs and ASMAs.

(107) With respect to WP 2 (ASPAs 137), WP 3 (ASPAs 123) and WP 5 (ASPAs 138), the United States explained that revisions were minor and aimed at bringing these management plans in line with Resolution 2 (2011) *Revised Guide to the Preparation of Management Plans for Antarctic Specially Protected Areas*. Changes included the addition of an introduction and the improvement

of the maps. In response to a query from the Russian Federation, the United States clarified that all plans included, in the reference section and when appropriate, the monitoring results of a site review.

- (108) With respect to WP 6 (ASPAs 141), in response to a question from the Russian Federation, Japan confirmed that its preparation of the management plan was in accordance with the “Guide to the Preparation of Management Plans for Antarctic Specially Protected Areas”, and included a biennial vegetation survey in the Yukidori Valley, but did not currently include avian surveys.
- (109) With respect to WP 11 (ASPAs 108), WP 12 (ASPAs 117), WP 13 (ASPAs 147) and WP 14 (ASPAs 170), the United Kingdom said that only minor changes had been made to the management plans. Some of these changes were: the addition of an introduction, a range of minor editorial amendments, the incorporation of improved maps, reference in the introduction to the Environmental Domains Analysis (Resolution 3 (2008)) and the Antarctic Conservation Biogeographic Regions (Resolution 6 (2012)), visitor management requirements related to the introduction of non-native species, and a redefinition of Area boundaries.
- (110) In introducing WP 29 (ASPAs 154) and WP 30 (ASPAs 156), New Zealand explained that all revisions were minor. ASPAs 154 was protected for its unique biodiversity, science and historic values, and ASPAs 156 was designated as a tomb to prevent unnecessary disturbance as a mark of respect in remembrance of the victims of an aircraft crash. In response to a query from Japan, New Zealand assured the Committee that there was no negative impact caused by recreational visits to ASPAs 156.
- (111) Argentina informed the Committee that it had reviewed the Management Plan for ASPAs 134 (WP 59) and that only minor adjustments had been made. These included the addition of: information concerning the reasons for designation, considerations related to the prevention of introduction of non-native species, two new sections in response to Resolution 2 (2011), and an update and expansion of the description of the values of the Area.
- (112) With respect to WP 60 (ASPAs 161), Italy informed the Committee that there had been no substantial changes to the Management Plan, and that boundaries, maps and descriptions remained the same.
- (113) Introducing WP 36 (ASPAs 135, 143 and 160), Australia said that only minor amendments were made to the management plans, and noted that in

each case the revision was prepared with reference to the revised guide in Resolution 2 (2011).

- (114) With regard to WP 54 rev.1 (ASMA 1), Brazil said that the plan had been updated to include two new aims, two new Appendices, four scientific values and two new maps. Brazil explained that the United States, as a member of the Management Group for ASMA 1, had participated in the review process. It recommended that the CEP should ask the Subsidiary Group on Management Plans to undertake an intersessional review. The proposer will also submit the current draft to CCAMLR WG-EMM/CCAMLR, in order to receive contributions to the final version, which would be presented to CEP XVII.
- (115) In noting the important links between CCAMLR and the CEP in respect of ASMAs and ASPAs with a marine component France suggested that the Committee should establish a mechanism for regular reports from the Scientific Committee of CCAMLR to the CEP on any harvesting of living resources in such areas. The SC-CAMLR Observer noted that such information was contained in IP 6 and confirmed that if further information was required by the CEP this could be provided in future. The Committee welcomed the information provided and encouraged the development of improved mechanisms for timely and efficient information exchange between CEP and SC-CCAMLR. New Zealand also noted the importance of delegations sharing ASPA and ASMA information directly with their CCAMLR colleagues within their own governments.
- (116) ASOC expressed its support for such a mechanism and declared that in its opinion there should be no fishing in ASMAs or ASPAs.
- (117) The Committee decided to refer the revised management plans for ASPA 141 and ASMA 1 to the SGMP for intersessional review, and agreed to forward the other revised management plans to the ATCM for adoption.

iii) New draft management plans for protected/managed areas

- (118) The Committee considered one proposal to designate a new Antarctic Specially Managed Area and one new Antarctic Specially Protected Area:
- *WP 8 Proposal for a new Antarctic Specially Managed Area at Chinese Antarctic Kunlun Station, Dome A (China).*

- WP 63 *Draft Antarctic Specially Protected Area (ASPA) Management Plan for Stornes, Larsemann Hills, Princess Elizabeth Land* (Australia, China, India, and the Russian Federation).

- (119) In introducing WP 8, China noted that it had conducted a Comprehensive Study in the Dome A area, and had prepared a draft management plan that aimed to enhance the protection of its scientific, environmental and logistical values. China proposed that the draft management plan be considered by the SGMP during the intersessional period, and invited Members to participate in this process.
- (120) While congratulating China for the comprehensive report, several Members questioned the justification of designating a new ASMA at Dome A. Some Members noted that Kunlun station was constructed only recently, and suggested that it might be premature to designate the area as an ASMA. The United Kingdom inquired whether the proposal made by China was aligned with the purposes of ASMAs as defined by Annex 5 of the Environmental Protocol where principal objectives were to avoid conflict and improve collaboration between different users of an area. The Russian Federation and Norway also asked what were the threats envisaged to this remote area. France noted that other sites had now been identified with deeper ice-coring potential. Germany questioned the advantages of designating an ASMA in such a remote region with a low level of biodiversity. The United States also suggested that further discussion among Members may be useful. While recognising the scientific value of Dome A and expressing its gratitude for the support of Chinese colleagues in the region, Australia agreed with the need for further consideration.
- (121) China quoted the Article 4 of Annex 5 to the Environmental Protocol and pointed out that its proposal for the designation of an ASMA did not conflict with the statement in this Article, especially the wording of “where activities are being conducted or may in the future be conducted”. China generally responded to the questions from some Members that its consideration of “planning and co-ordination” statement in Article 4 is based on solid information from the science community of the intention of carrying out scientific research in Dome A area by some countries and even non-governmental activities such as extreme sports could be anticipated, so that the precautionary principle was applied in this proposal. ASOC welcomed the intention by China to take a precautionary approach to area management.

- (122) China thanked Members for their comments and suggestions. China reiterated that its proposal was based not on the premise that more than one Party would necessarily be using the site but on a precautionary approach to likely future activities and interest in the region, and on the values to be protected.
- (123) The Committee accepted China's offer to lead further discussions on the proposed ASMA during the intersessional period, and encouraged Members to participate.
- (124) Norway suggested that the debate highlighted the need for the Committee to review and reconsider the overall process of designating ASPAs and ASMAs, and recommended that Members engage in a broad discussion of the topic. Many Members expressed their support for this suggestion. Norway noted that it would work intersessionally with interested Members on this topic with a view to developing concrete proposals.
- (125) In introducing WP 63, Australia stated that the proposed ASPA in the Larsemann Hills aimed to protect the area's unique geological features, specifically the rare mineral occurrences and the highly unusual host rocks in which they occur. It noted that this was consistent with Article 3.2(f) of Annex V which provides for examples of outstanding geological, glaciological or geomorphological features to be included in the series of ASPAs.
- (126) The Russian Federation noted that the draft ASPA management plan had been discussed at a Larsemann Hills ASMA Management Group meeting in St Petersburg in April 2013. Further details of the Management Group's activities are provided in IP 46.
- (127) Belgium suggested that the Grovenes and Broknes peninsulas, where Belgian and British scientists have identified the presence of endemic algal communities, might also be included within the boundary of future ASPAs.
- (128) The Committee agreed to forward the draft management plan for an ASPA at Stornes, Larsemann Hills, Princess Elizabeth Land, to the SGMP for review during the intersessional period.

CEP Advice to the ATCM

- (129) The Committee agreed to forward the following management plans to the ATCM for adoption:

#	Name
ASP A 137	Northwest White Island, McMurdo Sound
ASP A 123	Barwick and Balham Valleys, Southern Victoria Land
ASP A 138	Linnaeus Terrace, Asgard Range, Victoria Lands
ASP A 108	Green Island, Berthelot Islands, Antarctic Peninsula
ASP A 117	Avian Island, Marguerite Bay, Antarctic Peninsula
ASP A 147	Ablation Valley and Ganymede Heights, Alexander Island
ASP A 170	Marion Nunataks, Charcot Island, Antarctic Peninsula
ASP A 154	Botany Bay, Cape Geology, Victoria Land
ASP A 156	Lewis Bay, Mount Erebus, Ross Island
ASP A 135	North-East Bailey Peninsula, Budd Coast, Wilkes Land, East Antarctica
ASP A 143	Marine Plain, Mule Peninsula, Vestfold Hills, Princess Elizabeth Land
ASP A 160	Frazier Islands, Windmill Islands, Wilkes Land, East Antarctica
ASP A 134	Cierva Point and offshore islands, Danco Coast, Antarctic Peninsula
ASP A 161	Terra Nova Bay, Ross Sea
ASP A 132	Potter Peninsula, King George Island
ASP A 151	Lions Rump, King George Island
NEW ASP A	Cape Washington, South Victoria Land

(130) With respect to WP 56 regarding the SGMPs terms of reference 4 and 5, Norway, as convener of the SGMP, recalled that CEP XIV had supported the recommendations of the 2011 Workshop on Marine and Terrestrial Antarctic Specially Managed Areas, and had encouraged interested Members “to review the provisions of existing ASMA management plans, with a view to preparing a suggested work plan and supporting materials to support work by the SGMP to develop guidance for establishing ASMAs and for preparing and reviewing ASMA management plans” and asked the Committee’s views on whether this was an issue to be brought forward by the SGMP in the coming intersessional period. The Committee noted the importance of the topic, in particular in light of the discussions, but also noted the high work load of the SGMP, and suggested this issue be postponed to a future time.

(131) The Committee agreed that the work plan for the SGMP during the 2013/14 intersessional period should be as follows:

Terms of Reference	Suggested tasks
ToR 1 to 3	Review draft management plans referred by CEP for intersessional review and provide advice to proponents (including the five postponed plans from the 2012/13 intersessional period)
ToR 4 and 5	Work with relevant Parties to ensure progress on review of management plans overdue for five-yearly review
	Review and update SGMP work plan
Working Papers	Prepare report for CEP XVII against SGMP ToR 1 to 3
	Prepare report for CEP XVII against SGMP ToR 4 and 5

iv) Other matters relating to management plans for protected/managed areas

- (132) The Republic of Korea presented IP 26 rev.1 *Management Report of Narebski Point (ASPANo 171) during the 2012/2013 period*. In accordance with the provisions of the Management Plan for ASPA 171, scientific studies and management activities had been undertaken, and the paper outlined lessons learned and recommendations. The Republic of Korea noted that the population of penguins in the region had increased, but that the reason for this was unclear. The management plan would be reviewed in 2014.
- (133) Chile thanked the Republic of Korea for their document that includes new scientific information about the penguin colonies in the area. Chile also stated that it wished to include data on that research in the future. Chile reminded Parties that it will present a revision of ASPA 150 to the next CEP and will ask the Republic of Korea for their comments during the review process.
- (134) China reported that it planned a site visit to ASPA 168 in the 2013/14 season, and that China would report on a possible revision of the management plan to CEP XVII.
- (135) Norway, on behalf of Argentina, Chile, Spain, the United Kingdom and United States, presented IP 74 *Deception Island Specially Managed Area (ASMA) Management Group Report*, which summarised the activities undertaken within the ASMA, and the work of the Management Group to fulfil the objectives and principles of its Management Plan during the intersessional period (2012/13).

The following papers were also presented under this Agenda items:

- SP 6 *Status of Antarctic Specially Protected Area and Antarctic Specially Managed Area Management Plans*

9b) Historic Sites and Monuments

- (136) Germany introduced WP 18 rev.1 *Proposal to add the site commemorating the location of the former German Antarctic Research Station “Georg Forster” to the List of Historic Sites and Monuments*. It noted that the site, which had contained Germany’s first permanent Antarctic research base, had been cleaned and remediated following the station’s removal in 1996.
- (137) Several Members commended Germany for its successful station clean-up and removal, noting that this provided a model for other Parties to follow.
- (138) The Committee approved the proposal to add the site, noting that the designation applied to the site of the former German Antarctic Research Station “Georg Forster”, and not to the plaque commemorating the location, to the List of Historic Sites and Monuments, and agreed to forward it to the ATCM for adoption.
- (139) The Russian Federation introduced WP 23 *Proposed addition of the Professor Kudryashov’s drilling complex building at the Russian Antarctic Vostok station* to the List of Historic Sites and Monuments. The Russian Federation noted its proposal was aimed at commemorating the unique achievement of the Russian drillers and glaciologists in the field of drilling deep ice boreholes, reconstruction of paleoclimatic changes based on ice core data, microbiological studies of these ice cores, and ecologically clean unsealing of the subglacial Lake Vostok. Professor Kudryashov had made a major contribution to Antarctic science, and the drilling complex that carries his name hosted an important event in Antarctic history when Russian scientists unsealed the subglacial lake. In response to a query by the United Kingdom, the Russian Federation clarified that its proposal referred exclusively to the building not including the equipment and the borehole. It planned to remove the drilling fluid once the drilling activities at the site were concluded.
- (140) The Committee approved the proposal and agreed to forward it to the ATCM for adoption.
- (141) The United Kingdom introduced WP 62 *New Historic Sites and Monuments: Mount Erebus camp sites used by a contingent of the Terra Nova Expedition in December 1912*, jointly prepared with New Zealand and the United States.

While information about the sites was limited, the proponents considered the locations of the camps to be of significant interest to Antarctic historians, and that access to the sites should be controlled, in order to prevent disturbance of the recently discovered historic remains.

- (142) In response to queries, the United Kingdom clarified that the scope of their proposal included two separate new historic sites, corresponding to each of the camps described in WP 62.
- (143) The Committee approved the proposal and agreed to forward it to the ATCM for adoption.
- (144) Norway suggested that the Committee might consider at some time in the future engaging in a broader discussion on Historical Sites and Monuments designations. Norway pointed out that many constructions in Antarctica might be considered to have historical value and that this could lead to the designation of a large number of historic sites in the future, which might be seen to contradict the Environmental Protocol’s provision regarding clean-up of past activities in Antarctica. In supporting Norway’s proposal, Germany suggested that intersessional discussions could be valuable.
- (145) While several Members supported the point raised by Norway, Argentina and the United States recalled the contributions of Chilean Ambassador Jorge Berguño to the management of Historic Sites and Monuments, the Committee did not view the issue as an urgent priority. Rather, a review of the procedure of designating Historic Sites and Monuments would be noted in the Five-Year Work Plan.

CEP Advice to the ATCM

- (146) After considering proposals for four Historic Sites and Monuments, the Committee agreed to forward them to the ATCM for adoption:

#	Name of site/monument
NEW HSM	Location of the first permanently occupied German Antarctic research station “Georg Forster” at the Schirmacher Oasis, Dronning Maud Land
NEW HSM	Professor Kudryashov’s Drilling Complex Building, Vostok Station
NEW HSM	Upper “Summit Camp”, Mount Erebus
NEW HSM	Lower “Camp E”, Mount Erebus

9c) Site Guidelines

- (147) The United Kingdom introduced WP 15 *Policy Issues Arising from the 2013 On-Site Review of Guidelines for Visitor Sites in the Antarctic Peninsula*, WP 16, *Site Guidelines for i) Orne Harbour and ii) Orne Islands*, and WP 20, *On-Site Review of Guidelines for Visitor Sites in the Antarctic Peninsula: summary of programme and suggested amendment of eleven Guidelines*, jointly prepared with Australia, Argentina and United States. These papers, as well as a short presentation by the United Kingdom, described the organisation and outcomes of an on-site review of Site Guidelines carried out by the co-authors and IAATO in January 2013.
- (148) The United Kingdom reported that the review team had identified no significant visitor impacts on the sites other than those which had been the subject of previous discussion by the Committee. Evidence from this relatively short, but focused and intensive, series of visits suggested that the Guidelines were successful in directing the way that most organised groups of visitors were using the sites, in order to avoid any adverse environmental impacts. At the same time, it noted that Site Guidelines remained only one of a range of potential tools to manage visitation.
- (149) The Committee congratulated the proponents and acknowledged IAATO's constructive role in the review, and several Members noted the close relationship between the recommendations arising from this review and those adopted by the CEP and the ATCM via the CEP Tourism Study (2012). The Russian Federation viewed the on-site survey as an excellent model of a coordinated effort that could also be applied to other areas in Antarctica where humans were present. Germany endorsed the recommendation to collate generic and specific site guidelines into a practical package format and thus strengthening the generic site guidelines. IAATO added that the on-site review had been a useful public relations exercise, as it had involved close interaction between Committee Members and tour operators as well as tourists.
- (150) Several Members expressed their strong support for the recommendation for ongoing monitoring of sites to identify any visitor impacts, and suggested that the Committee should discuss how this might be achieved. On this note, New Zealand reiterated the value of the long-term data available from the Antarctic Site Inventory of Oceanites Inc. Norway also noted that

experiences from the Arctic might be relevant when considering issues related to methodologies for assessing site sensitivities.

- (151) ASOC acknowledged the value of site specific guidelines, but also urged the Committee to take a strategic approach to tourist management, consistent with Resolution 7 (2009).
- (152) In response to a question from Germany, the United Kingdom commented that, although there was less site-specific detail in the Site Guidelines for Orne Islands than for some other sites, it was considered a sufficiently important site to justify its own set of Guidelines given its location.
- (153) The CEP discussed the recommendations presented in WP 15:

The CEP noted and endorsed Recommendation 1 that: *Parties continue to make efforts to ensure that all visitors to sites covered by ATCM Site Guidelines are aware, and make use of, the Guidelines.* This should include recreational visits by National Antarctic Programme (NAP) personnel as well as visitors participating in private or non-commercial activity.

The CEP considered Recommendation 2: *For the CEP to consider the value of a survey to establish the level of recreational visits from NAP staff to sites with Site Guidelines in place.* The CEP encouraged members to bring forward information on recreational visits to sites subject to site guidelines, by NAP personnel. The United Kingdom offered to coordinate an informal process to seek and collate information for reporting to CEP XVII. The CEP further noted work underway in the ATCM with respect to the CEP tourism study recommendations on development of visitation databases, and encouraged Parties to consider ways to ensure visits by NAP personnel are included in such systems as they are developed.

The CEP noted and endorsed Recommendation 3: *That Parties continue to carry out on-site reviews of Site Guidelines, as determined by the individual requirements of the sites.* The CEP encouraged Parties to focus on including appropriate site-specific information within new or amended Site Guidelines.

The CEP considered Recommendation 4: *Parties work to establish an appropriate site monitoring programme, including a recommended set of criteria for such a programme.* The CEP noted that this recommendation

coincides with the recommendations 6 and 7 of the CEP tourism study relating to monitoring.

The CEP considered Recommendation 5: *In view of the assessment from this year's on-site review program that there are sites which are particularly sensitive to visitation, the CEP consider whether monitoring for visitor impacts would be useful in these particular locations.* The CEP noted that this recommendation coincides with the recommendations 3, 6 and 7 of the CEP tourism study relating to monitoring.

The CEP considered Recommendation 6: *That any CEP discussion of monitoring sites should include consideration of including non site-specific impacts (for example, litter or other objects).* The CEP noted that this recommendation relates to the recommendations of the CEP tourism study on monitoring, and encouraged Parties to consider this area in their future discussions

The CEP noted and endorsed Recommendation 7: *That Parties should continue to seek input from IAATO and other non-governmental operators as appropriate, when revising or creating new Site Guidelines. Operators should alert Parties to changes at sites that merit review and possible revision of the Site Guidelines.*

The CEP noted and endorsed Recommendation 8: that, where possible:

- illustrated photo-maps should be used to assist in on-site interpretation of the provisions of the Site Guidelines;
- a standardised map format should be developed for use across Site Guidelines;
- that the Site Guidelines should include information on the date of their adoption and any subsequent revision; and
- that the CEP considers the benefit of bringing all the Site Guidelines together with the similarly formatted General Guidelines as part of the practical package of information for visitors to Antarctica.

The CEP noted and endorsed Recommendation 9: *That the CEP encourages the development, by IAATO and other non-governmental operators, of best-practice training assessment and/or accreditation schemes for Antarctic guides and expedition leaders, noting the CEP discussions in 2005 and 2006.* The CEP further noted the desirability of ATCM engagement in this work.

The CEP considered Recommendation 10: *Noting that visible signs of disturbance are important in avoiding disturbance of wildlife, that CEP members give consideration to the production of visitor-focused guidelines detailing such signs.* The CEP encourages members to bring forward, in consultation with SCAR, proposals relating to this recommendation.

- (154) In considering the connections between the recommendations in WP 15 and the recommendations of the CEP tourism study, it was noted that the ATCM had requested the CEP to address Recommendations 3, 4, 6 and 7, where recommendations 3 and 6 had been identified as priority areas.
- (155) The United States introduced WP 26 *Proposed Amendment for Antarctic Treaty Site Guidelines for Visitors to Torgersen Island*, which proposed an amendment to the existing guidelines in response to significant declines in the Adélie penguin population. In response to a query from France, the United States commented that, as site guidelines were voluntary, it was more appropriate for the Torgersen Island site guidelines to strongly discourage, rather than to prohibit, early season visitation to the island. In response to a query from Norway regarding the absence of a reference to ship size, the United States noted that it was the timing of visits, rather than overcrowding, that was of most concern at this site. The Committee approved the revised Site Guidelines for this site.
- (156) Thanking the United States, ASOC noted that it was a good example of the practical application of the Precautionary Principle to site management.
- (157) The United States introduced WP 46 *Proposed Amendment for Antarctic Treaty Site Guidelines for Visitors Baily Head, Deception Island*, jointly prepared with Argentina, Chile, Norway, Spain, United Kingdom, ASOC and IAATO. It noted that the Deception Island Management Group had been prompted to review these guidelines following the report of a significant decline of more than 50 per cent in the abundance of chinstrap penguins breeding at Baily Head since the last comprehensive census in 1986/1987. The Committee approved the revised Site Guidelines for this site.
- (158) Ecuador introduced WP 64 *Updated Map of Barrientos Island*, which it proposed should be included in the current Site Guidelines for Barrientos Island. Several Members thanked Ecuador for their work, and IAATO remarked that the updated map was comprehensive and user-friendly. After minor modifications of the maps based on comments during the discussion the Committee approved the revised Site Guidelines.

CEP Advice to the ATCM

(159) After considering two new site guidelines and fourteen revised site guidelines, the Committee agreed to forward the following site guidelines to the ATCM for adoption:

- Yankee Harbour
- Half Moon Island
- Brown Bluff
- Hannah Point
- Cuverville Island
- Danco Island
- Neko Harbour
- Pleneau Island
- Petermann Island
- Damoy Point
- Jougla Point
- Baily Head, Deception Island
- Torgersen Island
- Barrientos Island
- Orne Harbour (new)
- Orne Islands (new)

(160) The United States presented IP 20 *Antarctic Site Inventory 1994-2013*, which provided an update on results of the Antarctic Site Inventory undertaken by Oceanites Inc. through February 2013. Key trends that this long-term dataset has identified are the rapid increase and southward expansion of gentoo penguin populations, and significant declines in chinstrap and Adélie penguin populations on the western Antarctic Peninsula.

(161) IAATO presented IP 97 *Report on IAATO Operator Use of Antarctic Peninsula Landing Sites and ATCM Visitor Site Guidelines, 2012-13 Season*, noting that traditional ship-based tourism represented over 95 per cent of

all landed activity, that the 20 most-visited sites represented 72 per cent of the total number of landings made, and that all but one of these most-visited sites – Portal Point – were covered by site specific management plans. In response, the United Kingdom offered to assist in the drafting of new site guideline for Portal Point should Members consider this necessary.

- (162) IAATO presented IP 102 *Barrientos Island Footpath Erosion*, which summarised the results of an internal investigation conducted by IAATO in relation to the erosion in moss beds on Barrientos Island. IAATO reported that its members would continue to prohibit walks through Closed Area B on Barrientos Island until additional information was available, and that it would review options to strengthen feedback from field staff. IAATO also commented that while Site Guidelines were perceived as very beneficial, the Barrientos Island example showed that more detailed information was needed where more precise management practices were promoted.
- (163) Ecuador thanked IAATO for its investigation, and informed the Committee that it had observed full compliance with Resolution 5 (2012) and that it would continue to update the Committee on this issue.

9d) Human Footprint and Wilderness Values

- (164) The Committee discussed proposals for revised site guidelines for one site New Zealand introduced WP 35 *Possible guidance material to assist Parties to take account of wilderness values when undertaking environmental impact assessments* and IP 39 *Intersessional report on the provision of guidance material to assist Parties to take account of wilderness values when undertaking environmental impact assessments*. New Zealand proposed that Parties use this material within the Guidelines for Environmental Impact Assessment in Antarctica, and possibly as part of a wider update of those Guidelines.
- (165) Members acknowledged New Zealand's ongoing leadership of the Committee's discussions of wilderness values. Many members expressed their support for the proposal and for continuing discussions of wilderness values. France remarked on some of the complexities concerning wilderness values, including the question of scale in establishing wilderness areas, and the differences between tangible and intangible values, and between aesthetic and wilderness values.

- (166) Japan encouraged members to provide concrete examples of how to take wilderness values into account for area protection.
- (167) In light of the discussions, New Zealand confirmed that it will aim to continue work on wilderness. This will include technical refinements and collaboration with interested Parties with a view to contributing to a review of the EIA guidelines in due course. New Zealand pointed out that the ASOC posting on the CEP Forum contained examples of how to take wilderness values into account in EIAs.
- (168) ASOC presented IP 60 *Mapping and modelling wilderness values in Antarctica: contribution to CEP's work in developing guidance material on wilderness protection using protocol tools*, which summarised the recommendations of a report produced by the Wildland Research Institute. Based on a literature review on how wilderness quality is mapped and modelled worldwide, using Geographical Information Systems (GIS), the paper recommended, *inter alia*, that the CEP adopt the universal basic premise that wilderness conditions are seen to exist where a location is remote from settlement and mechanised access, and relatively free from human-induced changes to land cover. ASOC called for Parties to use existing tools of the Environmental Protocol to take concrete steps to protect Antarctica's wilderness values.
- (169) The Netherlands supported ASOC's recommendations and suggested that a broader view of wilderness from across the world would also be helpful. In response to a query from the Russian Federation, ASOC clarified that their literature review had not included the development of a quantitative measure for Antarctic wilderness.
- (170) COMNAP presented IP 33 *Analysis of national Antarctic program increased delivery of science*, which presented the results of an analysis undertaken by the Chilean National Antarctic Program, Instituto Antartico Chileno (INACH). This analysis identified procedures and strategies to continue to deliver more science while reducing its programme's Antarctic footprint.

9e) Marine Spatial Protection and management

- (171) The following papers were presented under this Agenda item:
- IP 34 *Using ASMAs and ASPAs when necessary to complement CCAMLR MPAs* (IUCN)

9f) Other Annex V matters

- (172) The United Kingdom introduced WP 10 *Identification of potential climate change refugia for emperor penguins: a science-based approach*, which stated that climate change was likely to impact upon emperor penguin distribution range and breeding success. The United Kingdom suggested that the remote sensing techniques outlined in the paper could make a step-change contribution in improving the evidence base for the monitoring of vulnerable sites, including ASPAs, and recommended that the CEP: a) acknowledge the significant value offered by remote sensing as a technique for gathering detailed evidence on emperor penguin population variability, linked to localised climate change; b) endorse the proposal laid out in this paper as an appropriate method of identifying potential climate change refugia for emperor penguins; and c) encourage Parties with work programmes related to emperor penguins to consider collaboration with the United Kingdom in further developing and applying these monitoring techniques across the wider Antarctic region.
- (173) Members thanked the United Kingdom for its Paper and acknowledged the benefits of the proposed techniques. Several Members noted that although remote sensing was very useful, other complementary techniques had to be taken into account, including ground studies to validate remote sensing. France recalled some limits to only using satellite imagery and that individual tracking of emperor penguins in Dumont d'Urville provide useful information on the demographic parameters that help to improve our understanding of the variations in the size of colonies in connection with climate change. Germany and Argentina reminded Members of the activities of SCAR's Action Group on Remote Sensing, and proposed collaborative work with SCAR. Australia mentioned that its scientists were also engaged in remote sensing research, and expressed its will to collaborate with the United Kingdom and exchange information.
- (174) While congratulating the United Kingdom for its precautionary approach, China underlined that many factors impact the size of penguin colonies, and that potential shortcomings of data from remote sensing included the limited time of the observation, and that some data could only be registered by on-ground research. The Russian Federation agreed that changes in populations of birds and other species were not only related to climate change but also to other variables. It suggested that it would be interesting to compare the

situation of penguin colonies in East and West Antarctica, where the impacts of climate change are different.

- (175) SCAR advised that its newly formed Action Group on Remote Sensing would meet during the SCAR Biology Symposium in Barcelona in July 2013. ASOC noted that there is little knowledge on how the biology of emperor penguins might be affected by climate change and supported the United Kingdom's proposal to conduct large-scale and long-term studies.
- (176) In conclusion, the Committee endorsed the monitoring of emperor penguin colonies using remote sensing techniques to identify potential climate change refugia, and encouraged Members to undertake similar work in other regions of Antarctica. The Committee also noted that other techniques should be used to complement remote sensing, and welcomed the offer of the United Kingdom to lead informal discussions on the issue during the intersessional period.
- (177) In introducing WP 21 *Analysis of the ASPA and ASMA wildlife values*, the Russian Federation recalled its proposal to require monitoring programmes, particularly of Antarctic wildlife, in areas with existing or proposed management plans, in order to gather scientific evidence that would inform decisions about management plans.
- (178) In response, a number of Members reiterated the reservations they had stated at previous meetings regarding the proposal to make such monitoring mandatory, including CEP XV.
- (179) The Russian Federation thanked Members for their comments and suggestions, and noted that while its proposal was in full compliance with Resolution 2 (2011), it would revise its proposal, to remove the mandatory elements.
- (180) The Committee did not reach a consensus regarding the proposal of the Russian Federation regarding environmental monitoring related to protected areas. While the Committee expressed its gratitude towards the Russian Federation for raising an important issue, several Members still held concerns regarding the substance of the proposal. Accordingly, the Committee agreed to continue its discussion of monitoring at CEP XVII.
- (181) The Committee welcomed the Russian Federation's offer to lead informal intersessional discussions on this subject. It encouraged participation by interested Members and SCAR.

- (182) The Russian Federation introduced WP 22 *Russian Antarctic biogeographic regioning as compared with the New Zealand classification*, which noted that Russian scientists have generated classifications of major landscape types on the basis of environmental parameters. The Russian Federation noted that this work could build on and complement existing classifications, such as the Environmental Domains Analysis adopted under Resolution 3 (2008) and the Antarctic Conservation Biogeographic Regions adopted under Resolution 6 (2012).
- (183) Many Members thanked the Russian Federation for its work and expressed their strong support for the proposal. Australia recalled ATCM XXXV-WP 23, which it had submitted jointly with New Zealand and SCAR, which identified 15 biologically distinct Antarctic Conservation Biogeographic Regions and noted that the inclusion of more data could allow further analyses and possibly result in refinements to the classification. New Zealand highlighted the importance of continual refinement of biogeographic regions and associated scientific tools, and acknowledged the Russian Federation's contribution in this regard.
- (184) SCAR welcomed the paper from the Russian Federation. It recalled ATCM XXXV-WP 23 rev.1 presented last year by Australia, NZ and SCAR, which noted that the Antarctic Conservation Biogeographic regions are based both on the original environmental domains analysis of the full Antarctic prepared by New Zealand. What the scientific analysis did to arrive at these regions was to include expert opinion and data on the distribution of organisms. SCAR welcomed the additional views from the Russian Federation, which help further develop biogeographic understanding of the region. The additional biodiversity data that are available are also welcome, and could be contributed to the SCAR biodiversity database hosted by Australia. The development by Australian scientists of an Antarctic Near Shore and Terrestrial Observing System will also help the CEP with its work. These new data, especially from genetic studies, will also help in understanding the influence of history on biogeography. Two new SCAR Research Programmes, State of the Antarctic Ecosystem and Antarctic Thresholds Ecosystem Resilience and Adaptation, provide a means to integrate biogeographic information both from scientists from the Russian Federation and those from elsewhere.

- (185) The Committee agreed that the work undertaken by the Russian Federation was complementary to previous work by Australia, New Zealand and SCAR, and that it provided useful data.
- (186) Belgium introduced WP 39 *Human footprint in Antarctica and the long-term conservation of terrestrial microbial habitats*, prepared jointly with SCAR, South Africa and the United Kingdom, which highlighted potential threats to the conservation of terrestrial microbial ecosystems in Antarctica, and to future scientific research on these ecosystems. Belgium pointed out that recent advances in molecular biology techniques had identified diverse microbial communities and species endemic to Antarctica. The proponents accordingly recommended: a) that microbial contamination of pristine sites are considered by Parties in their EIAs for activities in locations unlikely to have ever been visited; and b) that the protected area system should be used more actively to protect microbial habitats for future science and for their own intrinsic value, including through the designation of areas kept inviolate from human interference.
- (187) Members thanked Belgium and its co-authors for their contribution, supported by extensive scientific data, and recognised the importance of this question. Moreover they raised several questions, including: the difficulty of controlling the transportation of microbial organisms; the definition of “pristine area” as applied to micro-organisms in Antarctica; the possibility of establishing prohibited areas; and the current lack of decontamination methods. The inclusion of aquatic micro-organisms was proposed; and the significance of ecological research was proposed.
- (188) Some members noted the importance of work to protect microbial habitats and expressed general support for the recommendations in WP 39.
- (189) The United Kingdom introduced IP 111 *Management of Antarctic Specially Protected Areas: permitting, visitation and information exchange practices*, jointly prepared with Spain, which presented information on Parties’ information exchange practices associated with visits to ASPAs. Parties had interpreted and implemented the protected area legislation in different ways. Some Parties had not provided full information on ASPA visitation through the EIES within the required annual time limits. Estimated levels of visitation to ASPAs varied considerably, with, on average, the greatest level of visitation to (i) ASPAs within the Antarctic Peninsula and Ross Sea regions and (ii) those ASPAs designated for the protection of historic

values. The United Kingdom and Spain concluded that ASPA visitation data were likely to be of limited use for informing general and ASPA-specific environmental management practices without full and consistent disclosure by Parties.

- (190) Several Members expressed their concern at the lack of ASPA visitation data available in the EIES and recommended full and comprehensive information sharing in accordance with the requirements of Article 10 of Annex I of the Madrid Protocol, to enable more coordinated and effective management of activities within ASPAs. They also noted that consideration could in the future be given to reviewing and where appropriate revising the information exchange requirements to ensure that Parties' reports provide data of most relevance to informing protected area management. ASOC also noted that limitations in the exchange of information were an issue of broader relevance in the ATCM and CEP, for example with regard to inspections and biological prospecting.
- (191) Ecuador introduced WP 55 *Recovery of moss communities on the tracks of Barrientos Island and tourism management proposal*, jointly prepared with Spain, which described the results of the visitor monitoring system and an assessment of the state of the vegetation cover on the tracks of Barrientos Island. The paper proposed to conduct additional monitoring on both central and coastal paths, and encouraged Parties to develop specific visitor management measures for the western tip of the island.
- (192) The United Kingdom, France, and Argentina suggested keeping the discussed paths closed and expressed their willingness to contribute to management guidelines. In response to a query by France, Ecuador clarified that the known instances of the use of central and coastal paths were likely to have been due to a misunderstanding of the area maps. IAATO stated that its members had decided to refrain from using the paths, and IAATO was also ready to contribute to management guidelines. ASOC regarded the approach taken by Spain and Ecuador as a model for the management of areas with regular visits.
- (193) The following papers were also presented under this Agenda item:
- IP 35 *The non-native grass *Poa pratensis* at Cierva Point, Danco Coast, Antarctic Peninsula – on-going investigations and future eradication plans* (Argentina, Spain and United Kingdom)

- IP 46 *Report of the Antarctic Specially Managed Area No 6 Larsemann Hills Management Group* (Australia, China, India and Russian Federation)
- IP 73 *Antarctic trial of WWF's Rapid Assessment of Circum-Arctic Ecosystem Resilience (RACER) Conservation Planning Tool: initial findings* (United Kingdom and Norway)
- BP 10 *Update on Developing Protection for a Geothermal Area: Volcanic Ice Caves at Mount Erebus, Ross Island* (United States and New Zealand)

Item 10: Conservation of Antarctic Flora and Fauna

10a) Quarantine and Non-native Species

- (194) Germany introduced WP 19 *Report on the Research Project "The Impact of Human Activities on Soil Organisms of the Maritime Antarctic and the Introduction of Non-Native Species in Antarctica"*, regarding biosecurity measures to prevent the transfer and introduction of non-native soil organisms, and referred to IP 55 and related information included in the final report of the research project which is available at <http://www.umweltbundesamt.de/uba-info-medien/4416.html>.
- (195) Many Members expressed their appreciation of Germany's scientific efforts and highlighted factors which could increase the risk of introduction of non-native organisms, including increasing visitor numbers and climate change. New Zealand underlined the importance of continuing work on the issue of non-native species in Antarctica, and in taking a precautionary and preventative approach to managing risks. SCAR recalled the findings of its "Aliens in Antarctica" study presented to the ATCM in 2012, which concluded that on a per capita basis, scientists have been found to transport more plant propagules than other types of visitors; therefore all categories of visitors should be considered capable of transferring non-native species to the region.
- (196) The Committee commended Germany for its research and endorsed the recommendations contained therein. The Committee agreed to take the work forward, under the leadership of Germany, via an open and informal working group. The Committee noted the readiness of SCAR, IAATO and ASOC to contribute to this work.

(197) Other papers submitted under this agenda item were:

- IP 28 *Colonisation status of known non-native species in the Antarctic terrestrial environment (updated 2013)* (United Kingdom)
- IP 35 *The non-native grass Poa pratensis at Cierva Point, Danco Coast, Antarctic Peninsula – on-going investigations and future eradication plans* (Argentina, Spain, United Kingdom).
- BP 9 *Australia's new Antarctic cargo and biosecurity operations facility* (Australia)

10b) Specially Protected Species

(198) No papers were submitted under this Agenda item.

10c) Other Annex II Matters

(199) COMNAP presented IP 31 *Use of hydroponics by national Antarctic programs*, which reviewed the potential environmental impacts of hydroponics of the national Antarctic programmes of Australia, New Zealand and the United States, and the risk-based management measures in place.

Item 11: Environmental Monitoring and Report

(200) Belgium introduced WP 37 *www.biodiversity.aq: The new Antarctic Biodiversity Information Network*, jointly prepared with SCAR, which described the renewed international Antarctic Biodiversity Portal which built on the legacy of the SCAR Marine Biodiversity Information Network and the Antarctic Biodiversity Information Facility. SCAR demonstrated how the Portal provided access to both marine and terrestrial Antarctic biodiversity data.

(201) Australia welcomed the Biodiversity Portal initiative, and indicated that it would work closely with Belgium to maximise synergies with the Biodiversity Database, which is managed by the Australian Antarctic Data Centre on behalf of SCAR.

(202) Many Members expressed their support for the Biodiversity Portal, and thanked Belgium and SCAR for the work, which makes biodiversity data more accessible to the science community and the general public.

- (203) Several members raised questions, related to: the interaction with the Antarctic Environments Portal; long term funding; private funding; mapping; and the Committee's involvement with the portal.
- (204) In response to a question from Germany and Brazil, SCAR and New Zealand reiterated that the biodiversity portal was a depository of primary raw data, whereas the Antarctic Environmental Portal managed by New Zealand would provide summary information based on published peer-reviewed science that is relevant to the CEP priority issues.
- (205) Argentina expressed concern regarding dependence on private sources of funding, and over the scope of some maps included in the portal, which exceeded the area of the Antarctic Treaty. It also recalled the presentation of its WP 58 *Contributions to discussions on access to environment-related information and its management within the framework of the Antarctic Treaty System*.
- (206) Peru shared the concern of Argentina in connection with the geographical scope of the Antarctic Biodiversity Portal. Furthermore, Peru expressed that it could not support the Resolution that was proposed in WP 37 due to the fact that one of the associated institutions to *www.biodiversity.aq*, called Ocean Biogeographic Information System (OBIS), presented incorrect maps of Peru.
- (207) The Committee noted the initiative and acknowledged the great value of *www.biodiversity.aq*.
- (208) SCAR presented IP 19 *1st SCAR Antarctic and Southern Ocean Science Horizon Scan*, which aimed to assemble 50 of the world's leading Antarctic scientists, policy makers, leaders, and visionaries to identify the most important scientific questions that should be addressed by research in and from the southern polar region over the next two decades, in order to assist in aligning international programmes, projects and resources.
- (209) The Republic of Korea presented IP 27 *Korean/German Workshop about Environmental Monitoring on King George Island*, jointly prepared with Germany, which summarised the proceedings of the workshop that took place in Seoul, Korea, in April 2013. It noted that King George Island was a suitable site for studies of climate changes and human impacts. It also noted that long-term data collection via an integrated monitoring scheme was needed. The dialogue between Korea and Germany would be carried out on a regular basis, for example through annual meetings, with all interested

scientists who could contribute to monitoring and research activities in Maxwell Bay would be welcome to join.

(210) ASOC presented IP 67 *Management implications of tourist behavior*, which examined aspects of Antarctic tourist behaviour in the context of current tourism trends. The paper suggested a strategic approach to tourism regulation and management, including through using specially managed and protected areas as tourism management tools, rather than focusing on regulating specific tourist behaviour primarily through site-specific guidelines.

(211) Other papers submitted under this agenda item were:

- IP 5 *The Southern Ocean Observing System (SOOS) 2012 Report* (SCAR)
- IP 29 *Remote sensing for monitoring Antarctic Specially Protected Areas: Progress on use of multispectral and hyperspectral data for monitoring Antarctic vegetation* (United Kingdom)
- IP 59 *Update to Vessel Incidents in Antarctic Waters* (ASOC)
- IP 66 *Discharge of sewage and grey water from vessels in Antarctic Treaty waters* (ASOC)
- IP 76 *Report on the accident occurred to an excavator vehicle at Mario Zucchelli Station, Ross Sea, Antarctica* (Italy)
- IP 107 *Antarctic Center for Research and Environmental Monitoring, CIMAA: Advances in water quality monitoring and opportunities for cooperation* (Chile).

Item 12: Inspection Reports

(212) Germany introduced WP 4 *Inspection by Germany and South Africa in accordance with Article VII of the Antarctic Treaty and Article 14 of the Protocol on Environmental Protection: January 2013* and referred to IP 53 jointly prepared with South Africa. The inspections of Troll (Norway), Halley VI (United Kingdom), Princess Elisabeth (Belgium) and Maitri (India) stations on 8–29 January 2013 had observed no direct contraventions of the Antarctic Treaty or the Environmental Protocol, although environmental protection measures varied from station to station. The inspection team’s environmental recommendations included: replacing ageing incinerators and removing non-

functional items, improving prevention of and response to oil spills, monitoring and disposal of treated waste water, implementing measures to prevent the introduction of non-native species, and certifying that necessary permits had been obtained. The team also felt that future inspection teams should draw from past inspection reports as reference points.

- (213) South Africa expressed appreciation for the hospitality and cooperation received at all the stations that were inspected, and reiterated the value of such inspection in the furtherance of the implementation of the provisions of the Treaty and Protocol. Members whose stations had been inspected thanked Germany and South Africa for their report, confirmed that they intended to implement the recommendations, and noted that these inspections inspired improvement and were important checks for national Antarctic programmes.
- (214) Norway thanked Germany and South Africa for their thorough inspection report and noted the importance of inspections in Antarctica, both for ensuring maintenance of the principles of the Antarctic Treaty, and as a check and balance for the individual operators. Norway noted that the inspection had provided good input for further development of environmentally sound operations at Troll. Norway furthermore underscored that necessary permits had been obtained and were carried by Norwegian scientists conducting work in ASPA 142, although a copy of this permit was not available at the Troll Station at the time of the inspection. With regard to the general recommendations from the inspection Norway lent in particular its support to the importance of shared use of facilities and infrastructure from an environmental perspective.
- (215) On Maitri Station, India commented that some logistical issues had prevented its staff from offloading several pieces of machinery. India informed about the elaboration of a plan which aims at the introduction of best practice environmental standards at its research stations. For the next season, the incinerator at Maitri is proposed to be fitted with an emissions control mechanism. Containment of fuel tanks will be enhanced and the treatment of sewage water improved in a phased manner.
- (216) In referring to ATCM XXXVI-IP 37 on Halley VI Station, the United Kingdom confirmed that the new station was now open and fully operational. The station had recently been awarded enhanced status within the WMO's Global Atmosphere Watch programme. The United Kingdom reiterated

other Members' support for the sharing of facilities in order to minimise cumulative environmental impacts.

- (217) The United Kingdom introduced WP 9 *General Recommendations from the Joint Inspections undertaken by the United Kingdom, the Netherlands and Spain under Article VII of the Antarctic Treaty and Article 14 of the Environmental Protocol* and referred to IP 38 *Report of the Joint Inspections undertaken by the United Kingdom, the Netherlands and Spain under Article VII of the Antarctic Treaty and Article 14 of the Environmental Protocol*, jointly prepared with the Netherlands and Spain. The inspections undertaken in 1–14 December 2012 of 12 permanent stations, three unoccupied stations, three Historic Sites, four cruise ships, one yacht and one wreck site had observed no major contraventions of the Antarctic Treaty or Environment Protocol. The inspection team's environmental recommendations included: that new developments and activities should be preceded by an EIA, and that common facilities and services, such as fuel storage, power generation, water production, accommodation, and waste management should be shared by stations where possible to reduce the cumulative impacts of their activities.
- (218) Spain and the Netherlands thanked the United Kingdom for organising the inspection and extended their appreciation to all those inspected for their hospitality and cooperation. Spain reiterated the report's recommendation for frequent testing of fuel storage tanks for leakage and corrosion.
- (219) Brazil, China, Chile, Poland, the Republic of Korea, Argentina and the Russian Federation informed the Committee that they were each in the process of considering and implementing specific recommendations relating to their stations if appropriate.
- (220) While acknowledging the benefits of stations sharing facilities and resources, the Russian Federation remarked that this might be difficult to achieve, given practical problems and the fact that domestic legislation to implement the Environmental Protocol differed between Parties.
- (221) With respect to a recommendation regarding maximum visitor capacity for the most frequently visited sites, IAATO commented that it considered that the range of activities and visitor behaviour at a site were more relevant to the potential environmental impact.

- (222) Malaysia commented that it had been a beneficiary of international cooperation in Antarctica and noted that, while Malaysia did not have its own Antarctic station, Malaysian students had produced many PhDs and Masters degrees in Antarctic fields with the support of other Treaty Parties.
- (223) The Russian Federation presented IP 45 *Report of Russia – US joint Antarctic Inspection, November 29 – December 6, 2012*, jointly prepared with the United States. It reported on inspections conducted of Maitri (India), Zhongshan (China), Bharati (India), Syowa (Japan), Princess Elisabeth (Belgium), and Troll (Norway) stations, 29 November–6 December 2012. All stations were found to be well organised and generally compliant with the Antarctic Treaty and its Environmental Protocol. Recommended improvements included ensuring that station personnel understood the Protocol Annex 1 regarding EIA, and that national Antarctic programmes considered undertaking environmental monitoring of the potential impacts of stations' activities as part of their scientific programmes.
- (224) The United States thanked Russia for its cooperation and extended its appreciation to all personnel involved in the inspection.
- (225) All inspected Parties noted their appreciation to Russia and USA for the thorough inspection conducted by the two Parties. India explained that it was implementing a plan to address all the report's recommendations and that it would update the Committee on its progress. Japan confirmed that it was addressing the waste management issues mentioned in the report. Norway noted with interest the recommendation on making the monitoring of the impacts of station operations a part of science programmes.
- (226) ASOC pointed out that the negative aspects shown in the report were very similar to the ones shown in the past. It was concerned that there was a gap between Parties that implemented the Protocol stringently and others that did not. ASOC observed that the ongoing practice of inspections would contribute to improve standards of Protocol implementation.
- (227) China drew the attention of the Committee to the fact that the inspection team had arrived on the day of their station resupply, and that the entire staff had therefore been occupied with this task. It noted that some other issues raised in the report had been addressed in the meantime.

- (228) Uruguay introduced WP 51 rev.1 *Additional availability of information on lists of Observers of the Consultative Parties through the Antarctic Treaty Secretariat*, jointly prepared with Argentina, which recommended that Consultative Parties inform the Secretariat, in addition to notification through diplomatic channels, when they assign Observers to carry out Inspections. It further recommended that the ATS included this information in its database, to be available in Parties' pre-season information exchanges.
- (229) Italy drew the attention of the Committee to IP 77 *Italy answer to the US / Russian Inspection at Mario Zucchelli Station in 2012* (Italy) and IP 16 *Status of the fluid in the EPICA borehole at Concordia Station: an answer to the US / Russian Inspection in 2012* (France and Italy), which answered some questions raised by the joint US-Russian inspection which took place in 2012, mainly related to the transposition of regulations into domestic law and the status of the drilling fluid in the EPICA borehole at Concordia Station. Italy highlighted that this presented a good example of how inspections can be an effective tool also to increase internal political awareness.

Item 13: General Matters

- (230) SCAR presented IP 83 *The International Bathymetric Chart of the Southern Ocean (IBCSO): First Release*, and urged all Parties to continue to contribute data to the IBCSO database. The map and data were available for download, and more details could be found at: www.ibcso.org.
- (231) In presenting IP 104 *Colombia en la Antártida*, Colombia described its development of new organisations for supporting its work in Antarctica. Colombia said that they would soon be able to ratify the Environmental Protocol and join other countries in active research.
- (232) Turkey explained its growing interest and activities in the Antarctic arena, and outlined its intention of establishing an Antarctic base. Turkey expressed its wish to cooperate strongly with other Members in this respect.
- (233) Portugal stressed the importance of education and outreach as a potential issue for discussion at the CEP XVII. In response, Belgium highlighted the "Bringing the Poles to Brussels" science fair that was taking place on 25 and 26 May 2013 at the Academy Palace, organised by the Association of Polar Early Career Scientists.

(234) Brazil acknowledged the importance of education and outreach within the CEP. Education and outreach activities of APECS Belgium on the weekend of 25 and 26 May 2013 are an example to follow. These activities will include scientific and educational talks by renowned scientists from Belgium, Portugal and Brazil promoting capacity building for early career scientists as well as other educational activities to the general public. Brazil noted that it aims to carry on these activities in the next CEP/ATCM in Brasilia and establish a platform for other countries in the coming years. Several Members suggested putting the education and outreach item on the agenda for CEP XVII.

(235) Other papers submitted under this agenda item were:

- *IP 7 State of Japanese Environmental Management in Antarctica, with reference to the practices of other National Antarctic Programmes* (Japan).

Item 14: Election Officers

(236) The Committee elected Dr Polly Penhale from the United States as Vice-chair and congratulated her on appointment to the role.

(237) The Committee warmly thanked Ms Verónica Vallejos from Chile for her term in serving as Vice-chair.

Item 15: Preparation for the Next Meeting

(238) The Committee adopted the Provisional Agenda for CEP XVII (Appendix 2).

Item 16: Adoption of the Report

(239) The Committee adopted its Report.

Item 17: Closing of the Meeting

(240) The Chair closed the Meeting on Friday 24th May 2013.

Annex 1

CEP XVI Agenda and Summary of Documents

1. OPENING OF THE MEETING	
2. ADOPTION OF THE AGENDA	
SP 1 rev. 2	<i>ATCM XXXVI AND CEP XVI AGENDA AND SCHEDULE</i>
SP 12	<i>CEP XVI SUMMARY OF PAPERS</i>
3. STRATEGIC DISCUSSION ON THE FUTURE WORK OF THE CEP	
WP 7 France	<i>CEP FIVE-YEAR WORK PLAN ADOPTED AT THE XVTH CEP MEETING AT HOBART.</i> This paper provides the CEP Five-Year Work Plan as adopted at CEP XV so that it may be considered and updated at CEP XVI.
WP 28 Australia, Belgium, New Zealand, Norway and SCAR	<i>ANTARCTIC ENVIRONMENTS PORTAL: PROGRESS REPORT.</i> At CEP XV, New Zealand, SCAR and Australia introduced the concept of an Antarctic Environments Portal. This paper provides an update on the development of the Portal, addresses issues raised during informal intersessional discussions, and outlines the next steps for the project.
WP 58 Argentina	<i>CONTRIBUTIONS TO DISCUSSIONS ON ACCESS TO ENVIRONMENT-RELATED INFORMATION AND ITS MANAGEMENT WITHIN THE FRAMEWORK OF THE ANTARCTIC TREATY SYSTEM.</i> Argentina maintains that any information that is communicated in relation to or linked with the Committee for Environmental Protection or the Antarctic Treaty, or the manner in which it is communicated, must preserve the spirit of consensus in which these fora are handled, especially if the ultimate purpose of the information is to assist in decision-making processes.
IP 61 ASOC	<i>HUMAN IMPACTS IN THE ARCTIC AND ANTARCTIC: KEY FINDINGS RELEVANT TO THE ATCM AND CEP.</i> This paper informs on the two projects launched at the IPY Oslo Science Conference, 2010, exploring the subject of human impacts and future scenarios for the Antarctic environment. ASOC informs that the vast majority of future scenarios concur that existing environmental management practices and the current system of governance are insufficient to meet the obligations of the Environmental Protocol to protect the Antarctic environment.
4. OPERATION OF THE CEP	

5. COOPERATION WITH OTHER ORGANISATIONS	
WP 49 Belgium, Germany & Netherlands	<i>THE ANTARCTIC TREATY SYSTEM ROLE REGARDING THE DEVELOPMENT OF A COMPREHENSIVE SYSTEM OF MARINE PROTECTED AREAS.</i> This paper discusses the responsibility of Parties to environmental protection and the conservation of marine living resources under the international agreements that comprise the Antarctic Treaty system, and the connection between both. The Working Paper notes the work carried out so far towards the establishment of a representative system of marine protected areas in the CCAMLR Convention area, and invites the CEP to acknowledge this work and encourage its prompt and positive conclusion.
IP 3 COMNAP	<i>THE ANNUAL REPORT FOR 2012 OF THE COUNCIL OF MANAGERS OF NATIONAL ANTARCTIC PROGRAMS (COMNAP).</i> This document presents COMNAP highlights and achievements as well as products and tools developed in 2012.
IP 4 SCAR	<i>THE SCIENTIFIC COMMITTEE ON ANTARCTIC RESEARCH (SCAR) ANNUAL REPORT 2012/13.</i> This paper informs on the new Scientific Research Programs approved by the Meeting of Delegates of SCAR held in 2012 and on several major SCAR meetings to be held during the coming year.
IP 6 CCAMLR	<i>REPORT BY THE SC-CAMLR OBSERVER TO THE SIXTEENTH MEETING OF THE COMMITTEE FOR ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION.</i> This report focuses on the five issues of common interest to the CEP and SC-CAMLR: Climate change and the Antarctic marine environment; Biodiversity and non-native species in the Antarctic marine environment; Antarctic species requiring special protection; Spatial marine management and protected areas; and Ecosystem and environmental monitoring.
IP 15 Belgium	<i>CCAMLR MPA TECHNICAL WORKSHOP.</i> This paper informs on the workshop held in September 2012 aimed to provide a start to the process of the MPA planning of domains 3 (Weddell Sea), 4 (Bouvet-Maud) and 9 (Amundsen-Bellingshausen) for which there had been no active work towards the development of MPAs.
IP 52 SCAR	<i>OCEAN ACIDIFICATION: SCAR FUTURE PLANS.</i> This paper informs on the future work plan of the SCAR international ocean acidification Action Group, whose final report will be launched at the SCAR Open Science Conference in August 2014.
IP 105 Chile	<i>REPORT OF THE CEP OBSERVER TO THE XXXII SCAR DELEGATES' MEETING.</i> In 2012, SCAR invited the Environmental Protection Committee to attend as an observer the meeting that would be held in the United States that year. This paper presents the most relevant aspects of the meeting, to inform the CEP.
BP 20 SCAR	<i>THE SCIENTIFIC COMMITTEE ON ANTARCTIC RESEARCH (SCAR) SELECTED SCIENCE HIGHLIGHTS 2012/13.</i> This Background Paper highlights some recent key science papers published since the last Treaty meeting and should be read in conjunction with IP 4.

BP 21 SCAR	<i>ANTARCTIC CLIMATE CHANGE AND THE ENVIRONMENT: AN UPDATE.</i> This paper is the full “Antarctic climate change and the environment: an update” paper recently published in the journal Polar Record. It should be read in conjunction with WP 38 that summarises the key highlights.
6. REPAIR AND REMEDIATION OF ENVIRONMENTAL DAMAGE	
WP 27 New Zealand	<i>REPAIR OR REMEDIATION OF ENVIRONMENTAL DAMAGE: REPORT OF THE CEP INTERSESSIONAL CONTACT GROUP.</i> This paper reports on the discussions of the ICG which considered environmental issues related to the practicality of repair or remediation of environmental damage in the circumstances of Antarctica, in order to assist the ATCM in adopting an informed decision in 2015 related to the resumption of negotiations on liability.
WP 32 Australia and United Kingdom	<i>AN ANTARCTIC CLEAN-UP MANUAL: REPORT OF INFORMAL INTERSESSIONAL DISCUSSION.</i> This paper informs on the intersessional informal discussions on the proposal originally made at CEP XV on an Antarctic Clean-Up Manual. Australia and the United Kingdom recommend that the CEP endorse the revised manual, encourage Members and Observers to develop practical guidelines and supporting resources for inclusion in the manual, and forward the attached draft Resolution and manual to the ATCM for approval.
WP 42 France & Italy	<i>THE NEED TO TAKE INTO ACCOUNT THE DISMANTLING COSTS OF STATIONS IN COMPREHENSIVE ENVIRONMENTAL EVALUATIONS (CEE) RELATING TO THEIR CONSTRUCTION.</i> This paper informs on a theoretical estimation of cost and duration that are necessary for the dismantling of Concordia Station. The paper suggests that the results would be also applicable to coastal stations, and that an estimate of decommissioning costs be most systematically taken into account when a CEE is prepared for the construction of a new station.
IP 36 France	<i>CLEAN-UP OF THE CONSTRUCTION SITE OF UNUSED AIRSTRIP “PISTE DU LION”, TERRE ADÉLIE, ANTARCTICA.</i> This paper informs on the procedure put in place to remove the unused airstrip facilities at Ile du Lion, describing the planning process, clean-up activities and monitoring, as well as lessons learned from the activity.
IP 68 ASOC	<i>REUSE OF A SITE AFTER REMEDIATION. A CASE STUDY FROM CAPE EVANS, ROSS ISLAND.</i> Using a case study from a small site at Cape Evans, this paper examines the use of a remediated site by an operator different to the one which conducted the remediation activity, and makes a number of suggestions relevant to assessing cumulative impacts, assessing the effectiveness of remediation, and managing remediated sites.

<p>IP 70 Brazil</p>	<p><i>ENVIRONMENTAL DAMAGE REPAIR: DISASSEMBLING OF FERRAZ STATION, ADMIRALTY BAY, ANTARCTICA.</i> In this paper Brazil presents the structure of the Environmental Management Plan that guided the disassembling of Comandante Ferraz station, destroyed by a fire in February 2012.</p>
<p>7. CLIMATE CHANGE IMPLICATIONS FOR THE ENVIRONMENT: STRATEGIC APPROACH</p>	
<p>WP 38 SCAR</p>	<p><i>THE ANTARCTIC CLIMATE CHANGE AND THE ENVIRONMENT REPORT (ACCE): A KEY UPDATE.</i> This paper represents a major update of the original SCAR ACCE report. It summarises subsequent advances in knowledge concerning how the climates of the Antarctic and Southern Ocean have changed in the past and how they might change in the future, and examines the associated impacts on the marine and terrestrial biota.</p>
<p>SP 7 Secretariat</p>	<p><i>ACTIONS TAKEN BY THE CEP AND THE ATCM ON THE ATME RECOMMENDATIONS ON CLIMATE CHANGE.</i> This paper presents an update of actions taken by the ATCM and the CEP on the 30 recommendations on climate change agreed at the ATME on Climate Change in 2009.</p>
<p>IP 32 COMNAP</p>	<p><i>COST/ENERGY ANALYSIS OF NATIONAL ANTARCTIC PROGRAM TRANSPORTATION.</i> This paper presents the results of a transportation cost and energy analysis that was recently undertaken on behalf of the Alfred Wegener Institute–Helmholtz Center for Polar and Marine Research. It focuses on the analysis of transportation of people and cargo via both maritime and air transportation methods.</p>
<p>IP 34 COMNAP</p>	<p><i>BEST PRACTICE FOR ENERGY MANAGEMENT – GUIDANCE AND RECOMMENDATIONS.</i> Considering ATME Recommendation 4, this paper presents an update to the information presented last year, and includes the updated results of the survey of COMNAP Members and a report on progress on the voluntary implementation of the guidance and recommendations developed by COMNAP in 2007 based on the survey replies.</p>
<p>IP 62 ASOC</p>	<p><i>AN ANTARCTIC CLIMATE CHANGE REPORT CARD.</i> This paper summarizes the recent results of research in the areas of environmental and ecosystem changes, and finds that changes are occurring in a variety of areas, from the pH level of seawater to the stability of the West Antarctic Ice Sheet.</p>
<p>IP 65 ASOC</p>	<p><i>BLACK CARBON AND OTHER SHORT-LIVED CLIMATE POLLUTANTS: IMPACTS ON ANTARCTICA.</i> In this paper ASOC proposes that the analysis of the extent of black carbon and other short-lived climate pollutants emissions, especially from local sources, should be a priority for ongoing research, and included in the Strategic Work Plan.</p>

IP 69 ASOC	UPDATE: THE FUTURE OF THE WEST ANTARCTIC ICE SHEET. This paper provides significant updates from <i>The Future of the West Antarctic Ice Sheet: Observed and Predicted Changes, Tipping Points, and Policy Considerations</i> (IP07 at ATME on Climate Change 2010).
IP 101 IAATO	IAATO'S CLIMATE CHANGE WORKING GROUP: REPORT OF PROGRESS. This paper informs on the developments of the IAATO's Climate Change Working Group, including additional efforts towards raising awareness of climate change in the Antarctic resulting from human activities worldwide and a list of ways in which IAATO member operators manage their carbon emissions.
BP 21	ANTARCTIC CLIMATE CHANGE AND THE ENVIRONMENT: an UPDATE. This paper is the full "Antarctic climate change and the environment: an update" paper recently published in the journal <i>Polar Record</i> . It should be read in conjunction with WP 38.
8. ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT ASSESSMENT	
a) Draft Comprehensive Environmental Evaluations	
b) Other EIA Matters	
WP 24 Russian Federation	APPROACHES TO STUDY OF THE WATER LAYER OF SUBGLACIAL LAKES IN THE ANTARCTIC. This paper informs on the technologies being used in the drilling activities at Lake Vostok and on the future activities to be developed. The Russian Federation informs that the work undertaken has proved the validity of proposed measures and proposes to use this principle in future studies of the lake water layer.
IP 49 Russian Federation	RESULTS OF STUDIES OF SUBGLACIAL LAKE VOSTOK AND DRILLING OPERATIONS IN DEEP ICE BOREHOLE OF VOSTOK STATION IN THE SEASON 2012-2013. This paper presents additional information on the technical procedures and preliminary results of scientific activities conducted at Lake Vostok during the past summer season.
SP 5 Secretariat	ANNUAL LIST OF INITIAL ENVIRONMENTAL EVALUATIONS (IEE) AND COMPREHENSIVE ENVIRONMENTAL EVALUATIONS (CEE) PREPARED BETWEEN APRIL 1ST 2012 AND MARCH 31ST 2013. This paper informs on the Environmental Impact Assessments prepared during the most recent reporting period.

<p>IP 24 Republic of Korea</p>	<p><i>PROGRESS OF THE JANG BOGO STATION DURING THE FIRST CONSTRUCTION SEASON, 2012/13.</i> This paper informs on the Jang Bogo Station construction activities, which started in December 2012 and will continue for two Antarctic summer seasons. The paper reports on material transportation, construction activities, waste management and environmental monitoring as well as on accidents and incidents that have occurred. The paper also informs on the activities to be undertaken in the 2013/14 season.</p>
<p>IP 25 Republic of Korea</p>	<p><i>MITIGATION MEASURES OF ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS CAUSED BY JANG BOGO CONSTRUCTION DURING 2012/2013 SEASON.</i> This paper informs on the implementation of the mitigation measures proposed in the CEE presented in 2011 and suggested by the Parties, to reduce the environmental impacts caused by the construction activity of Jang Bogo Station.</p>
<p>IP 42 Russian Federation</p>	<p><i>TO DISCOVERY OF UNKNOWN BACTERIA IN LAKE VOSTOK.</i> This paper describes the technical and scientific procedures put in place which allowed, in late February 2013, the discovery of previously unknown bacteria in the subglacial Lake Vostok.</p>
<p>IP 48 Russian Federation</p>	<p><i>PERMIT FOR THE ACTIVITY OF THE RUSSIAN ANTARCTIC EXPEDITION IN 2013-17.</i> This paper informs on the legal requirements and permits granted by the Russian Federation, namely on the Environmental Impact Assessments for the declared activities. The paper describes in particular the IEE prepared for the activities planned in the five-year expedition from 1 January 2013 to 31 December 2017.</p>
<p>IP 58 Brazil</p>	<p><i>TERMS OF REFERENCE OF THE INITIAL ENVIRONMENTAL EVALUATION (IEE): PROJECT OF THE NEW FERRAZ STATION (ADMIRALTY BAY, ANTARCTICA).</i> This paper informs on the process for the reconstruction of Comandante Ferraz Station. The paper presents information on the procedures undertaken, including the selection of the conceptual project for the future station and the terms of reference for the preparation of the IEE.</p>
<p>IP 75 India</p>	<p><i>INITIAL ENVIRONMENTAL EVALUATION FOR ESTABLISHMENT OF THE GROUND STATION FOR EARTH OBSERVATION SATELLITES AT THE INDIAN RESEARCH STATION BHARATI AT LARSEMANN HILLS, EAST ANTARCTICA.</i> This document presents the IEE related to the proposed activities for installing a ground station for earth observing satellites. India concludes that the adverse impacts on the environment at the site are of a low category and that the IEE is sufficient to address the issue.</p>
<p>IP 80 Italy</p>	<p><i>FIRST STEPS TOWARDS THE REALIZATION OF A GRAVEL RUNWAY NEAR MARIO ZUCHELLI STATION: INITIAL CONSIDERATIONS AND POSSIBLE BENEFITS FOR THE TERRA NOVA BAY AREA.</i> In this paper Italy informs on the first results of surveys and studies on the technical, economical and environmental feasibility of a gravel runway in the vicinity of Mario Zucchelli Station.</p>

BP 2 New Zealand	<i>ASSESSING THE VULNERABILITY OF ANTARCTIC SOILS TO TRAMPLING.</i> This paper provides information on the specific objectives of management in the Area, proposed as ASMA 2 in 2004.
9. AREA PROTECTION AND MANAGEMENT	
a) Management Plans	
i. <i>Draft management plans which had been reviewed by the Subsidiary Group on Management Plans</i>	
WP 56 Norway	<i>SUBSIDIARY GROUP ON MANAGEMENT PLANS – REPORT ON 2012/13 INTERSESSIONAL WORK.</i> During the 2012/13 intersessional period the Subsidiary Group on Management Plans reviewed eight draft ASPA management plans. The SGMP recommends that the Committee approve three revised management plans: ASPA 132, ASPA 151 and a New ASPA: <i>Cape Washington and Silverfish Bay, Terra Nova Bay, Ross Sea</i> . The SGMP also advises the CEP that further intersessional work will be conducted with regards to five management plans submitted for intersessional review: ASPA 128, ASPA 144, ASPA 145, ASPA 146 and a New ASPA: <i>High altitude geothermal sites of the Ross Sea region</i> .
ii. <i>Draft revised management plans which had not been reviewed by the Subsidiary Group on Management Plans</i>	
WP 2 United States	<i>REVISED MANAGEMENT PLAN FOR ANTARCTIC SPECIALLY PROTECTED AREA No 137 NORTHWEST WHITE ISLAND, McMURDO SOUND.</i> Since the revisions were minor and focused on bringing the plan formatting in line with the Guide to the Preparation of Management Plans for Antarctic Specially Protected Areas adopted in Resolution 2 (2011), the United States recommends that the CEP adopt the revised Management Plan for ASPA 137.
WP 3 United States	<i>REVISED MANAGEMENT PLAN FOR ANTARCTIC SPECIALLY PROTECTED AREA No 123 BARWICK AND BALHAM VALLEYS, SOUTHERN VICTORIA LAND.</i> Since the revisions were minor and focused on bringing the plan formatting in line with the Guide to the Preparation of Management Plans for Antarctic Specially Protected Areas adopted in Resolution 2 (2011), the United States recommends that the CEP adopt the revised Management Plan for ASPA 123.
WP 5 United States	<i>REVISED MANAGEMENT PLAN FOR ANTARCTIC SPECIALLY PROTECTED AREA No 138 LINNAEUS TERRACE, ASGARD RANGE, VICTORIA LAND.</i> Since the revisions were minor and focused on bringing the plan formatting in line with the Guide to the Preparation of Management Plans for Antarctic Specially Protected Areas adopted in Resolution 2 (2011), the United States recommends that the CEP adopt the revised Management Plan for ASPA 138.

<p>WP 6 Japan</p>	<p>REVISION OF THE MANAGEMENT PLAN FOR ANTARCTIC SPECIALLY PROTECTED AREA No 141 <i>YUKIDORI VALLEY, LANGHOVDE, LÜTZOW-HOLM BAY.</i> Given that this Management Plan has been amended, Japan recommends that the CEP ask the Subsidiary Group on Management Plans to undertake a more detailed intersessional review of the revised Management Plan and report back to CEP XVII.</p>
<p>WP 11 United Kingdom</p>	<p>REVISED MANAGEMENT PLAN FOR ANTARCTIC SPECIALLY PROTECTED AREA No 108, GREEN ISLAND, BERTHELOT ISLANDS, ANTARCTIC PENINSULA. Since there are no major changes to the Area description or management measures, the United Kingdom proposes that the CEP approve the revised Management Plan for ASPA 108.</p>
<p>WP 12 United Kingdom</p>	<p>REVISED MANAGEMENT PLAN FOR ANTARCTIC SPECIALLY PROTECTED AREA No 117, AVIAN ISLAND, MARGUERITE BAY, ANTARCTIC PENINSULA. Since only minor amendments are required, the United Kingdom proposes that the CEP approve the revised Management Plan for ASPA 117.</p>
<p>WP 13 United Kingdom</p>	<p>REVISED MANAGEMENT PLAN FOR ANTARCTIC SPECIALLY PROTECTED AREA No 147, ABLATION VALLEY AND GANYMEDE HEIGHTS, ALEXANDER ISLAND. Since only minor amendments are required, the United Kingdom proposes that the CEP approve the revised Management Plan for ASPA 147.</p>
<p>WP 14 United Kingdom</p>	<p>REVISED MANAGEMENT PLAN FOR ANTARCTIC SPECIALLY PROTECTED AREA No 170, MARION NUNATAKS, CHARCOT ISLAND, ANTARCTIC PENINSULA. Since only minor amendments are required, the United Kingdom proposes that the CEP approve the revised Management Plan for ASPA 170.</p>
<p>WP 29 New Zealand</p>	<p>REVISION OF MANAGEMENT PLAN FOR ANTARCTIC SPECIALLY PROTECTED AREA No 154: BOTANY BAY, CAPE GEOLOGY, VICTORIA LAND. New Zealand informs that all revisions made in the management plan of ASPA 154 are minor with standard wording applied where applicable, and therefore recommends that the CEP approve the revised management plan.</p>
<p>WP 30 New Zealand</p>	<p>REVISION OF MANAGEMENT PLAN FOR ANTARCTIC SPECIALLY PROTECTED AREA No 156: LEWIS BAY, MOUNT EREBUS, ROSS ISLAND. New Zealand informs that all revisions made in the management plan of ASPA 156 are minor with standard wording applied where applicable, and therefore recommends that the CEP approve the revised management plan.</p>
<p>WP 36 Australia</p>	<p>REVIEW OF MANAGEMENT PLANS FOR ANTARCTIC SPECIALLY PROTECTED AREAS (ASPAs) 135, 143 AND 160. Australia informs that only minor amendments are required in the management plans of ASPA 135 North-East Bailey Peninsula, ASPA 143 Marine Plain, and ASPA 160 Frazier Islands, and recommends that the CEP approve the revised Management Plans for these ASPAs.</p>

WP 54 rev. 1 Brazil, Ecuador, Perú & Poland	REVIEW OF THE MANAGEMENT PLAN FOR ASMA No 1: KING GEORGE ISLAND, SOUTH SHETLAND ISLANDS. The Admiralty Bay Management Group has conducted its first five-yearly review of the Management Plan for ASMA 1, and recommends that the CEP ask the Subsidiary Group on Management Plans to undertake an intersessional review and report back to CEP XVI.
WP 59 Argentina	REVISED MANAGEMENT PLAN FOR ASPA 134 (CIERVA POINT AND OFFSHORE ISLANDS, DANCO COAST, ANTARCTIC PENINSULA). Argentina has carried out the review of the Management Plan for ASPA 134 and requests the CEP to assess the need to refer the SGMP for intersessional consideration, or, if not deemed necessary, to proceed with the adoption of this revised Management Plan.
WP 60 Italy	REVISION OF MANAGEMENT PLAN FOR ANTARCTIC SPECIALLY PROTECTED AREA N° 161 TERRA NOVA BAY, ROSS SEA. Italy informs that there have been no substantial changes made to the provisions of the existing Management Plan. The boundaries, map and descriptions of the area remain the same, without changes. Italy recommends that the CEP approve the revised Management Plan for ASPA 161.
<i>iii. New draft management plans for protected/managed areas</i>	
WP 8 China	PROPOSAL FOR A NEW ANTARCTIC SPECIALLY MANAGED AREA AT CHINESE ANTARCTIC KUNLUN STATION, DOME A. This paper presents an initial draft management plan for Kunlun Station Dome A aimed to protect the environment of the Dome A area. China proposes that the draft management plan be considered intersessionally by the SGMP.
WP 63 Australia, China, India & Russian Federation	DRAFT ANTARCTIC SPECIALLY PROTECTED AREA (ASPAs) MANAGEMENT PLAN FOR STORNES, LARSEMANN HILLS, PRINCESS ELIZABETH LAND. This paper proposes the adoption of a new ASPA aimed to protect the geological features of the area that are unique to Antarctica, specifically the rare mineral occurrences and the highly unusual host rocks in which they occur. The paper recommends that the CEP, as appropriate, refer the draft Management Plan to ATCM XXXVI for adoption or to the SGMP for intersessional review.
<i>iv. Other matters relating to management plans for protected/managed areas</i>	
SP 6 Secretariat	STATUS OF ANTARCTIC SPECIALLY PROTECTED AREA AND ANTARCTIC SPECIALLY MANAGED AREA MANAGEMENT PLANS. This paper presents information on the status of ASPA and ASMA management plans according to the review requirements of Annex V to the Protocol.

<p>IP 26 rev. 1 Republic of Korea</p>	<p><i>MANAGEMENT REPORT OF NAREBSKI POINT (ASPA No 171) DURING THE 2012/2013 PERIOD.</i> This paper informs on the activities undertaken in accordance with the provisions of the Management Plan for ASPA 171. The paper describes scientific studies carried out as well as management activities, lessons learned and recommendations.</p>
<p>IP 74 Argentina, Chile, Norway, Spain UK & USA</p>	<p><i>DECEPTION ISLAND SPECIALLY MANAGED AREA (ASMA) MANAGEMENT GROUP REPORT.</i> This paper summarizes the activities undertaken within ASMA 4, and the work of the Management Group to fulfill the objectives and principles of the Management Plan during the intersessional period.</p>
<p>b) Historic Sites and Monuments</p>	
<p>WP 18 rev. 1 Germany</p>	<p><i>PROPOSAL TO ADD THE SITE COMMEMORATING THE LOCATION OF THE FORMER GERMAN ANTARCTIC RESEARCH STATION “GEORG FORSTER” TO THE LIST OF HISTORIC SITES AND MONUMENTS.</i> Germany proposes that the historic site of the German Georg Forster Station marked by a commemorative plaque at the Schirmacher Oasis in Dronning Maud Land be added to the list of Historic Sites and Monuments approved by the ATCM. The plaque commemorates the first permanently used German research base in Antarctica.</p>
<p>WP 23 Russian Federation</p>	<p><i>PROPOSED ADDITION OF THE PROFESSOR KUDRYASHOV’S DRILLING COMPLEX BUILDING AT THE RUSSIAN ANTARCTIC VOSTOK STATION TO THE LIST OF HISTORIC SITES AND MONUMENTS.</i> This paper proposes to add to the List of HSMs the Professor Kudryashov’s drilling complex building at the Russian Antarctic Vostok station. This proposal is connected with the need to commemorate the unique achievement of the Russian drillers and glaciologists in the field of drilling deep ice boreholes, reconstruction of paleoclimatic changes based on ice core data, microbiological studies of these ice cores, and ecologically clean unsealing of the subglacial Lake Vostok.</p>
<p>WP 62 United Kingdom, New Zealand & United States</p>	<p><i>NEW HISTORIC SITES AND MONUMENTS: MOUNT EREBUS CAMP SITES USED BY A CONTINGENT OF THE TERRA NOVA EXPEDITION IN DECEMBER 1912.</i> This paper proposes two new HSMs in the locations of camp sites on Mount Erebus, used between 8 and 13 December 1912 by a team of scientists who were in Antarctica as part of Captain Scott’s Terra Nova expedition 1910-1912. The sites were located in December 2012. The locations of the camps are of significant interest to Antarctic historians, and uncontrolled access to the sites, which might disturb any additional historic remains, would be of concern. The United Kingdom, New Zealand and the United States are therefore of the view that these sites should be afforded protection under Annex V of the Protocol.</p>

BP 1 New Zealand	<i>ANTARCTIC HERITAGE TRUST CONSERVATION UPDATE 2013</i> . This paper forms an update to the paper provided to the CEP XV/ATCM XXXV of the restoration project being undertaken at ASPAs 155,157,158 at Ross Island, and ASPA 159 at Cape Adare.
c) Site Guidelines	
WP 15 UK, Argentina, Australia & USA	<i>POLICY ISSUES ARISING FROM THE 2013 ON-SITE REVIEW OF GUIDELINES FOR VISITOR SITES IN THE ANTARCTIC PENINSULA</i> . This paper reports on an On-Site Review of Site Guidelines during January 2013 by the United Kingdom, Argentina, Australia, the United States and IAATO. The paper discusses those issues in light of the CEP's recent considerations and the developments in visitor use and makes recommendations for consideration by the Committee.
WP 16 UK, Argentina, Australia & USA	<i>SITE GUIDELINES FOR i) ORNE HARBOUR AND ii) ORNE ISLANDS</i> . Further to the review reported in WP 15, new site guidelines have been prepared for i) Orne Harbour and ii) Orne Islands. The proponents recommend that the CEP submit both Site Guidelines for adoption by the ATCM.
WP 20 UK, Argentina, Australia & USA	<i>ON-SITE REVIEW OF GUIDELINES FOR VISITOR SITES IN THE ANTARCTIC PENINSULA: SUMMARY OF PROGRAMME AND SUGGESTED AMENDMENT OF ELEVEN GUIDELINES</i> . Further to WP 15, this paper provides an overview of the work of the United Kingdom, Argentina, Australia, the United States and IAATO, and proposes the amendment of 11 Site Guidelines to ensure that they are brought up to date and can continue to be an effective tool for visitor management.
WP 26 United States	<i>PROPOSED AMENDMENT FOR ANTARCTIC TREATY SITE GUIDELINES FOR VISITORS TORGERSEN ISLAND</i> . This paper proposes, as a precautionary measure in light of changes in the penguin population on the island, an amendment to the Site Guidelines to strongly discourage visits during the early breeding season when the birds are most sensitive to brown skua predation and potential human disturbance.
WP 46 United States, Argentina, Chile, Norway, Spain, United Kingdom, ASOC & IAATO.	<i>PROPOSED AMENDMENT FOR ANTARCTIC TREATY SITE GUIDELINES FOR VISITORS BAILY HEAD, DECEPTION ISLAND</i> . This paper informs on a review of the Site Guidelines by the Deception Island Management Group, following a report of a significant decline in the chinstrap penguins breeding at Baily Head. Although the decrease is most likely related to numerous and complex effects of climate change, the Group used the review as an opportunity to decrease redundancy between these site specific Site Guidelines for Visitors and the General Guidelines for Visitors to the Antarctic.

WP 64 Ecuador	<i>UPDATED MAP OF BARRIENTOS ISLAND.</i> This paper presents for consideration of the Committee and the Parties an updated map of the Barrientos island to contribute to compliance with Resolution 5 (2012) and facilitate tourism and research activities that are performed at this site.
IP 20 United States	<i>ANTARCTIC SITE INVENTORY: 1994-2013.</i> This paper provides an update on results of the Antarctic Site Inventory project through February 2013, which has collected biological data and site-descriptive information in the Antarctic Peninsula since 1994.
IP 97 IAATO	<i>REPORT ON IAATO OPERATOR USE OF ANTARCTIC PENINSULA LANDING SITES AND ATCM VISITOR SITE GUIDELINES, 2012-13 SEASON.</i> This paper presents the data collected by IAATO covering the landing sites and site guidelines use for the 2012-13 season.
IP 102 IAATO	<i>BARRIENTOS ISLAND FOOTPATH EROSION.</i> This paper informs on the IAATO internal investigation of a footpath erosion in vegetation at Barrientos Island presented at the CEP XV meeting by Ecuador and Spain.
d) Human footprint and wilderness values	
WP 35 New Zealand	<i>POSSIBLE GUIDANCE MATERIAL TO ASSIST PARTIES TO TAKE ACCOUNT OF WILDERNESS VALUES WHEN UNDERTAKING ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT ASSESSMENTS.</i> This paper provides a report developed from intersessional discussions on the issue of wilderness management in Antarctica. The paper suggests an option for further developing the EIA guidelines so as to provide a structured means of taking account of wilderness values when preparing environmental impact assessments of proposed activities.
IP 39 New Zealand	<i>INTERSESSIONAL REPORT ON THE PROVISION OF GUIDANCE MATERIAL TO ASSIST PARTIES TO TAKE ACCOUNT OF WILDERNESS VALUES WHEN UNDERTAKING ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT ASSESSMENTS.</i> This report, connected to WP 35, suggests guidance material that will assist Parties to take account of wilderness values when undertaking environmental impact assessments of proposed activities.
IP 33 COMNAP	<i>ANALYSIS OF NATIONAL ANTARCTIC PROGRAM INCREASED DELIVERY OF SCIENCE.</i> This paper presents the results of an analysis that was recently undertaken by the Chilean National Antarctic Program, Instituto Antartico Chileno (INACH) which looked at reducing the environmental impact while doing more science. This analysis allowed it to then set procedures and strategies to continue to deliver more science while reducing its programs' Antarctic footprint.

IP 60 ASOC	<i>MAPPING AND MODELLING WILDERNESS VALUES IN ANTARCTICA: CONTRIBUTION TO CEP'S WORK IN DEVELOPING GUIDANCE MATERIAL ON WILDERNESS PROTECTION USING PROTOCOL TOOLS.</i> This paper summarizes the recommendations of the report "Mapping and modelling wilderness values in Antarctica" produced by the Wildland Research Institute, as a contribution to the CEP's work in developing guidance material on wilderness protection using Protocol tools.
e) Marine Spatial Protection and Management	
BP 17 ASOC	<i>ANTARCTIC OCEAN LEGACY UPDATE 1 – SECURING ENDURING PROTECTION FOR THE ROSS SEA REGION.</i> This paper summarizes the Antarctic Ocean Legacy Update Report, reviewing why the region should be protected, updating on the latest developments and calling for the Ross Sea marine reserve to be designated as one of the keystones of a Southern Ocean system of marine protected areas and marine reserves.
f) Other Annex V Matters	
WP 10 United Kingdom	<i>IDENTIFICATION OF POTENTIAL CLIMATE CHANGE REFUGIA FOR EMPEROR PENGUINS: A SCIENCE-BASED APPROACH.</i> Over the coming century, climate change will probably impact upon emperor penguin distribution range and breeding success in the Antarctic Peninsula region and wider Antarctica. The United Kingdom therefore recommends that the CEP endorse the monitoring of emperor penguin colonies using remote sensing techniques to identify potential climate change <i>refugia</i> , and encourages other Parties to undertake similar work in other regions of Antarctica.
WP 21 Russian Federation	<i>ANALYSIS OF THE ASPA AND ASMA WILDLIFE VALUES.</i> Noting Resolution 2 (2011) on the Revised Guide to the Preparation of Management Plans, the Russian Federation recommends the adoption of a Measure on the need of conducting monitoring programs in reviewing ASPA and ASMA management plans in which representatives of living Antarctic nature are designated as the main values to be protected .
WP 22 Russian Federation	<i>RUSSIAN ANTARCTIC BIOGEOGRAPHIC REGIONING AS COMPARED WITH THE NEW ZEALAND CLASSIFICATION.</i> In this paper, taking into account Resolution 6 (2012) on Antarctic Conservation Biogeographic Regions, the Russian Federation proposes to consider further developments of biogeographic regioning related to landscape science of Antarctica.

<p>WP 39 Belgium, South Africa, United Kingdom & SCAR</p>	<p><i>HUMAN FOOTPRINT IN ANTARCTICA AND THE LONG-TERM CONSERVATION AND STUDY OF TERRESTRIAL MICROBIAL HABITATS.</i> Recent advances in molecular biology techniques have shown the presence of diverse microbial communities and the existence of species endemic to Antarctica. The purpose of this paper is to highlight potential threats both to the conservation of terrestrial microbial ecosystems in Antarctica and to future scientific research requiring study of these ecosystems.</p>
<p>WP 55 Spain</p>	<p><i>RECOVERY OF MOSS COMMUNITIES ON THE PATHS OF BARRIENTOS ISLAND AND A PROPOSAL FOR TOURISM MANAGEMENT.</i> This paper reports on the results of a monitoring program of visits to the island, an assessment of the vegetation cover and as a result, a management proposal for visitors.</p>
<p>IP 35 Argentina, Spain & United Kingdom</p>	<p><i>THE NON-NATIVE GRASS POA PRATENSIS AT CIERVA POINT, DANCO COAST, ANTARCTIC PENINSULA – ON-GOING INVESTIGATIONS AND FUTURE ERADICATION PLANS.</i> This paper describes the research undertaken by Argentina, Spain and the UK during the season 2012/13 at Cierva Point in order to eradicate the non-native grass <i>Poa pratensis</i>.</p>
<p>IP 46 Australia, China, India & Russian Federation</p>	<p><i>REPORT OF THE ANTARCTIC SPECIALLY MANAGED AREA NO 6 LARSEMANN HILLS MANAGEMENT GROUP.</i> This paper gives a brief report on the Management Group’s activities during 2012-13. The paper informs that the Management Group aims to finalise the review of the management plan at its next meeting in July 2013, and to submit a revised management plan for consideration at CEP XVII.</p>
<p>IP 73 United Kingdom & Norway</p>	<p><i>ANTARCTIC TRIAL OF WWF’S RAPID ASSESSMENT OF CIRCUM-ARCTIC ECOSYSTEM RESILIENCE (RACER) TOOL: INITIAL FINDINGS.</i> This paper provides a brief update on the progress of the trial of the RACER, a tool from the Arctic to assess ecosystem resilience and areas of conservation importance, and the possible application of RACER to Antarctica.</p>
<p>IP 111 United Kingdom & Spain</p>	<p><i>MANAGEMENT OF ANTARCTIC SPECIALLY PROTECTED AREAS: PERMITTING, VISITATION AND INFORMATION EXCHANGE PRACTICES.</i> This paper presents research into Parties’ information exchange practices associated with the visitation of ASPAs. Improved provision and formal interpretation of ASPA visitation data are recommended to enable more co-ordinated and effective management of activities within ASPAs.</p>
<p>BP 10 United States & New Zealand</p>	<p><i>UPDATE ON DEVELOPING PROTECTION FOR A GEOTHERMAL AREA: VOLCANIC ICE CAVES AT MOUNT EREBUS, ROSS ISLAND.</i> This paper presents an update on the progress of the development of protection for the geothermal ice caves on the summit of Mount Erebus, and informs on plans for the 2013-14 intersessional period.</p>

10. CONSERVATION OF ANTARCTIC FLORA AND FAUNA	
a) Quarantine and Non-native Species	
WP 19 Germany	<i>REPORT ON THE RESEARCH PROJECT “THE IMPACT OF HUMAN ACTIVITIES ON SOIL ORGANISMS OF THE MARITIME ANTARCTIC AND THE INTRODUCTION OF NON-NATIVE SPECIES IN ANTARCTICA”</i> . Germany presents the results of the research project, and invites Parties and the CEP to consider the results of the project and the recommendations which concern biosecurity measures against the transfer and introduction of non-native soil organisms, and decide as appropriate.
IP 55 Germany	<i>FINAL REPORT ON THE RESEARCH PROJECT “THE IMPACT OF HUMAN ACTIVITIES ON SOIL ORGANISMS OF THE MARITIME ANTARCTIC AND THE INTRODUCTION OF NON-NATIVE SPECIES IN ANTARCTICA”</i> . This paper presents the final report of the Project.
IP 28 United Kingdom	<i>COLONISATION STATUS OF KNOWN NON-NATIVE SPECIES IN THE ANTARCTIC TERRESTRIAL ENVIRONMENT (UPDATED 2013)</i> . This paper is an update on the information presented during the past three years. The United Kingdom informs that during the last year there has been further development in the understanding of the colonisation potential and biology of some of the non-native species described previously, and evidence of a possible new non-native species within ASPA 128.
IP 35 Argentina, Spain & United Kingdom	<i>THE NON-NATIVE GRASS POA PRATENSIS AT CIERVA POINT, DANCO COAST, ANTARCTIC PENINSULA – ON-GOING INVESTIGATIONS AND FUTURE ERADICATION PLANS</i> . This paper describes the research undertaken by Argentina, Spain and the UK during the season 2012/13 at Cierva Point in order to eradicate the non-native grass <i>Poa pratensis</i> .
BP 9 Australia	<i>AUSTRALIA’S NEW ANTARCTIC CARGO AND BIOSECURITY OPERATIONS FACILITY</i> . This paper informs on the new cargo and biosecurity operations facility established in Hobart by the Australian Antarctic Division to support its Antarctic operations.
b) Specially Protected Species	
c) Other Annex II Matters	
WP 10 United Kingdom	<i>IDENTIFICATION OF POTENTIAL CLIMATE CHANGE REFUGIA FOR EMPEROR PENGUINS: A SCIENCE-BASED APPROACH</i> . Over the coming century, climate change will probably impact upon emperor penguin distribution range and breeding success in the Antarctic Peninsula region and wider Antarctica. The United Kingdom therefore recommends that the CEP endorse the monitoring of emperor penguin colonies using remote sensing techniques to identify potential climate change <i>refugia</i> , and encourages other Parties to undertake similar work in other regions of Antarctica.

<p>IP 31 COMNAP</p>	<p><i>USE OF HYDROPONICS BY NATIONAL ANTARCTIC PROGRAMS.</i> The national Antarctic programs of Australia, New Zealand and the United States operate hydroponic facilities in Antarctica. Each program has reviewed the potential environmental impacts of hydroponics and has risk-based management measures in place.</p>
<p>11. ENVIRONMENTAL MONITORING AND REPORTING</p>	
<p>WP 37 Belgium & SCAR</p>	<p><i>WWW.BIODIVERSITY.AQ: THE NEW ANTARCTIC BIODIVERSITY INFORMATION NETWORK.</i> This paper informs on the renewed international Antarctic Biodiversity portal, which builds on the legacy of the SCAR Marine Biodiversity Information Network and the Antarctic Biodiversity Information Facility, providing access to both marine and terrestrial Antarctic biodiversity data.</p>
<p>IP 5 SCAR</p>	<p><i>THE SOUTHERN OCEAN OBSERVING SYSTEM (SOOS) 2012 REPORT.</i> This report highlights SOOS achievements in 2012, and planned activities for 2013.</p>
<p>IP 19 SCAR</p>	<p><i>1ST SCAR ANTARCTIC AND SOUTHERN OCEAN SCIENCE HORIZON SCAN.</i> The SCAR 2011-2016 Strategic Plan calls for instituting a “Horizon Scanning” activity, to be held every 4 or 5 years, to support SCAR’s vision of leadership and international cooperation in Antarctic and Southern Ocean science and assist in achieving its mission of excellence in science and scientific advice to policy makers. The Scan will assemble 50 of the world’s leading Antarctic scientists, policy makers, leaders, and visionaries to identify the most important scientific questions that will or should be addressed by research in and from the southern Polar Regions over the next two decades.</p>
<p>IP 27 Rep. of Korea & Germany</p>	<p><i>KOREAN/GERMAN WORKSHOP ABOUT ENVIRONMENTAL MONITORING ON KING GEORGE ISLAND.</i> This paper informs on the joint Workshop held in April 2012. The paper reports that there was a very fruitful exchange of information on the previous and ongoing monitoring and research activities in the Maxwell Bay area, and that the participants reached an agreement that the successful dialog between Korea and Germany should be carried out on a regular basis e.g. by annual meetings.</p>
<p>IP 29 United Kingdom</p>	<p><i>REMOTE SENSING FOR MONITORING ANTARCTIC SPECIALLY PROTECTED AREAS: PROGRESS ON USE OF MULTISPECTRAL AND HYPERSPECTRAL DATA FOR MONITORING ANTARCTIC VEGETATION.</i> This paper provides an update on the development and application of new remote sensing techniques to monitor vegetation within Antarctic Specially Protected Areas and the wider Antarctic environment.</p>

IP 59 ASOC	<i>UPDATE TO VESSEL INCIDENTS IN ANTARCTIC WATERS.</i> This paper provides additional information and analysis of vessel incidents in Antarctic waters, including a map of vessel incidents and case studies of several recent incidents in the context of the evolving Polar Code which point to a number of inadequacies in the current draft Polar Code.
IP 66 ASOC	<i>DISCHARGE OF SEWAGE AND GREY WATER FROM VESSELS IN ANTARCTIC TREATY WATERS.</i> This paper provides information on discharges of black (sewage) and grey water from vessels, expresses concerns that the current system for the management of sewage and grey water waste streams may not be sufficient to provide adequate protection for Antarctic ecosystems and wildlife, and summarises the current regulation.
IP 67 ASOC	<i>MANAGEMENT IMPLICATIONS OF TOURIST BEHAVIOUR.</i> This paper examines aspects of Antarctic tourist behaviour in the context of current tourism trends, and discusses the implications for tourism regulation and management.
IP 76 Italy	<i>REPORT ON THE ACCIDENT OCCURRED TO AN EXCAVATOR VEHICLE AT MARIO ZUCHELLI STATION, ROSS SEA, ANTARCTICA.</i> This paper informs on an excavator that fell into the sea in front of Mario Zucchelli Station in December 2012.
IP 107 Chile	<i>ANTARCTIC CENTER FOR RESEARCH AND ENVIRONMENTAL MONITORING, CIMAA: ADVANCES IN WATER QUALITY MONITORING AND OPPORTUNITIES FOR COOPERATION.</i> This paper presents the results obtained by the Antarctic Center for Research and Environmental Monitoring, CIMAA, in the Chilean Bernardo O'Higgins Base during the 2012-2013 season. In addition, reports on new international collaborative activities to verify the operation of sewage treatment plants.
12. INSPECTION REPORTS	
WP 4 Germany & South Africa	<i>INSPECTION BY GERMANY AND SOUTH AFRICA IN ACCORDANCE WITH ARTICLE VII OF THE ANTARCTIC TREATY AND ARTICLE 14 OF THE PROTOCOL ON ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION: JANUARY 2013.</i> In this paper Germany and South Africa report on the inspections conducted of four stations in Dronning Maud Land from 9 to 29 January 2013 under the applicable provisions of the Antarctic Treaty and Madrid Protocol.
IP 53 Germany & South Africa	<i>INSPECTION BY GERMANY AND SOUTH AFRICA IN ACCORDANCE WITH ARTICLE VII OF THE ANTARCTIC TREATY AND ARTICLE 14 OF THE PROTOCOL ON ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION: JANUARY 2013.</i> This paper presents the full inspection report describing the observations and conclusions of the 2013 German-South African Joint Antarctic Inspection Team.

<p>WP 9 United Kingdom, the Netherlands & Spain</p>	<p>GENERAL RECOMMENDATIONS FROM THE JOINT INSPECTIONS UNDERTAKEN BY THE UNITED KINGDOM, THE NETHERLANDS AND SPAIN UNDER ARTICLE VII OF THE ANTARCTIC TREATY AND ARTICLE 14 OF THE ENVIRONMENTAL PROTOCOL. This paper informs that inspections were conducted jointly by the United Kingdom, the Netherlands and Spain in the Antarctic Peninsula region in December 2012. The Observers identified a series of general recommendations arising from their Inspection which have potential relevance beyond just those bases, stations, sites and vessels inspected.</p>
<p>IP 38 United Kingdom, the Netherlands & Spain</p>	<p>REPORT OF THE JOINT INSPECTIONS UNDERTAKEN BY THE UNITED KINGDOM, THE NETHERLANDS AND SPAIN UNDER ARTICLE VII OF THE ANTARCTIC TREATY AND ARTICLE 14 OF THE ENVIRONMENTAL PROTOCOL. Full Report of the joint Inspection described in WP 9.</p>
<p>WP 51 rev. 1 Uruguay & Argentina</p>	<p>ADDITIONAL AVAILABILITY OF INFORMATION ON LISTS OF OBSERVERS OF THE CONSULTATIVE PARTIES THROUGH THE ANTARCTIC TREATY SECRETARIAT . This paper suggests that the Antarctic Treaty Secretariat could provide a complementary source of information for the Parties on the appointment of Observers in accordance with Article 7 of the Antarctic Treaty and Article 14 of the Protocol. This information could be available through restricted access, in the Pre-season Information section of the EIES.</p>
<p>IP 16 France & Italy</p>	<p>STATUS OF THE FLUID IN THE EPICA BOREHOLE AT CONCORDIA STATION: AN ANSWER TO THE US / RUSSIAN INSPECTION IN 2012. At CEP XV, the US and the Russian Federation reported the results of their joint inspection at Concordia station in January 2012. Among the comments, a doubt was raised about a possible leakage of the drilling fluid of the EPICA borehole and inaccurate information was provided on the nature of this drilling fluid. The aim of this Information Paper is to answer to these remarks.</p>
<p>IP 45 Russian Federation & United States</p>	<p>REPORT OF RUSSIA – US JOINT ANTARCTIC INSPECTION, NOVEMBER 29 – DECEMBER 6, 2012. This paper informs on the second phase of the joint inspection of seven Antarctic stations. The paper also informs on the main conclusions of this second phase.</p>
<p>IP 77 Italy</p>	<p>ITALY ANSWER TO THE US / RUSSIAN INSPECTION AT MARIO ZUCHELLI STATION IN 2012. This paper presents more detailed information about the ability of Italy to fully implement legal standards related to the Environmental Protocol, in answer to concerns expressed in the report of the 2012 inspection.</p>

13. GENERAL MATTERS	
IP 7 Japan	<i>STATE OF JAPANESE ENVIRONMENTAL MANAGEMENT IN ANTARCTICA, WITH REFERENCE TO THE PRACTICES OF OTHER NATIONAL ANTARCTIC PROGRAMMES.</i> This paper informs that the Ministry of Environment of Japan decided to investigate the status of environmental conservation in Antarctic stations of each country as a reference to identify potential future improvements in environmental conservation.
IP 83 SCAR	<i>THE INTERNATIONAL BATHYMETRIC CHART OF THE SOUTHERN OCEAN (IBCSO): FIRST RELEASE.</i> This paper informs on the project initiated in 2006, in particular on the data repository and the map released by the Alfred-Wegener-Institute in Germany.
IP 104 Colombia	<i>IP 104. COLOMBIA IN ANTARCTICA.</i> This paper informs on a decision by Colombia of undertaking a more active role in Antarctica through a more active participation on Antarctic science, exchange of information, international cooperation and exchange of information. Colombia announced that is planning and Antarctic expedition for the 2014 or 2015 summer season and that it has initiated the process to ratify the Environmental Protocol.
14. ELECTION OF OFFICERS	
15. PREPARATION FOR NEXT MEETING	
16. ADOPTION OF THE REPORT	
17. CLOSING OF THE MEETING	

Appendix 1

CEP Five-Year Work Plan

Issue / Environmental Pressure Actions	CEP Priority	Intersessional Period	CEP XVII 2014	Intersessional Period	CEP XVIII 2015	Intersessional Period	CEP XIX 2016	Intersessional Period	CEP XX 2017
Introduction of non-native species Actions: 1. Continue developing practical guidelines & resources for all Antarctic operators. 2. Continue advancing recommendations from climate change ATME. 3. Consider the spatially explicit-PA10	1	Informal intersessional discussions (Germany) Interested members, experts, NAPs work on response measures and eradication.	Discuss further monitoring measures for inclusion in NSS manual, including a surveillance strategy for areas at high risk of establishment	Prepare for review of manual-consider informal discussion group	Review non-native species manual		2016	Period	
			Discuss further response measures for inclusion in NSS manual						
Tourism and NGO activities Actions: 1. Provide advice to ATCM as requested. 2. Advance recommendations from ship-borne tourism ATME.	1	Parties to cooperate to prepare material in response to recommendations 3 and 6 of the tourism study	Provide interim response to ATCM on tourism study recommendations 3 and 6. Consider format of site guidelines in response to recommendation 8 of WP15 (2013)						
			ICG to advance recommendations from ATME	Interim report from the ICG Standing agenda item, SCAR provides update	ICG continues to advance recommendations from ATME	ICG report Standing agenda item, SCAR provides update		Standing agenda item, SCAR provides update	Continue to advance recommendations from ATME
Global Pressure: Climate Change Actions: 1. Consider implications of climate change for management of Antarctic environment. 2. Advance recommendations from climate change ATME.	1								

Issue / Environmental Pressure Actions	CEP Priority	Intercessional Period	CEP XVII 2014	Intercessional Period	CEP XVIII 2015	Intercessional Period	CEP XIX	Intercessional	CEP XX 2017
<p>Processing new and revised protected / managed area management plans</p> <p>Actions:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Refine the process for reviewing new and revised management plans. 2. Update existing guidelines. 3. Advance recommendations from climate change ATME. 4. Develop guidelines to ASMA's preparation. 5. Consider the need to enhance the process for designation of new ASPAs and ASMA's. 	1	SGMP / conducts work as per agreed work plan	Consideration of SGMP / report	SGMP / conducts work as per agreed work plan Develop guidelines to ASMA's preparation.	Consideration of SGMP / report	SGMP / conducts work as per agreed work plan	Consideration of SGMP / report		
<p>Marine spatial protection and management</p> <p>Actions:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Cooperate with CCAMLR on Southern Ocean bioregionalisation and other common interests and agreed principles. 2. Identify and apply processes for spatial marine protection. <p>Advance recommendations from climate change ATME.</p>	1								
<p>Operation of the CEP and Strategic Planning</p> <p>Actions:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Keep the 5 year plan up to date based on changing circumstances and ATCM requirements. 2. Identify opportunities for improving the effectiveness of the CEP. 3. Consider long-term objectives for Antarctica (50-100 years time). 	1		Standing item Review and revise work plan as appropriate		Preparations for the 25th anniversary Standing item Review and revise work plan as appropriate		25th anniversary of Protocol. Review and revise work plan as appropriate		

Issue / Environmental Pressure Actions	CEP Priority	Intercessional Period	CEP XVII 2014	Intercessional Period	CEP XVIII 2015	Intercessional Period	CEP XIX	Intercessional Period	CEP XX 2017
Repair or Remediation of Environmental Damage Actions: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Respond to further request from the ATCM related to Decision 4 (2010), as appropriate Establish Antarctic-wide inventory of sites of past activity Consider guidelines for repair and remediation Members develop practical guidelines and supporting resources for inclusion in the clean-up manual 	1		Consider updating Clean-up Manual, as appropriate Consider further request by the ATCM		Secretariat requested to develop and maintain an inventory Consider further request by the ATCM for final advice				
Human footprint / wilderness management Actions: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Develop an agreed understanding of the terms "footprint" and "wilderness" Develop methods for improved protection of wilderness under Annexes I and V. 	2	Continue informal intercessional discussions, including on microbiological issues							
Monitoring and state of the environment reporting Actions: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Identify key environmental indicators and tools. Establish a process for reporting to the ATCM. SCAR to support information to COMNAP and CEP. 	2		Report to the CEP, as appropriate						
Biodiversity knowledge Actions: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Maintain awareness of threats to existing biodiversity. Advance recommendations from climate change ATME 	2				Discussion of SCAR update on underwater noise.				

Issue / Environmental Pressure Actions	CEP Priority	Intercessional Period	CEP XVII 2014	Intercessional Period	CEP XVIII 2015	Intercessional Period	CEP XIX	Intercessional	CEP XX 2017
<p>Site specific guidelines for tours-visited sites</p> <p>Actions:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Review site specific guidelines as required 2. Provide advice to ATCM as required. 3. Review the format of the site guidelines 	2	UK to coordinate an informal process to seek and collate information on National Operator's use of site guidelines	<p>Standing agenda item; Parties to report on their reviews of site guidelines</p> <p>Report to the CEP with Barriotes with Barrionos, Island, Aitcho Islands, monitoring results.</p>		<p>Standing agenda item; Parties to report on their reviews of site guidelines</p>		<p>Standing agenda item; Parties to report on their reviews of site guidelines</p>		<p>Standing agenda item; Parties to report on their reviews of site guidelines</p>
<p>Overview of the protected areas system</p> <p>Actions:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Apply the Environmental Domains Analysis (EDA) and Antarctic Conservation Biogeographic Regions (ACBR) to enhance the protected areas system. 2. Advance recommendations from climate change ATME. 3. Maintain and develop Protected Area database. 	2		<p>Discuss possible implications of an updated gap analysis based on EDA and ACBR.</p>						
<p>Outreach and education</p> <p>Actions:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Review current examples and identify opportunities for greater education and outreach. 2. Encourage Members to exchange information regarding their experiences in this area. 3. Establish a strategy and guidelines for exchanging information between Members on Education and Outreach for long term perspective. 	2								
<p>Maintain the list of Historic Sites and Monuments</p> <p>Actions:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Maintain the list and consider new proposals as they arise. 2. Consider strategic issues as necessary, including issues relating to designation of buildings as HSM versus clean-up provisions of the Protocol. 	3	Secretariate update list of HSMs	<p>Standing item</p> <p>Secretariate update list of HSMs</p>	<p>Standing item</p> <p>Secretariate update list of HSMs</p>	<p>Standing item</p> <p>Secretariate update list of HSMs</p>	<p>Standing item</p> <p>Secretariate update list of HSMs</p>	<p>Standing item</p> <p>Secretariate update list of HSMs</p>	<p>Standing item</p> <p>Secretariate update list of HSMs</p>	<p>Standing item</p> <p>Secretariate update list of HSMs</p>

Issue / Environmental Pressure Actions	CEP Priority	Interseasonal Period	CEP XVII 2014	Interseasonal Period	CEP XVIII 2015	Interseasonal Period	CEP XIX	Interseasonal	CEP XX 2017
Exchange of Information	3		Secretariat Report		Secretariat Report		Secretariat Report		Secretariat Report
Actions: 1. Assign to the Secretariat. 2. Monitor and facilitate easy use of the EIES.									
Implementing and Improving the EIA provisions of Annex I	3	Establish ICG to review draft CEEs as required	Consideration of ICG reports on draft CEE, as required	Start a revision of the EIA Guidelines, including human footprint, wilderness, decommissioning of stations, etc. Establish ICG to review draft CEEs as required	Consideration of ICG reports on draft CEE, as required	Establish ICG to review draft CEEs as required	Consideration of ICG reports on draft CEE, as required	Establish ICG to review draft CEEs as required	Consideration of ICG reports on draft CEE, as required
Actions: 1. Refine the process for considering CEEs and advising the ATCM accordingly. 2. Develop guidelines for assessing cumulative impacts. 3. Keep the EIA Guidelines under review. 4. Consider application of strategic environmental assessment in Antarctica. 5. Advance recommendations from climate change ATME									
Specialty protected species	3		Consider proposal as required						
Actions: 1. Consider proposals related to specially protected species.									
Emergency response action and contingency planning	3	Discussion		Discussion					
Actions: 1. Advance recommendations from ship-borne tourism ATME.									
Updating the Protocol and reviewing Annexes	3								
Actions: 1. Consider the need and aim to reviewing Protocol Annexes.									
Inspections (Article 14 of the Protocol)	3		Standing item		Standing item		Standing item		Standing item
Actions: 1. Review inspection reports as required.									

Issue / Environmental Pressure	CEP Priority	Intercessional Period	CEP XVII 2014	Intercessional Period	CEP XVIII 2015	Intercessional Period	CEP XIX	Intercessional Period	CEP XX 2017
Waste	3								
Actions: 1. Develop guidelines for best practice disposal of waste including human waste.		COMNAP reviews information from 2006 waste management workshop							
Energy management	4								
Actions: 1. Develop best-practice guidelines for energy management at stations and bases.									
Outreach and education	2								
Actions: 1. Review current examples and identify opportunities for greater educational outreach. 2. Encourage Members to exchange information regarding their experiences in this area. 3. Establish a strategy and guidelines for exchanging information between Members on Education and Outreach for long term perspective.									

Appendix 2

Provisional Agenda for CEP XVII

1. Opening of the Meeting
2. Adoption of the Agenda
3. Strategic Discussions on the Future Work of the CEP
4. Operation of the CEP
5. Cooperation with other Organisations
6. Repair and Remediation of Environment Damage
7. Climate Change Implications for the Environment: Strategic approach
8. Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA)
 - a. Draft Comprehensive Environmental Evaluations
 - b. Other EIA Matters
9. Area Protection and Management Plans
 - a. Management Plans
 - b. Historic Sites and Monuments
 - c. Site Guidelines
 - d. Human footprint and wilderness values
 - e. Marine Spatial Protection and Management
 - f. Other Annex V Matters
10. Conservation of Antarctic Flora and Fauna
 - a. Quarantine and Non-native Species
 - b. Specially Protected Species
 - c. Other Annex II Matters
11. Environmental Monitoring and Reporting
12. Inspection Reports
13. General Matters
14. Election of Officers
15. Preparation for Next Meeting
16. Adoption of the Report
17. Closing of the Meeting