

Report of the Committee for Environmental Protection (CEP XVII)

Brasilia, 28 April – 2 May 2014

Item 1: Opening of the Meeting

- (1) The CEP Chair, Dr Yves Frenot (France), opened the meeting on Monday 28 April 2014 and thanked Brazil for arranging and hosting the meeting in Brasilia.
- (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 (IP 97 CEP XVII – *Work done during the intersessional period*), noting that all the planned work agreed at the end of CEP XVI had been achieved.

Item 2: Adoption of the Agenda

- (4) The Committee adopted the following agenda and confirmed the allocation of 43 Working Papers, 52 Information Papers, 4 Secretariat Papers and 8 Background Papers 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 WP 10 *Antarctic Environments Portal: Progress Report*, jointly prepared with Australia, Belgium, Norway and SCAR, which provided an update on the Portal's development. New Zealand noted that the Portal aimed to support the work of the Committee by providing up-to-date scientifically based information on the priority issues being addressed by the Committee. New Zealand emphasised two main aspects of the Portal: the website itself, including information summaries on key issues available in all four Treaty languages, a search facility, an interactive map and a section on "emerging issues"; and the supporting editorial process by which the Portal's content is generated and managed. New Zealand highlighted the planned next steps in the Portal's development, including seeking funding to support long-term hosting of the website; the employment of an editor to oversee the development and the management of the Portal's content; and

completion of the technical development itself. To support this further work and ensure that the Portal meets the needs of the CEP, New Zealand noted its intention to establish a Reference Group for the purposes of exchanging ideas and seeking feedback.

- (6) Many Parties expressed their support for the Portal initiative and their appreciation for the extent to which New Zealand had responded to the comments provided at CEP XVI.
- (7) SCAR reiterated its full support for the Portal initiative and the potential it provided to support SCAR's advisory role to the Antarctic Treaty System. In this regard SCAR emphasised the importance it placed on guaranteeing the reliability and independence of the Portal's content.
- (8) In discussing further development of the Portal, a number of Members recommended that consideration be given to ensuring a balanced membership of the proposed editorial Committee and that clear terms of reference be developed for the editorial committee to ensure that the content of the Portal remained non-political and based on published peer-reviewed research.
- (9) Argentina suggested that the editorial committee should involve CEP Members. It expressed an interest in joining the editorial committee and offered to assist with the Spanish translations of Portal content to minimise costs.
- (10) The United Kingdom highlighted the need to maximise the use of the Portal and integrate the information it would provide into future discussions of the CEP.
- (11) In response to a suggestion from France, SCAR noted that its limited resources meant that it would be unable to take on responsibility for managing and maintaining the Portal, but that it would play an active role in supporting the project and developing and reviewing the content.
- (12) Japan noted its support for the Portal and the rigorous editorial process and commented that if the Secretariat were to be involved in managing the Portal in the future then it would need to be on a cost-neutral basis.
- (13) In response to a query from the United States about how information on the Portal would be prioritised, New Zealand explained that the Portal had been developed based on the priority issues set out in the CEP Five-year Work Plan, and that this would evolve over time, as the CEP's priorities changed.

- (14) In response to a query from Germany regarding the peer review process, New Zealand clarified that secondary peer reviews were used to guarantee that the information summaries available through the Portal represented a balanced perspective on existing peer-reviewed literature.
- (15) Chile stated that it is important to establish clear terms of reference which ensure the scientific content of the information of the Portal to avoid political issues and controversial interpretations of the data which could go over the prescribed procedure.
- (16) Brazil also stressed the importance of having a balanced representation on the editorial committee and of the revised literature.
- (17) The Committee and ASOC warmly congratulated New Zealand, Australia, Belgium, Norway and SCAR for the progress they had made on the Portal, supported the recommendations contained in the Working Paper, and encouraged the project sponsors to complete the development of the Portal ahead of CEP XVIII.
- (18) Argentina introduced WP 47 rev. 1 *Outreach Activities on Occasion of the 25th Anniversary of the Signing of the Protocol on Environment Protection to the Antarctic Treaty*, jointly prepared with Chile. It suggested that given the upcoming anniversary of the Protocol, Members should consider initiating public outreach activities to raise awareness of the Committee and its achievements. Such outreach tasks should be targeted at the international community at large and, in particular, to the community of the State Parties to the Madrid Protocol, who have supported this work. Particularly, Argentina suggested considering the possibility of preparing an online publication, written in simple language for the community at large, which may be circulated among various governmental and non-governmental, academic and education institutions, among others. It recommended that the CEP: acknowledges the importance of public outreach on the Committee's work; encourages the exchange of ideas on suitable outreach activities, such as an online publication; and consults the Antarctic Treaty Secretariat on how it might provide support to this proposal.
- (19) The Committee thanked Argentina and Chile, and expressed its support for the initiative. Several Members highlighted the need for the CEP to think in advance about the anniversary and on innovative ways to increase the visibility of the Committee and its work.

- (20) Some Members raised issues regarding the proposed online publication, including the nature of its content and how it could be prepared in due time. Norway noted that while it was uncertain as to the role of the Committee in outreach activity in the light of its role as an advisory body to the ATCM, the CEP would nevertheless be best placed to disseminate the achievements of the Committee. Australia reported that it had been working on a list of achievements of the CEP which could be a useful reference for discussions. It also reminded the Committee that any communication should be approved by consensus, and suggested that it should be succinct and factually based. Brazil and Belgium noted the relevance of WP 9 to this topic. While recognising the importance of commemorating the CEP's achievements, the United Kingdom wanted any publication to be honest and realistic regarding the challenges that lay ahead. ASOC stated that the 25th anniversary of the signature of the Protocol was an opportunity to evaluate the successes and challenges of implementing this instrument.
- (21) Norway suggested that the 25th anniversary would be a suitable juncture to assess the effectiveness of the dynamics between the CEP as the advisory body and the ATCM, possibly including through a symposium, and noted that it would discuss further with other interested Members about the planning of such an event. In response to a suggestion made by Norway for a symposium to consider these matters Chile indicated it would be interested in supporting one to be held in 2016 prior to ATCM XXXIX, with the aim of concluding these discussions and coordinating the proposed outreach activities.
- (22) In responding to concerns raised, Argentina pointed out that the proposal was not simply to highlight successes, but also to fulfil the duty to inform the community about the actions taken to implement the provisions of the Madrid Protocol. It noted that the proposal had been brought forward two years in advance with the objective of initiating a debate and making its implementation feasible. It thanked Australia for its valuable contribution and for making the preliminary list of achievements available.
- (23) The Committee agreed that the wording of any publication should be agreed by consensus, and would accordingly need to be succinct and factually-based. It also agreed that in addition to highlighting achievements, it was important to give consideration to the on-going and emerging challenges facing the Antarctic environment, such as the challenges identified in the CEP Five-year Work Plan. It noted that Australia had been working on a list of achievements of the CEP which could be a useful reference for the discussion.

- (24) The Committee agreed to continue informal discussions on this matter during the intersessional period.
- (25) The Committee revised and updated its Five-year Work Plan (see Appendix 1).

Item 4: Operation of the CEP

- (26) The Secretariat introduced SP 7 *ATCM Multi-Year Strategic Work Plan: Report of the Secretariat on Information Exchange Requirements and the Electronic Information Exchange System*. It provided a review of the existing requirements for information exchange and their evolution, a summary of the outcomes of informal discussions on the subject at both the ATCM and CEP, a list of pending issues and a report on the functioning of the Electronic Information Exchange System (EIES). The Secretariat noted that this paper would be thoroughly debated by the ATCM.
- (27) Several Members commended the Secretariat for the effective development of the EIES and reiterated that information exchange was fundamental to the operation of the Treaty. New Zealand referred to WP 55 *Reviewing information exchange requirements*, submitted by Australia to the ATCM, and noted that there would be an opportunity for the Committee to provide advice to the ATCM in its consideration of the information exchange system. Australia noted that it had submitted WP 55 to the ATCM in furtherance of the priority identified in the ATCM Multi-year Strategic Work Plan to conduct a comprehensive review of information exchange requirements. Several Members agreed that the CEP should be involved in providing advice on environment-related reporting requirements, if the ATCM decided to conduct a review, noting that this suggestion was raised in WP 55.
- (28) Germany fully supported a full review of the EIES and the establishment of an ICG on this matter. However, Germany noted that there are three levels of the EIES that need development: (1) content, (2) functionality and (3) reliable and complete reporting in time. Germany noted that WP 55 focused on (1), whereas in Germany's view the major problems are (2) and (3) which should receive attention accordingly.
- (29) The Committee agreed and noted its interest in contributing to discussions on environmental information exchange requirements and to await the conclusions of ATCM discussions on WP 55.

- (30) The following paper was also submitted under this agenda item:
- IP 97 *CEP XVII – Work done during the intersession period* (France)

Item 5: Cooperation with other Organisations

- (31) COMNAP presented IP 3 *The Annual Report for 2013 of the Council of Managers of National Antarctic Programs (COMNAP)* and emphasised the Wastewater Management Workshop to be held in Christchurch in August 2014. The paper further noted that COMNAP marked 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*. Other highlights from the past year included the granting of membership to the Czech Republic's National Antarctic Programme, as well as the development of the Search and Rescue (SAR) webpage.
- (32) The SC-CAMLR Observer presented IP 10 *Report by the SC-CAMLR Observer to the Seventeenth Meeting of the Committee for Environmental Protection*. As in previous years, 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. The full report on the 32nd SC-CAMLR meeting was available on the CCAMLR website <http://www.ccamlr.org/en/meetings/27>.
- (33) The SC-CAMLR Observer drew the Committee's attention to the issue of the effects of climate change as a cross-cutting issue. He emphasised that increased warming and acidification were highly likely to impact marine ecosystems during the current century. Accordingly he informed the Committee that climate change would be prioritised during the meeting of SC-CAMLR XXXIII.
- (34) SCAR presented IP 13 *The Scientific Committee on Antarctic Research (SCAR) Annual Report 2013/14* and highlighted several examples of its activities. These included the initiation in 2013 of the new five Scientific Research Programmes, in particular State of the Antarctic Ecosystem (AntEco), Antarctic Thresholds - Ecosystem Resilience and Adaptation (AntT-ERA), and Antarctic Climate Change in the 21st Century (AntClim21).

Several other SCAR Groups were also of interest to the work of the CEP, such as Southern Ocean Acidification, which would publish a report on this matter in August 2014; Geoheritage Values; Environmental contamination in Antarctica; and Remote Sensing to monitor birds and animal populations. SCAR also provided an annual update to the Antarctic Climate Change and the Environment Report. SCAR had held a Science Horizon Scan in New Zealand in April 2014, following the crowdsourcing of over 850 unique questions and the nomination of almost 500 scientists by the SCAR community. The selected 70 participants had identified a list of the 80 most important scientific questions that should be addressed by research in Antarctica and the Southern Ocean beyond the next 20 years. SCAR in collaboration with several partners was developing a strategy entitled *Antarctic Conservation in the 21st Century*. A Scoping Workshop on Practical Solutions had been held in September 2013 and a symposium would be held in August 2014. The 33rd SCAR meetings and Open Science Conference would be held in Auckland, New Zealand from 22 August to 3 September 2014.

- (35) The Committee agreed to send CEP Observers to the following upcoming events: Dr Yves Frenot would represent the Committee at the next COMNAP meeting to be held in Christchurch, New Zealand, 27 – 29 August; Dr Polly Penhale would represent the CEP at the CCAMLR XXXIII in Hobart, 20 – 31 October; and Ms Verónica Vallejos would represent the CEP in the XXXIII SCAR meetings and Open Science Conference in Auckland, 22 August – 3 September.
- (36) The following papers were also submitted under this agenda item:
- BP 9 *The Scientific Committee on Antarctic Research (SCAR) Selected Science Highlights for 2013/14* (SCAR)
 - BP 14 *Antarctica New Zealand Membership of the International Union for Conservation of Nature (IUCN)* (New Zealand)

Item 6: Repair and Remediation of Environment Damage

- (37) Australia introduced WP 28 *Antarctic clean-up activities: checklist for preliminary site assessment*, which presented a suggested checklist for site assessments. It recommended that the attached Checklist for Preliminary Site Assessment be included in section 3 of the CEP Clean-up Manual, which was adopted by Resolution 2 (2013), as a resource for those planning or undertaking clean-up activities in Antarctica. The checklist identified broad

categories of information and more specific details that could be used to document the site and to inform later stages of the clean-up process.

- (38) Following minor modifications to address suggestions made by France, Argentina and the United Kingdom, the Committee agreed to include the checklist in the CEP Clean-up Manual.
- (39) Brazil presented IP 7 *Remediation Plan for the Brazilian Antarctic Station area*, and reported on its progress in remediating the site where the Comandante Ferraz station had been destroyed by fire. In accordance with Annex III to the Protocol and the Clean-up Manual, the Brazilian National Antarctic Programme began to develop a remediation plan for the area surrounding the station, with the aim of minimising impacts on the Antarctic environment. Brazil delivered an informative presentation about the activities being carried out at the site.
- (40) The Committee commended Brazil on its efforts in implementing the remediation plan. Australia thanked Brazil for informing the CEP about the progress of the project, and encouraged it to continue providing information on the methods and on the efficiency of activities carried out, so as to promote the sharing of experiences on remediation.
- (41) In response to a question from Chile, Brazil replied that an independent study committee, which had been commissioned by the Brazilian Navy for evaluating environmental impacts, was responsible for approving the reconstruction of the base.
- (42) The CEP thanked Brazil for providing information on the remediation project and expressed an interest in receiving further updates from Brazil.
- (43) The following paper was also submitted under this agenda item:
 - BP 18 *Tareas de Gestión Ambiental en la Base Belgrano II* (Argentina)

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

- (44) Norway and the United Kingdom jointly introduced WP 8 *Report from ICG on Climate Change*, which reported on the results of the ICG's intersessional discussions. The Committee was reminded that the ultimate goal of the ICG was to develop a Climate Change Response Work Programme (CCRWP) for

the CEP. The ICG had agreed to a stepwise approach to the development of such a climate change response work programme. During the first intersessional period the ICG had: (1) considered the status of recommendations from the Antarctic Treaty Meeting of Experts (ATME) on impacts of climate change (2010) relevant for the CEP; (2) categorised and systematised the climate change themes/issues embedded in the ATME recommendations; (3) considered and identified decisions/steps already taken or in progress by the CEP with regard to the identified issues and topics; and (4) initiated thoughts on what the remaining needs and required actions by the CEP were, which in the next round would form the basis for the CCWRP. The ICG convenors also encouraged and invited Members to become actively involved in the development of the final phase of the process. In the course of its deliberations the ICG had also noted that it could be useful to discuss whether there would be a need for an over-arching objective for the CCRWP to provide guidance and define the scope of the plan.

- (45) Several Members and Observers commended the ICG's work and noted the importance of addressing the effects of climate change in Antarctica. New Zealand noted that the Antarctic Environments Portal would be a useful tool to inform discussions around appropriate management responses to this issue.
- (46) While acknowledging the importance of addressing such effects, Brazil and China expressed the view that the work programme should take into account the outcomes of discussions in other multilateral fora, such as the United National Framework on Climate Change (UNFCCC) and its Kyoto Protocol. Chile stated that the CEP must take into account the world concern about climate change and that the circumstances existing when the Madrid Protocol was signed have changed due to the advance of science and technology. Argentina also stressed the importance of limiting the discussions regarding climate change to its consequences in Antarctica. They further emphasised that any recommendations should not establish obligations that do not respect the principles of the international regime on climate change, in particular the principle of common but differentiated responsibilities.
- (47) New Zealand and Australia referred to the ICG's suggestion for an over-arching objective and agreed that it would provide useful guidance and define the scope of the work.

- (48) The Committee acknowledged the progress of the work done by the ICG on Climate Change and agreed that the ICG continue its work and complete the tasks related to the final phase of the process in order to meet the remaining requirements of its terms of reference. In endorsing the ICG's work, the Committee called for an increased participation of all Members in the process.
- (49) The Committee furthermore agreed to ask the Secretariat to continue to update the overview of ATME recommendations (currently the updated version of ATCM XXXVI - SP 7), in line with the recommendations of CEP XIV.
- (50) The United States introduced WP 40 *Fostering Coordinated Antarctic Climate Change Monitoring*, jointly prepared with the United Kingdom and Norway. Given the importance of climate change-related issues and the on-going attention being paid by the ATCM, CEP and SC-CAMLR to these matters, the paper proposed that the ATCM continue to develop new observational systems to understand better climate processes. In particular, it recommended that the ATCM promote efforts to (1) strengthen coordination for addressing climate research priorities as a means to improve existing observing efforts and understanding of observing system requirements, particularly those requirements that would lead to improved understanding of the Antarctic on a system-wide scale and (2) continue to support cooperation between the CEP and SC-CAMLR in areas of mutual interest, which included ecosystem and environmental monitoring, through periodic joint workshops.
- (51) Members thanked the proponents for drawing attention to the need for increased efforts to coordinate monitoring of climate change impacts. SCAR noted the several large scale monitoring efforts already undertaken or in progress; the Southern Ocean Observing System (SOOS) (IP 14 *Report on the 2013-2014 activities of the Southern Ocean Observing System (SOOS)*) and the Workshop to develop an Antarctic Near-Shore and Terrestrial Observing System (ANTOS), and offered support in connecting the SCAR bodies addressing this issue with Members. COMNAP further noted the costs involved in monitoring programmes, and highlighted the United States' comment in WP 40 regarding the need to ensure appropriate resources for such programmes. CCAMLR also agreed that the Committee and SC-CAMLR shared a common interest in ecosystem and environmental monitoring, specifically in relation to the impact of climate change on the marine environment.

- (52) The CEP discussed the proposal in WP 40 on the desirability of a second joint CEP /SC-CAMLR workshop, and welcomed this in principle. The general scope of such a workshop could be to identify the effects of climate change that are considered most likely to impact the conservation of the Antarctic and to identify existing and potential sources of research and monitoring data relevant to the CEP and SC-CAMLR.
- (53) The CEP welcomed the offer from the CEP Observer to SC-CAMLR (Dr Penhale) to coordinate an informal discussion group to further develop the scope of a workshop. Furthermore the CEP encouraged its Members to consult with their respective SC-CAMLR Representatives to prepare for discussion of this issue at SC-CAMLR XXXIII.
- (54) The CEP noted that the timing and venue of the workshop should facilitate maximum engagement from CEP and SC-CAMLR and considered that planning for a workshop in 2016 would allow for appropriate collaboration given the relative meeting schedules of CEP and SC-CAMLR.
- (55) Chile noted that it would be hosting the CEP meeting in 2016 and that this time frame would allow it to plan for hosting such a workshop in conjunction with CEP XIX.
- (56) The United Kingdom introduced WP 46 *Antarctic trial of WWF's Rapid Assessment of Circum-Arctic Ecosystem Resilience (RACER) Conservation Planning Tool*, jointly prepared with Germany, Norway and Spain, and IP 94 rev. 1 *Antarctic trial of WWF's Rapid Assessment of Circum-Arctic Ecosystem Resilience (RACER) Conservation Planning Tool – methodology and trial outcomes*. RACER focused on identifying sources of resilience rather than vulnerability and on ecological function rather than individual species. CEP XV had endorsed a trial to test the applicability of the RACER methodology in the terrestrial Antarctic. The trial, which had been conducted by 17 experts from Australia, Chile, China, Germany, the Russian Federation, Spain and the United Kingdom, had focused on Antarctic Conservation Biogeographic Region (ACBR) 3 (North-west Antarctic Peninsula). Early trial outcomes for this relatively productive and diverse part of the terrestrial Antarctic Peninsula indicated that the methodology and the RACER concept had value in an Antarctic context, noting that some limitations and challenges existed. The trial had identified a number of areas believed to be of conservation importance on the basis of their likely resilience to climate change. Some of

these areas were located in existing ASPAs, while others were not currently protected under Annex V.

- (57) The United Kingdom noted the potential value of this conservation planning tool for informing the further development of the Antarctic Protected Area system and for the monitoring and review of existing ASPAs.
- (58) Noting that resilience should be a key factor in the designation and review of protected areas, several Members congratulated the proponents and expressed their willingness to contribute to further development of the RACER tool, to complement existing environmental protection measures. In response to a question from Chile, the United Kingdom indicated that work on RACER would continue in an expedited but informal manner and that they welcomed all interested Members to participate in intersessional work.
- (59) Spain pointed out that unmanned aerial vehicles (UAVs) and remote sensing, as also used in the Arctic, would be useful in an ecosystem approach that focused on remote areas.
- (60) Argentina pointed out that the methodology would have its greatest potential in remote places, as some locations have a large amount of in-the-field monitoring information and the areas have already been surveyed.
- (61) The Committee supported the recommendations contained in WP 46, and:
- based on the RACER trial outcomes, and given the rapid climatic change occurring in the Antarctic Peninsula, encouraged Parties to take into consideration resilience in the designation, management and review of protected areas;
 - recognised RACER as one possible tool to determine key features important for conferring resilience (noting that it may be adapted for use in more productive and diverse parts of Antarctica), and noted that protecting areas which are resilient to climate change may ultimately assist in the longer-term protection of biodiversity; and
 - encouraged on-going support for further collaboration among interested experts to investigate the applicability of the RACER methodology in Antarctica.

- (62) WMO presented IP 29 *WMO-led developments in Meteorological (and related) Polar Observations, Research and Services*, and drew the Committee’s attention to relevant meteorological (and related) observations, research and services that resulted from its work. This included the Antarctic Observing Network, WMO Global Cryosphere Watch and its core observing network CryoNet, the Global Integrated Polar Prediction System and the Global Framework for Climate Services with its Polar Regional Climate Centres and Polar Regional Climate Outlook Forums.
- (63) SCAR presented IP 39 *SCAR engagement with the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change (UNFCCC)* and IP 60 *Antarctic Climate Change and the Environment – 2014 Update*. SCAR noted that in 2013 it had attended the UNFCCC meeting in Bonn and the UNFCCC Conference of the Parties in Warsaw, where it had promoted the ACCE Executive Summary update. It also reported that the ACCE group would launch a “wiki” version of their report in 2014.
- (64) ASOC presented IP 68 *Antarctic Climate Change Report Card 2014* and IP 74 *The West Antarctic Ice Sheet in the Fifth Assessment Report of the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (IPCC): a key threat, a key uncertainty*, on key findings from climate change research in Antarctica over the last two years.
- (65) ASOC presented IP 72 *Near-term Antarctic Impacts of Black Carbon and Short-lived Climate Pollutant Mitigation*. The paper referred to the “On Thin Ice” report, co-published by the World Bank and the International Cryosphere Climate Initiative (ICCI) in November 2013, which showed a surprising degree of Antarctic climate benefits from black carbon reductions, in terms of a decrease in radioactive forcing on Antarctica.

Item 8: Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA)

8a) Draft Comprehensive Environmental Evaluations

- (66) China introduced WP 16 *The Draft Comprehensive Environmental Evaluation for the construction and operation of the New Chinese Research Station, Victoria Land, Antarctica*; IP 37 *The Draft Comprehensive Environmental Evaluation for the construction and operation of the New Chinese Research Station, Victoria Land, Antarctica*; and IP 54 *The Initial Responses to the Comments on the Draft CEE for the construction and operation of the New*

Chinese Research Station, Victoria Land, Antarctica. The draft CEE provided information on the proposed construction and operation of a new Chinese research station on Inexpressible Island, Terra Nova Bay in the Ross Sea, and was prepared in accordance with Annex I to the Environment Protocol and the Guidelines for Environmental Impact Assessment in Antarctica (Resolution 4 (2005)). China thanked Members for their initial comments on the draft CEE and delivered an informative presentation on the proposed construction.

- (67) The United States introduced WP 43 *Report of the Intersessional Open-ended Contact Group Established to Consider the Draft CEE for the “Proposed Construction and Operation of a New Chinese Research Station, Victoria Land, Antarctica”*. The ICG congratulated China for its efforts to minimise environmental impact, including plans to construct the station using prefabricated modules aimed to reduce construction waste on site, to utilise modern technologies, to minimise energy use and atmospheric emissions, to utilise renewable energy, and to minimise waste discharges. The ICG advised the Committee that the draft CEE was generally clear, well structured, and well presented. It agreed that the information contained in the draft CEE supported the proponent’s conclusion that the construction and operation of the new Chinese station was likely to have more than a minor or transitory impact. The ICG also noted that should China decide to proceed with the proposed activity, the final CEE should address a number of issues as detailed within the report.
- (68) The Committee thanked China for its presentation, for addressing many of the Members’ initial concerns and for the helpful information provided in IP 54 in response to the comments and concerns raised in the intersessional discussion. It also thanked the United States for its excellent work as the convener of the ICG.
- (69) New Zealand recalled that the EIA provisions of the Environment Protocol required all activities in Antarctica to be planned on the basis of sufficient information, allowing prior assessments and informed judgments about their possible impacts on the Antarctic environment. It added that it was important for national operators to set high EIA standards and noted that the CEE review process was an opportunity for Members to support each other in reaching these standards.

- (70) Several Members raised specific comments on China's draft CEE including on the need for: more detailed information on the scientific rationale for the establishment of a new station in this area; greatly improved baseline or "reference state" information for the chosen site, especially with regard to fauna and flora in the area as well as the near shore marine environment; an improved assessment of the cumulative impacts of the station given its close proximity to other stations in the area; and more information on the planned aviation network in the draft CEE.
- (71) In response to a comment from Germany, that China's proposed waste management method did not meet the best available technology requirements, China affirmed that it had comprehensively researched this issue and compared the chosen method against alternatives. China invited German experts to participate in its waste management research and testing.
- (72) France and ASOC suggested that Members should explore new ways to collaborate, such as by sharing infrastructure or assisting in decommissioning unwanted stations.
- (73) Italy asked China to provide the Parties with additional information about its future scientific research activities in the Victoria Land area and underlined that relevant information related to the bibliography, as reported to the ATCM in IP 90 *Scientific activities in Terra Nova Bay: a brief overview of the Italian National Antarctic Program*, should be taken into due consideration for further investigation activities.
- (74) The United States noted that it would welcome direct contact with China to discuss potential cooperation and collaboration.
- (75) The Republic of Korea expressed its hope that China's plan would add to the regional capacity for scientific research and lead to strengthening the network for international cooperation. Korea recommended that China accommodate the advice and suggestions from the Parties with a view to an eco-friendly station that will serve as a well-designed science platform, and indicated its willingness to render China support and assistance.
- (76) As a general comment, Australia remarked that is very helpful for the CEP's discussion of draft CEEs to have a paper presenting the proponent's initial responses to comments raised during the intersessional review process, such as the information provided by China in IP 54.

- (77) In response to these comments, China recognised a need to widen the availability of facilities in Antarctica to support the activities of its scientists. It noted the scientific importance of the Ross Sea area, due to its potential influence on Chinese climate, and expressed its desire to strengthen international cooperation in the Ross Sea. China assured the Committee that more information and details would be provided on all pending issues in the final version of the CEE, and welcomed further input from Members.

CEP advice to the ATCM on the draft CEE prepared by China for the proposed construction and operation of a new Chinese research station in Victoria Land, Antarctica

- (78) The Committee discussed in detail the draft Comprehensive Environmental Evaluation (CEE) prepared by China for the proposed construction and operation of a new Chinese research station in Victoria Land, Antarctica (WP 16). The Committee discussed the report by the United States of the ICG (WP 43), established to consider the draft CEE in accordance with the *Procedures for Intersessional CEP Consideration of Draft CEEs*, and information provided by China in an initial response to the ICG comments (IP 54). The Committee also discussed additional information provided by China during the meeting in response to issues raised during the ICG.
- (79) Having fully considered the draft CEE, the Committee advised ATCM XXXVII that:
- 1) The draft CEE generally conforms to the requirements of Article 3 of Annex I to the Protocol on Environmental Protection to the Antarctic Treaty.
 - 2) The draft CEE is generally clear, well structured, and well presented, although the final CEE would benefit from improved maps (particularly of building and facility locations in relation to wildlife and HSMs) and improved figures drawn to scale with labels and legends.
 - 3) The information contained in the draft CEE supports the proponent's conclusion that the construction and operation of Chinese station is likely to have more than a minor or transitory impact on the environment.
 - 4) If China decides to proceed with the proposed activity, there are a number of aspects for which additional information or clarification should be provided in the required final CEE. In particular, the ATCM's

attention is drawn to the suggestions that further details should be provided regarding:

- the planned scientific programme, particularly in relation to that of other national programmes in the Terra Nova Bay and Ross Sea regions;
- the initial environmental reference state, with a focus on the geology of the region, the soil, freshwater, and near-shore marine communities, and the distribution and abundance of the fauna and flora communities;
- a description of the methods used to forecast the impacts of the proposed activity;
- mitigation measures related to non-native species, fuel management and energy production, and potential disturbance and impact to fauna and flora and nearby HSMs;
- the potential for cumulative impacts of operational and scientific research activities from the multiple national programmes operating in the Terra Nova Bay region;
- further details of wind energy production, due to the extremely high and variable wind speed environment at the proposed location;
- waste management, including alternatives to the proposed magnetic pyrolysis furnace;
- the plans for decommissioning the station;
- the planned environmental monitoring programme; and
- opportunities for engaging in discussions about cooperation and collaboration with the other national programmes in the Terra Nova Bay and Ross Sea regions, as well as with other national programmes.

(80) Belarus introduced WP 22 *Construction and Operation of Belarusian Antarctic Research Station at Mount Vechernyaya, Enderby Land Draft Comprehensive Environmental Evaluation*. The Draft CEE provided the rationale for the construction of the Belarusian Antarctic research station

at Tala Hills, Enderby Land. It was developed in conformity with Annex I to the Environment Protocol and the Guidelines for Environmental Impact Assessment in Antarctica (Resolution 4 (2005)). Belarus informed the Committee that the first phase of construction would take place in 2014-18, and made a presentation on the details of the project.

- (81) Australia introduced WP 27 *Report of the intersessional open-ended contact group established to consider the draft CEE for the "Construction and operation of Belarusian Antarctic Research Station at Mount Vechernyaya, Enderby Land"*. It noted that the ICG participants had commended Belarus for its plans to utilise a compact station design with renewable energy sources, to develop international cooperation, and to implement a programme to monitor and respond to the impacts of the proposed activity. The ICG advised that the draft CEE was generally clear, well structured and well presented, and generally conformed to the requirements of Article 3 of Annex I to the Protocol on Environmental Protection. It further advised that the draft CEE's conclusion that the impacts of the proposed activity were likely to be minor or transitory was not adequately supported by the information contained within it. The ICG suggested that were Belarus to proceed with the proposed activity, there would be a number of aspects for which additional information or clarification should be provided in the final CEE.
- (82) The Committee thanked Belarus for its presentation, noting its response to several issues raised during the intersessional discussions. The Committee also thanked Australia for convening the ICG.
- (83) The Russian Federation stated that it would cooperate with Belarus on several aspects of the initiative, including science, logistics and the removal of waste. France welcomed the removal of waste planned by Belarus and the Russian Federation.
- (84) Several Members raised specific comments on the Belarus draft CEE including the need for: more information about the planned research activities at the new station; greater consideration of alternative locations; improved description of the initial reference state including of the nearby lakes; and greater information on plans for handling fuels and wastes.
- (85) Belgium suggested that modern molecular techniques to characterise the diversity of microbial and small-sized biodiversity could be applied by Parties submitting draft CEEs so as to better assess possible impacts on microhabitats.

- (86) Norway, New Zealand, the Netherlands and the United Kingdom all reminded the Committee that according to the Antarctic Treaty, the building of an Antarctic research station was not a prerequisite to achieve Consultative status, referring to a statement in the draft CEE implying such a requirement. The Netherlands mentioned that based on its scientific activity in the Antarctic Treaty area, it had been a Consultative Party for many years prior to the opening of its Antarctic facility in 2013. The United Kingdom referred positively to its hosting of the Antarctic Dutch facility and welcomed increased cooperation between NAPs.

**CEP advice to the ATCM on the draft CEE prepared by Belarus for
‘Construction and operation of Belarusian Antarctic Research Station at
Mount Vechernyaya, Enderby Land’**

- (87) The Committee discussed in detail the draft Comprehensive Environmental Evaluation (CEE) prepared by Belarus in WP 22 *Construction and Operation of Belarusian Antarctic Research Station at Mount Vechernyaya, Enderby Land. Draft Comprehensive Environmental Evaluation*. It also discussed the report by Australia of the ICG established to consider the draft CEE in accordance with the Procedures for Intersessional CEP Consideration of Draft CEEs (WP 27), and additional information provided by Belarus in its presentation during the meeting in response to issues raised during the ICG.
- (88) Having fully considered the draft CEE, the Committee advised the ATCM XXXVII that:
1. The draft CEE generally conforms to the requirements of Article 3 of Annex I to the Protocol on Environmental Protection to the Antarctic Treaty.
 2. If Belarus decides to proceed with the proposed activity, there are a number of aspects for which additional information or clarification should be provided in the required final CEE. In particular, the ATCM’s attention is drawn to the suggestions that further details should be provided regarding:
 - the description of the proposed activity, particularly including planned scientific activities, scientific installations and ancillary infrastructure, and plans for decommissioning the station;

- possible alternative locations, particularly the alternative of locating new facilities within the area occupied by the Mount Vechernyaya field base;
 - some aspects of initial environmental reference state, particularly flora and fauna, the near shore marine environment and lake biota;
 - the description of the methodology used to forecast the impacts of the proposed activity;
 - potential direct impacts to flora and fauna, the landscape and lake environments, and non-native species risks;
 - mitigation measures related to fuel management and energy management, non-native species, waste and waste water management, and wildlife disturbance resulting from aircraft operations;
 - cumulative impacts that might arise in light of existing activities and other known planned activities in the area;
 - the planned environmental monitoring programme; and
 - further opportunities for international cooperation.
3. The information provided in the draft CEE does not support the conclusion that the impacts of constructing and operating the proposed station are likely to be minor or transitory.
 4. The draft CEE is generally clear, well structured, and well presented, although improvements to the maps and figures are recommended, and further information and clarification are required to facilitate a comprehensive assessment of the proposed activity.

8b) Other EIA matters

- (89) Germany introduced WP 5 *UAVs and their possible environmental impacts*, jointly prepared with Poland, and drew Members' attention to the possible environmental impacts of using Unmanned Aerial Vehicles (UAVs) in light of their significantly increased use for scientific and non-scientific purposes in the Antarctic. Germany and Poland encouraged Members to: (1) recognise this issue; (2) exchange information and share experience on the use of UAVs and linked possible environmental impacts; (3) facilitate research on

the possible environmental impacts of UAVs; and (4) establish an ICG to discuss and further work on this proposal during the 2014/15 intersessional period. Germany and Poland further suggested that these recommendations be merged with the recommendations in WP 51.

- (90) The United States introduced WP 51 *Considerations for the use of unmanned aircraft systems (UAS) for research, monitoring, and observation in Antarctica*. The United States encouraged the CEP and ATCM to: (1) note the potential value of Unmanned Aerial Systems (UAS) to scientific research and environmental monitoring in Antarctica; (2) ask SCAR to review the risks of UAS operations to the environment; (3) ask COMNAP to review the risks of UAS operations to other aircraft and on station operations; and (4) invite COMNAP, SCAR and external experts to discuss the possible establishment of guidelines for the use of these platforms in Antarctica.
- (91) The Committee thanked Germany, Poland and the United States for their contribution and noted that it was a timely discussion given the increased scientific and non-scientific use of UAVs in Antarctica. Several Members noted the potential scientific and environmental advantages of UAVs for research and environmental monitoring, as well as the potential safety, environmental and operational risks. They also expressed the desirability of developing appropriate guidelines for the use of such devices in the Antarctic Treaty area.
- (92) In relation to the benefits of using UAVs, Spain argued that they were particularly useful in reaching remote areas. Moreover, these devices could complement remote sensing information and provide in situ confirmation for satellite data. Several Members remarked that UAVs often had a lower environmental impact than alternatives when used for environmental monitoring. ASOC stated that it was important to develop guidelines and best practice, and their deployment should be the subject of EIAs in accordance to Article 8 and Annex I to the Protocol.
- (93) Australia, Canada, the United Kingdom and France stated that they had some experience with the use and regulation of UAVs and/or terrestrial robots which they were willing to share. IAATO agreed that the use of UAVs was increasing and noted that a number of their members already had experience in the use of UAVs in Antarctica. IAATO was developing guidelines for the use of UAVs for tourism operations, such as the guideline that UAVs should not be used over concentrations of wildlife, and would be happy to share

such guidelines and experiences with Parties. Drawing on their experiences in the Arctic, Canada and Norway emphasised the usefulness of considering bipolar synergies in working to develop guidelines for the use of UAVs.

- (94) Members further noted that there were many different types of unmanned autonomous vehicles, including both terrestrial and marine devices and devices used for leisure or science. Given the multiplicity of devices, Norway, IAATO and China agreed with Poland's suggestion that guidelines would need to be broad enough to be used by a wide range of operators, yet complex enough to encompass different types of devices, uses and environments.
- (95) Argentina posed some questions regarding the use of this equipment, especially near concentrations of birds, such as the appropriate flight heights, the need to consider the granting of permits for "harmful interference" or the need to analyse, for some cases, the relevance of applying the Guidelines for the Operation of Aircraft near Concentrations of Birds in Antarctica (Resolution 2 (2004)). Argentina also noted the provisions for banning overflights established in some ASPA management plans or the possible difficulty of recovering such equipment in remote areas, where an accident occurs. Argentina indicated the need to consider separately the scientific use versus the recreational use of the equipment.
- (96) Norway suggested that it would be useful if those who use UAVs in the future, in particular in the context of fauna research, could as far as possible document and make available results of the reaction that the presence of UAVs create during use as a contribution to the improvement of guidelines.
- (97) With a view to holding in-depth discussions on UAVs at the next CEP, the Committee requested that the following be prepared for CEP XVIII: reports by SCAR and COMNAP on the utility and risks of UAV operation in Antarctica; a paper from IAATO on its experiences and current practices relating to UAVs; and additional papers referring to Members' experiences on this matter. The Committee also agreed to record in its Five-year Work Plan its intention to further discuss issues relating to UAVs.
- (98) The United States introduced WP 13 *Coastal Camping Activities Conducted by Non-Governmental Organizations*, prepared jointly with Norway. It summarised information collected on the experiences and responses of

competent authorities in addressing issues related to non-governmental camping activities. Findings indicated that while some Parties considered existing guidelines as sufficient, others would like further clarification with the potential to develop additional guidance for coastal camping activities. Given the likely increase in both frequency and intensity of coastal camping activities in the future, the proponents suggested that this topic might need further discussion.

- (99) In thanking the United States and Norway for introducing the issue, several Members pointed out the need to harmonise the procedures and regulations applicable to the issuing of permits to coastal camping activities. The Russian Federation pointed out that the differences in national systems of authorising activities in Antarctica, combined with the non-adoption of Annex VI to the Environment Protocol resulted in legal uncertainties for this and other potentially damaging activities, and urged Members to consider how to implement a comprehensive system to authorise non-governmental activities. ASOC noted that Visitor Site Guidelines, which were originally designed for sightseeing landings at particular sites, now had to be used for a range of activities including camping. Addressing concerns expressed by France, IAATO clarified that the coastal camping referred to involves short overnight stays where passengers go ashore late at night and return to the ship before breakfast. IAATO presented guidelines for this activity under IP 98 at CEP XVI. In the context of the discussions, Norway underlined the importance of continuing work to increase the understanding of what the site-specific environmental impacts of camping may be, and how these would be best considered and regulated.
- (100) The Committee welcomed the United States' offer to conduct intersessional informal consultations with interested Members to discuss the issue further and decide on how best to proceed.
- (101) Australia introduced WP 29 *Review of the Guidelines for Environmental Impact Assessment in Antarctica*. Recalling that the EIA Guidelines were first adopted in 1999 and last revised in 2005, and that the CEP had scheduled a review of the EIA Guidelines via an ICG during 2014/15, Australia had reviewed past CEP discussions and developments and identified a number of matters that could be considered by that ICG. These included the possible need to address matters raised in the Committee's past discussions of non-native species, footprint and wilderness values, decommissioning of stations, environmental aspects of Antarctic tourism and climate change. Additionally,

the EIA guidelines could be updated to make reference to relevant new EIA procedures and resources, and to consider matters regularly raised in the CEP's review of draft CEEs.

- (102) The United Kingdom introduced WP 24 *Improvements to the Antarctic Environmental Impact Assessment process*. It encouraged Members to consider whether there are mechanisms in addition to the EIA guidelines that might improve the EIA process to ensure that it remained an effective and practical tool to minimise environmental impact. The United Kingdom also expressed its full support for Australia's paper, and underscored the need to give EIA a higher priority in the Five-year Work Plan. The United Kingdom suggested that an EIA ICG be established for 2 years to examine the EIA issues raised in both WP 29 and WP 24.
- (103) The Committee congratulated Australia and the United Kingdom for their efforts to promote a revision and improvement of EIA guidelines. Several Members noted the importance of this initiative in light of developing challenges such as climate change.
- (104) Several Members raised a number of issues that may merit consideration during any review of EIA guidelines. Some Members noted that consideration of climate change issues in the context of Antarctic EIA discussion should reflect that the UNFCCC is the primary forum for international climate change action, but that the Treaty Parties have important responsibilities for addressing the implications of climate change for the governance and management of the Antarctic Treaty area.
- (105) Norway noted that global EIA methodology and principles have developed substantially since the adoption of the Protocol, and suggested that it could be useful to assess the Annex I provisions in light of this general development, using this as basis for identifying issues that could merit further attention in the future.
- (106) Brazil, Argentina and China emphasised the need to take into account the principles of the international regime on climate change, in particular the principle of common but differentiated responsibilities, and to focus on the consequences of climate change in Antarctica, rather than the causes, when discussing climate change. Argentina also indicated that some of the issues raised by the United Kingdom in WP 24 would need further discussions, as

“best available technology”, “auditing” or the impact of an activity to climate change, before being considered on the Guidelines review process.

- (107) Not denying the relevance of this principle, the Netherlands suggested that regarding the scientific nature of the CEP, the Committee should avoid any reference to that principle in its work for which other more political related fora, such as the UNFCCC, would be more suitable.
- (108) In response to the comment made by the Netherlands, Brazil stressed that the principles established to deal with climate change applied to all discussions on the matter independently of the forum.
- (109) The Russian Federation stated that the review should be placed in the framework of new EIA guidelines, and should not imply a revision of Annex I, noting that many Members had incorporated the Environment Protocol into national legislations. ASOC agreed with the importance of taking a long-term holistic approach in the planning of Antarctic activities and suggested with respect to WP 24 that it would be important to consider EIA follow-up in the revision of EIA guidelines.
- (110) The Committee decided to establish an ICG to review the EIA Guidelines, with the following terms of reference:
1. Consider whether the Guidelines for Environmental Impact Assessment appended to Resolution 1 (2005) should be modified to address issues including those identified in ATCM XXXVII - WP 29 and, as appropriate, suggest modifications to the Guidelines.
 2. Record issues raised during discussions under ToR 1, which relate to broader policy or other issues for the development and handling of EIAs, and which may warrant further discussion by the CEP with a view to strengthening the implementation of Annex I to the Protocol.
 3. Provide an initial report to CEP XVIII.
- (111) The Committee agreed that Australia and the United Kingdom would jointly convene the ICG.
- (112) France introduced WP 34 *IEE or CEE: which one to choose?* prepared jointly with Belgium, which provided an analysis of how Members chose between submitting an IEEs or CEEs for various activities. It reported that interpretations given to the concept of “minor or transitory impact” varied

significantly from Party to Party. Taking into account the establishment of an ICG on the revision of EIA guidelines, France suggested to include in the ToR the continuation of the analysis of IEEs and CEEs initiated in WP 34 and the consideration of the opportunity to define a restricted list of activities which should be systematically considered as having a “more than a minor or transitory impact” on the environment, and thus requiring the systematic implementation of a CEE. It argued that such an approach could help to reduce some of the potential differences between Members in defining a number of activities and in assessing their environmental impacts.

- (113) While the Committee noted the initiative and acknowledged its value, several Members raised questions mainly related to the difficulties associated with establishing a common interpretation of “minor or transitory impact” and with the risks of introducing inflexibility to the procedure by prescribing a list.
- (114) Germany suggested that the CEP should reach a common understanding of the terms “minor” and “transitory” in the context of the EIA process.
- (115) The Russian Federation recalled that earlier attempts to define the terms had failed to find consensus.
- (116) Spain thanked France and Belgium for the Working Paper and reminded the Committee that according to Article 8 and Annex I to the Protocol each Member can evaluate the environmental impacts in accordance with its appropriate national procedures.
- (117) South Africa commented that the wider impacts of activities could be neglected if a list were to be developed.
- (118) In this regard, the United Kingdom noted that it was difficult to foresee all issues that could arise in the future and so be inadvertently left out of the proposed list, and that it was important to retain flexibility in the EIA process. The United Kingdom reinforced the idea of assessing impacts in terms of consequences and results. China pointed out that the existence of different interpretations was a general problem that appeared in several areas of the Protocol.
- (119) Acknowledging Members’ concerns, Belgium explained that the proposal was intended to promote efficiency rather than inflexibility, and encouraged further discussion on the matter.

- (120) Argentina indicated that the methodology itself does not make it possible to identify in advance if an activity would need to be considered as an IEE or CEE, before analysing the impacts. In response, France drew attention to differences in the degree of detail and the review process between CEEs and IEEs, suggesting that the requirement for a CEP consultation for CEEs made the category of assessment more challenging.
- (121) The Committee thanked France and Belgium for their efforts to improve the EIA process. While it did not agree to establish an ICG at this time, it decided to continue reflecting on this issue in an informal manner. In addition, it noted that a number of EIA guidelines had been developed by Members and that it could also be useful for these guidelines to be exchanged.
- (122) The Russian Federation presented IP 63 *Results of drilling operations for the study of the lower part of the glacier in deep bore hole at Vostok Station in the season 2013-14* and IP 64 *Study of the water column of the Subglacial Lake Vostok*, which provided information about the drilling operation in the water column of Lake Vostok and provided an IEE for the Committee's consideration. The paper contained a comparison of the Russian method and the alternative method for the study of subglacial lakes, proposed by the United States specialists – fast ice drilling by means of hot water and launching the measuring complex through this hot water to collect water samples of the subglacial lakes – and evaluated the advantages of the kerosene-freon mixture approach.
- (123) France thanked the Russian Federation for its paper, but noted that some comments within the paper evoked a number of questions relating to the drilling at the Concordia station, which France and Italy had responded to in ATCM XXXVI - IP 16. France reiterated the major differences between the drilling projects at Concordia Station and Lake Vostok. Considering the next penetration into the water column of the lake and the uncertainties of the water pressure at the bottom of the borehole, France still had some major concerns about the risk of contamination associated with the nature of the drilling fluid being used in the Vostok borehole. The Russian Federation responded that it had presented information at previous CEPs and ATCMs to illustrate how penetration of the lake had occurred without contamination.
- (124) Italy introduced IP 57 *Towards the realization of a gravel runway in Terra Nova Bay, Ross Sea, Antarctica*, providing details of new surveys undertaken.

- (125) ASOC presented IP 73 *New Antarctic stations: Are they justified?* noting that new stations continue to be built in the Antarctic, often in near-pristine areas. IP 73 focused on the sharing of facilities as an alternative to the establishment of new stations, rather than in other forms of scientific cooperation. IP 73 described the methods used as well as the limitations of the methods. It identified no substantial relationship between the number of stations and publications in peer-reviewed scientific journals. More recent information, from official inspection reports 2004-2014, seemed to corroborate limited research activities at some stations. To enhance the quality of research and mitigate the avoidable impacts of research stations, ASOC suggested that: the Committee should state that constructing a new station was not a requirement for achieving Consultative status; Members already operating Antarctic stations should agree to avoid or minimise further station construction by their own National Antarctic Programmes; and Members should agree to carry out regular international peer reviews of their individual science programmes and make the results available to the other Members and the public. ASOC welcomed scientific research carried out in accordance with high environmental standards and embodying international scientific cooperation.
- (126) While thanking ASOC for the paper, several Members expressed concerns regarding the method of analysis in the paper, noting that the paper did not capture the significance of longer term projects, nor did it cover the last ten years which would have seen increased scientific output resulting from the construction of new stations during this period.
- (127) The Russian Federation noted that the development of research stations network in Antarctica gave an opportunity to gain knowledge of the Antarctic environment. Station sharing can become a problem when economic changes differently affect the countries sharing the facility.
- (128) COMNAP agreed with the point made by the Russian Federation, who reminded the CEP that there were many examples in the Antarctic community of collaboration in logistics/operations and in science. COMNAP strongly disagreed with ASOC's assertion in the summary paragraph of IP 73 that said there were "...few international cooperation initiatives for sharing facilities..." and drew attention to IP 47, which presented the results of a survey of National Antarctic Programmes on international scientific and logistic collaboration in Antarctica and which revealed a significant and high degree of international cooperation amongst programmes. COMNAP

further noted that the number of published polar scientific papers had increased fourfold in the period of 1981 to 2006, in comparison to published global scientific papers, which had doubled. Several Members cited specific examples of cooperation and collaboration in relation to their own National Antarctic Programmes.

- (129) Argentina stated that it supported COMNAP's view related to the existing and large international cooperation among Parties. The scientific stations could not be judged by the numbers of publications, but the data generated by the many international research programmes in cooperation had great quality. Argentina also noted that it supported several cooperation programmes.
- (130) The Russian Federation noted the original recommendations of the International Geophysical Year 1957-58 to build stations in remote areas, and the importance of specific scientific data gathered in those areas. It identified the necessity of logistic support for research stations as a principal explanation for the number of research stations in certain areas, and considered that those often had a specific scientific purpose. It also referred to the difficulties of sharing stations in respect of distributing liability in relation to Annex VI to the Environment Protocol and in times of economic crisis. China agreed and noted the significant investment in building a station.
- (131) Australia expressed its support for several of the principles highlighted in IP 73. In particular, it highlighted the environmental benefits of promoting further collaboration, the desirability of seeking to minimise environmental impact whilst maximising scientific output, within practical constraints, and the importance of considering alternatives to building new stations, which was consistent with the requirements the Environment Protocol and Annex I. France emphasised the importance of cost/benefit analysis in the building of new stations incorporating environmental impacts, economic costs and scientific outputs. It also stressed that alternatives including cooperation and sharing of infrastructures should be carefully considered before construction of any new station.
- (132) In IP 36 *Establishment and beginning of pilot operation of the 2nd Korean Antarctic Research Station "Jang Bogo" at Terra Nova Bay*, the Republic of Korea reported the establishment and beginning of pilot operations of its second Antarctic research station. Korea anticipated that the Jang Bogo station will contribute greatly to the global effort to protect the Antarctic

environment by advancing scientific knowledge. The Republic of Korea expressed special thanks to Italy and the United States for their support during the period of construction.

(133) The following papers were also submitted under this agenda item:

- IP 56 *Initial Environmental Evaluation for the realization of a new access road to Enigma Lake Twin Otter runway at Mario Zucchelli Station, Terra Nova Bay (Italy)*
- SP 5 *Annual list of Initial Environmental Evaluations (IEE) and Comprehensive Environmental Evaluations (CEE) prepared between April 1st 2013 and March 31st 2014 (ATS)*

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

(134) Norway introduced WP 31 *Subsidiary Group on Management Plans – Report on 2013/14 Intersessional Work*, on behalf of the Subsidiary Group (SGMP). The group had reviewed seven revised management plans for ASPAs and one revised management plan for an ASMA and recommended that the Committee approve five of these.

(135) With respect to ASPA 141: Yukdori Valley, Langhovde, Lützow-Holm Bay (Japan) and ASPA 128: Western Shores of Admiralty Bay, King George Island, South Shetland Islands (Poland and the United States), the SGMP advised the Committee that the final revised management plans had been well written, of high quality and adequately addressed the key points raised during the review. Accordingly, the SGMP recommended that the CEP approve these revised management plans.

(136) With respect to the updated proposal for a new ASPA at High Altitude Geothermal Sites of the Ross Sea region (New Zealand and the United States), the SGMP advised the Committee that the revised management plan was well written, of high quality and adequately addressed the key points raised in its advice to the proponents. Accordingly, the SGMP recommended that the Committee approve the management plan for this new ASPA.

- (137) The SGMP further recommended that the CEP advise the ATCM that as a consequence of adopting the new ASPA for high altitude geothermal sites of the Ross Sea region, current ASPA 118 (Summit of Mount Melbourne) and ASPA 130 (Tramway Ridge, Mount Erebus) should be de-designated as protected areas. It additionally noted that the CEP may wish to give further attention to discussions on the protection of microbial communities in geothermal areas.
- (138) With respect to a proposal for a new ASPA at Stornes, Larsemann Hills, Princess Elizabeth Land (Australia, China, India and the Russian Federation), the SGMP advised the Committee that the final revised management plan was well written, of high quality, and adequately addressed the key points raised in its advice to the proponents. Accordingly, the SGMP recommended that the Committee approve the management plan for this new ASPA. Belgium encouraged the concerned Parties to also specifically protect biological values elsewhere in the Larsemann Hills by designating an ASPA at Broknes and Grovnes.
- (139) With respect to ASMA 1: Admiralty Bay, King George Island, South Shetland Islands (Brazil, Ecuador, Peru, Poland and the United States), the SGMP advised the Committee that the final revised management plan was well written, of high quality and adequately addressed the key points raised during the review. Accordingly, the SGMP recommended that the CEP approve the management plan for this ASMA.
- (140) In a response to a question raised by the Russian Federation on whether the proposal for ASMA 1 included an assessment of the potential environmental impact of the fire at the Comandante Ferraz station, Brazil stated that the area was being monitored since the accident and that IP 7 presented detailed information on the first phase of the remediation plan for the station area. Poland added that it was open to cooperate on this issue.
- (141) The SGMP further advised the Committee that further intersessional work would be conducted with regards to three management plans submitted for intersessional review:
- a. ASPA 144: 'Chile Bay' (Discovery Bay), Greenwich Island, South Shetland Islands (Chile)
 - b. ASPA 145: Port Foster, Deception Island, South Shetland Islands (Chile)
 - c. ASPA 146: South Bay, Doumer Island, Palmer Archipelago (Chile)

(142) The Committee endorsed the SGMP's recommendations and agreed to forward the revised management plans for ASPA 141, ASPA 128, ASMA 1, a new ASPA at high altitude geothermal sites of the Ross Sea region and a new ASPA at Stornes, Larsemann Hills, Princess Elizabeth Island to the ATCM for adoption.

ii. Draft revised management plans which have not been reviewed by the Subsidiary Group on Management Plans

(143) The Committee considered under this category revised management plans for ten ASPAs and one ASMA, in addition to a proposal to enlarge existing ASPA 162 and de-designate ASMA 3:

- a. *WP 3 Revised Management Plan for Antarctic Specially Protected Area No.139 Biscoe Point, Anvers Island, Palmer Archipelago (United States)*
- b. *WP 6 Revised Management Plan for Antarctic Specially Protected Area No. 113 Litchfield Island, Arthur Harbor Anvers Island, Palmer Archipelago (United States)*
- c. *WP 7 Revised Management Plan for Antarctic Specially Protected Area No. 121 Cape Royds, Ross Island (United States)*
- d. *WP 26 Revised Management Plan for Antarctic Specially Protected Area No. 124 Cape Crozier, Ross Island (United States)*
- e. *WP 18 Revision of the Management Plan for Antarctic Specially Protected Area (ASP) No. 169 Amanda Bay, Ingrid Christensen Coast, Princess Elizabeth Land, East Antarctica (Australia and China)*
- f. *WP 19 Revision of the Management Plan for Antarctic Specially Protected Area (ASP) No. 136 Clark Peninsula, Budd Coast, Wilkes Land, East Antarctica (Australia)*
- g. *WP 30 Proposal to modify the management arrangements for Mawson's Huts and Cape Denison (Australia)*
- h. *WP 21 Revision of the Management Plan for Antarctic Specially Managed Area (ASMA) No. 6 Larsemann Hills, East Antarctica (Australia, China, India and the Russian Federation)*
- i. *WP 52 Revision of Management Plan for Antarctic Specially Protected Area (ASP) No. 150, Ardley Island (Ardley Peninsula), Maxwell Bay, King George Island (Chile)*

- j. WP 54 *Revision of Management Plan for Antarctic Specially Protected Area (ASP) No. 125, Fildes Peninsula, King George Island (Chile)*
 - k. WP 11 *Review of Antarctic Specially Protected Area (ASP) No. 142 – Svarthamaren (Norway)*
 - l. WP 58 rev. 1 *Revised Management Plan for Antarctic Specially Protected Area No. 171, Narębski Point, Barton Peninsula, King George Island (Republic of Korea)*
- (144) With respect to WP 3 (ASP 139), WP 6 (ASP 113) and WP 7 (ASP 121), the United States explained that revisions were minor and primarily involved updating maps. In relation to WP 26 (ASP 124), it pointed out that while revisions to the management plans for these areas were extensive and included changes to plant values, all modifications afforded improved protection of the area and should therefore be approved.
- (145) Australia introduced WP 18 (ASP 169) (also on behalf of China) and WP 19 (ASP 136), and noted that there were only minor revisions to the description of each area and to the management provisions contained in the management plans. It noted that ASP 169 was primarily designated to provide additional protection to the Amanda Bay emperor penguin colony, and that ASP 136 was designated to protect the largely undisturbed terrestrial ecosystem at Clark Peninsula.
- (146) With respect to WP 30, Australia noted that the proposal to enlarge ASP 162 and to de-designate ASP 3 would provide additional protection to the historic landscape, structures and artefacts located outside the current ASP, and would also simplify the management arrangements for the site, which would be subject to a single management plan. Australia also noted that consequential changes to the Visitor Site Guidelines for Mawson's Huts and Cape Denison would be required.
- (147) With respect to WP 21, prepared jointly by Australia, China, India and the Russian Federation, the Russian Federation outlined the proposed changes to the management of ASP 6, which included: the inclusion of Stornes as an ASP; reference to ASP 169 Amanda Bay; an updated description of activities and facilities; updated objectives to protect the environment from the introduction of non-native species; and updated maps and references.
- (148) In introducing WP 11, Norway commented on the minor revisions to the management plan for ASP 142, which included: updated information on

the seabird population in the area, revised boundary information, information about the size of the area, and reference to the Antarctic Conservation Biogeographic Region categorisation. Norway reminded the Committee that the area protects the largest known inland colony of Antarctic petrels in Antarctica, and that significant declines in the population have been observed in recent decades, while noting that is as yet too early to provide solid explanations for this.

- (149) Germany congratulated Norway on the revised management plan and the monitoring of petrels. It further noted the decreasing seabird population, and requested Norway to provide further information when it became available.
- (150) Introducing WP 52 (ASPA 150) and WP 54 (ASPA 125), Chile explained that all revisions to the management plans were minor and maintained the management objectives. In relation to ASPA 150, the revised management plan included reference to the approved guidelines for the northeast beach off the area and modifications of the infrastructure in the area. The changes to ASPA 125 included removing mention of a species no longer present on the Fildes Peninsula.
- (151) While thanking Chile for the preparation of the revised management plans for these two areas, Germany noted that there were a lot of changes in the updated plans necessary based on results of research in the area, and proposed referring them to the SGMP.
- (152) With respect to WP 58 rev. 1, the Republic of Korea explained that the first five-year review of ASPA 171 involved minor changes to the management plan. The changes included the incorporation of new information on fauna and flora, and the correction of errors on the map. Germany proposed to update the old population data from 1986/87 and the Republic of Korea added the new data and reference into the management plan.
- (153) The Committee decided to refer the revised management plans for ASPAs 125 and 150 to the SGMP for intersessional review, and agreed to forward the other revised management plans to the ATCM for adoption.

CEP Advice to the ATCM

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

#	Name
ASPА 113	Litchfield Island, Arthur Harbor, Anvers Island, Palmer Archipelago
ASPА 121	Cape Royds, Ross Island
ASPА 124	Cape Crozier, Ross Island
ASPА 128	Western Shores of Admiralty Bay, King George Island, South Shetland Islands
ASPА 136	Clark Peninsula, Budd Coast, Wilkes Land, East Antarctica
ASPА 139	Biscoe Point, Anvers Island, Palmer Archipelago
ASPА 141	Yukidori Valley, Langhovde, Lützow-Holm Bay
ASPА 142	Svarthamaren
ASPА 162	Mawson’s Huts, Cape Denison, Commonwealth Bay, George V Land, East Antarctica
ASPА 169	Amanda Bay, Ingrid Christensen Coast, Princess Elizabeth Land, East Antarctica
ASPА 171	Narębski Point, Barton Peninsula, King George Island
NEW ASPА	High altitude geothermal sites of the Ross Sea region
NEW ASPА	Stornes, Larsemann Hills, Princess Elizabeth Land
ASMA 1	Admiralty Bay, King George Island, South Shetland Islands
ASMA 6	Larsemann Hills, East Antarctica
ASPА 151	Lions Rump, King George Island
NEW ASPА	Cape Washington, South Victoria Land

(155) As a consequence of the enlargement of the area of ASPА 162, the Committee advises that it is necessary to de-designate ASMA 3: Cape Denison, Commonwealth Bay, George V Land, East Antarctica.

(156) As the new proposed ASPА at High altitude geothermal sites of the Ross Sea region incorporates the former ASPА 118 and ASPА 130, and the new management plan is intended to replace the two existing management plans, the CEP advises the ATCM that as a consequence of adopting this new ASPА the current ASPА 118 (Summit of Mount Melbourne) and ASPА 130 (Tramway Ridge, Mount Erebus) should be de-designated as protected areas.

(157) Referring to WP 31, Norway as the convenor of the SGMP noted that no tasks relating to terms of reference 4 and 5 had been on the SGMP work plan in the 2013/14 intersessional period. With reference to earlier discussions in the CEP on the need for guidance material for establishing ASMAs and for preparing and reviewing ASMA management plans, the SGMP had suggested

that it now would be timely to initiate work to this end. The Committee noted the importance of the topic, and agreed that the SGMP should address the issue in the intersessional period.

- (158) The Committee agreed that the work plan for the SGMP during the 2014/15 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 three postponed plans from the 2013/14 intersessional period).
ToR 4 and 5	Work with relevant Parties to ensure progress on review of management plans overdue for five-yearly review.
	Initiate the work to develop guidance for preparing and reviewing ASMA management plans, <i>inter alia</i> by developing a work plan for the process.
	Review and update SGMP work plan.
Working Papers	Prepare report for CEP XVIII against SGMP ToR 1 to 3.
	Prepare report for CEP XVIII against SGMP ToR 4 and 5.

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

- (159) China introduced WP 15 *Report of the Informal Discussions on the Proposal for a new Antarctic Specially Managed Area at Chinese Antarctic Kunlun Station, Dome A*. The paper reported on informal discussions coordinated by China during the intersessional period on the proposal for a new ASMA. In the presentation to the meeting, China provided a summary of the two rounds of the informal discussion of the proposal and thanked the participants. China especially pointed out that the second round brought the discussion to some specific points that China thinks are of critical importance, especially concerning the issues of how the Parties utilise the international mechanism available in the Protocol and the difference found in the wording of different versions of Annex V and how the Parties would interpret it. Considering that disagreements remain regarding China's proposal and that China still holds the expectation of promoting the value protection of Dome A by designating an ASMA, based on international cooperation initiatives, China proposed that the informal discussions continue for another intersessional period at the CEP forum to see what result might come out for consideration at next year's CEP meeting.
- (160) The Committee accepted China's offer to lead further informal discussions on the proposed ASMA during the intersessional period.

- (161) The United Kingdom introduced WP 25 *The Status of Antarctic Specially Protected Area No. 114 Northern Coronation Island, South Orkney Islands*, which noted that the original values for protecting this site were largely based on assumptions that could not be substantiated by the limited amount of field data available. Furthermore, significant physical restrictions on access to the area made the collection of data extremely difficult. Satellite remote sensing data, collected recently, showed little evidence of exceptional terrestrial biological habitat. Consequently, the United Kingdom sought the views of the Committee on whether the additional protection afforded by ASPA status within the area was still appropriate.
- (162) In supporting Australia's intervention that such a de-designation should not be taken lightly, Norway noted that the Committee could consider establishing guidelines for the de-designation process. ASOC welcomed WP 25 as a demonstration of the Environment Protocol's flexibility in designating ASPAs and ASMAs. It encouraged Members to identify and give adequate protection to inviolate areas in terms of Annex V to the Environment Protocol.
- (163) The Committee agreed to de-designate ASPA 114: Northern Coronation Island, South Orkney Islands, and in doing so, emphasised that the site remained under the general protection of the Environment Protocol.

CEP Advice to the ATCM

- (164) After considering the evidence provided, the Committee recommended the de-designation of ASPA 114: Northern Coronation Island, South Orkney Islands.
-
- (165) The following paper was also submitted under this agenda item:
- BP 11 *Initiation of a review of ASPA 104: Sabrina Island, Northern Ross Sea, Antarctica* (New Zealand)

9b) Historic Sites and Monuments

- (166) The following papers were submitted under this agenda item:
- IP 16 *Judgment of the Regional Court of Paris dated 6 February 2014 regarding the carrying out of undeclared and unauthorized non-governmental activities in the area of the Treaty and the Damage caused to the Wordie House Hut (HSM no 62)* (France)

- IP 25 *The 1912 ascent of Mount Erebus of the Terra Nova Expedition: the location of additional campsites and further information on HSM 89* (United Kingdom, United States and New Zealand)

9c) Site Guidelines

- (167) The United Kingdom introduced WP 23 *Horseshoe Island Visitor Site Guidelines: Proposed Revision*, which noted that asbestos-containing materials were confirmed to be present at Historic Site & Monument (HSM) No 63 Base Y, Horseshoe Island. The United Kingdom recommended that the Visitor Site Guidelines for Horseshoe Island be updated to reflect: (1) the known presence of asbestos-containing materials in the loft; (2) that the loft should not be accessed by visitors; and (3) that visitors should report any significant damage to the roof to the British Antarctic Survey.
- (168) In reply to a question from Germany, the United Kingdom noted that it was drawing up plans regarding the maintenance of historic sites and that should it decide to remove the asbestos from the Antarctic Treaty area, the material would be disposed of appropriately in the United Kingdom.
- (169) The Committee agreed to revise the Visitor Site Guidelines for HSM 63 Base Y, Horseshoe Island, according to the United Kingdom's recommendations.
- (170) The Committee also adopted the revised Visitor Site Guidelines for Mawson's Huts and Cape Denison, as presented by Australia in WP 30.

CEP Advice to the ATCM

- (171) The Committee agreed to forward the following revised Site Guidelines to the ATCM for adoption:
- Horseshoe Island
 - Mawson's Huts and Cape Denison
-
- (172) Other papers submitted under this agenda item included:
- IP 18 *Site Guidelines: mapping update* (United Kingdom, United States, Argentina and Australia)

- IP 27 rev. 1 *Antarctic Site Inventory: 1994-2014* (United States)
- IP 59 *National Antarctic Programme use of locations with Visitor Site Guidelines in 2013-14* (United Kingdom, Argentina, Australia and United States)
- IP 86 *Tourism management policies at Carlini Scientific Station* (Argentina)

9d) Human footprint and wilderness values

- (173) ASOC presented IP 69 *Antarctica Resolution at the 10th World Wilderness Conference*, which informed the Committee that delegates to the 2013 World Wilderness Congress had passed an Antarctic Treaty area resolution. In line with the resolution, ASOC urged Members to take specific steps to protect the Antarctic wilderness by: continuing wilderness mapping projects; implementing the area protection provisions of Annex V, Article 3; performing remediation at affected sites; decreasing human impact through, *inter alia*, minimising shipping and logistics travel; and public education on wilderness values.
- (174) ASOC presented IP 71 rev. 1 *Managing Human Footprint, Protecting Wilderness: A Way Forward*, which reviewed the work done to address footprint and wilderness issues in Antarctica. ASOC encouraged the CEP to: adopt definitions of footprint and wilderness for improved assessment and mapping procedures; undertake actions towards improving information sharing on footprint programmes; and encourage Members to submit EIAs with analyses of cumulative impact assessments and wilderness considerations. It also invited Members to table proposals for wilderness/inviolate protected areas to ensure a broad representation of biogeographic regions by ATCM XXXIX/CEP XIX in 2016.
- (175) With regard to IP 69 and IP 71, several Members thanked ASOC for its contributions to progressing wilderness discussions and expressed their intention to take part in initiatives aimed at the protection of Antarctic wilderness values, including through the proposed ICG on reviewing the EIA guidelines.
- (176) New Zealand noted the importance of the Committee remaining alert to the need to conserve Antarctic wilderness values, including from cumulative impacts. Further, consistent data collection on the extent and nature of impacts of national activities will help inform future consideration of this issue.

- (177) France pointed out the need to differentiate the concepts of human footprint and wilderness values from those of aesthetic values. Belgium supported the designation of inviolate areas to keep reference areas for microbial diversity research. Argentina reminded Members that there existed no standard definitions for “human footprint” or “wilderness”, and echoed the United States’ comment that Members should not devote excessive effort to discussing such definitions.
- (178) The Committee agreed that it was important to take account of wilderness values in its on-going development of various initiatives, including through its review of the EIA guidelines and protected and managed area management plans. In this regard, Members welcomed the inclusion of wilderness values in the ICG on reviewing the EIA guidelines.

9e) Marine Spatial Protection and Management

- (179) Belgium introduced WP 39 *The concept of “outstanding values” in the marine environment under Annex V of the Protocol*, jointly prepared with France. It proposed that Members develop a more coherent approach to the implementation of Article 3 of Annex V to account for the impact of land-based activities and associated logistic support on the marine environment. While acknowledging that the Guidelines for Implementation of the Framework for Protected Areas set forth in Article 3, Annex V to the Environment Protocol, Resolution 1 (2000) aimed to facilitate methodical assessment and designation of such areas, Belgium noted that it did not focus on the identification of specific areas that meet the Guidelines’ criteria. Belgium and France proposed the establishment of an ICG to discuss the implementation of Annex V, Article 3 in respect of how the concept of “outstanding values” applied to the marine environments in terms of potential threats to that environment from activities covered by Article 3 (4) to the Protocol.
- (180) Several Members noted the need to take account of the impact of land-based activities on the marine environment and noted under-representation of marine values in ASPAs.
- (181) Several Members emphasised that there should be clarity between CEP and CCAMLR mandates and work. With reference to MPAs, the Russian Federation emphasised that their boundaries should not extend into coastal areas, and further noted that fishing activities did not occur in these areas. Japan reiterated its view that fishing was the most important activity in

terms of environmental impact and that CCAMLR should be the place for marine-related discussions.

- (182) China and the Russian Federation expressed their concern that the designation of coastal ASPAs could interfere with navigation to and from Antarctic stations. The Russian Federation further noted that such designations should not impede Antarctic science.
- (183) While Germany fully supported the recommendations in WP 39, it proposed to discuss as a first step the concept of “outstanding values” as they apply to the marine environment within the remit of the ATCM and CEP. Germany also stated that there is a need to provide complementary guidance for ASPAs, which should be the aim of the upcoming ICG in which Germany expressed its willingness to participate.
- (184) The United States noted that marine or coastal ASPAs would not necessarily impede the work of National Antarctic Programmes. The United States referred to Section 7(ii) in the management plan of the marine ASPAs 152 and 153. This section lists “Activities that are or may be conducted in the Area, including restrictions on time or place” and includes “Essential operational activities of vessels that will not jeopardise the values of the Area, such as transit through, or stationing within, the Area in order to facilitate science or other activities, including tourism, or for access to sites outside of the Area”. Thus, the management plans would allow for National Antarctic Programmes to conduct operational or science activities within these ASPAs.
- (185) Japan stated that in the event that an ICG was established on this issue, it should not have a mandate to propose additions to Article 3 of Annex V. Norway encouraged the use of available relevant work done by other bodies such as the Convention on Biological Diversity and the International Union for Conservation of Nature (IUCN) to enrich further discussions.
- (186) The Committee agreed to establish an ICG to discuss “outstanding values” in the Antarctic marine environment, with the following terms of reference:
1. Identifying key “outstanding values” within different contexts/scopes of the marine environment and analysing how they may be affected by activities under the competence of the CEP linking both terrestrial and marine environments;

2. Identifying criteria by which marine areas with “outstanding values” would require protection through the ASPA instrument and, if appropriate, identifying activities that may have impacts on marine environment and associated risks to be managed/mitigated through the range of tools available to the CEP, including the outstanding values;
 3. Understanding the work of CCAMLR on systematic conservation planning, in order to avoid duplication of efforts, complement it and maintain separate roles, while using the appropriate tools available to the CEP’s work to implement Article 3 (2) of Annex 5 to the Protocol;
 4. Discussing options for the CEP within the existing framework and tools of the Treaty and the Protocol to include “outstanding values” of the marine environment, when establishing and/or reviewing ASPAs, in accordance with Article 3 of Annex V to the Protocol; and
 5. Providing an initial report to CEP XVIII.
- (187) The Netherlands presented IP 49 *The role of the Antarctic Treaty Consultative Meeting in protecting the marine environment through marine spatial protection*, which discussed the ATCM’s responsibility in relation to marine spatial protection and relevant legal instruments available to it. It further identified the interactions between the ATCM, CEP and CCAMLR regarding the harmonisation of marine spatial protection efforts, noted the slow and limited process of establishing marine spatial protection in the Antarctic Treaty area, and highlighted the need for further efforts to harmonise the work of the ATCM, CEP and CCAMLR on this matter. France thanked the Netherlands for its paper which would be of particular relevance for the work of the ICG on marine spatial protection.

9f) Other Annex V matters

- (188) Norway introduced WP 33 *Background and initial thought and questions: Need for and development of procedures concerning ASPA and ASMA designation*. Norway reminded the Committee that based on discussions at CEP XVI, it had suggested that the CEP should review the overall process of designating ASPAs and ASMAs and that many Members had expressed their support for this.
- (189) Norway noted that Articles 5 and 6 of Annex V to the Environment Protocol indicate that the process of designating an ASPA or ASMA is formally

initiated through the submission of a draft management plan, but that no established procedure leading up to the point at which the formal designation takes place through the submission of a management plan exists. Norway underlined that in its view it is an underlying assumption that the Antarctic Protected Area system would greatly benefit by giving room for such discussions related to the background and need for protection of an area.

- (190) Accordingly, Norway encouraged the CEP to consider the following questions with regard to ASPA/ASMA designation: (1) Would there be merit in having a process that would allow Members and the CEP to have a discussion about the merit of an area as an ASPA/ASMA before a management plan for an area not yet designated as a protected/managed area was prepared and submitted by the proponent(s)?; and (2) If such an approach was a useful way forward, would there be merit in having guidance as to instances where interim protection might be needed until a management plan had been submitted and approved due to immediate threats? Furthermore, Norway noted that in considering these questions it will also be important to consider whether introducing procedures of this nature could have potential negative outcomes and how such potential obstacles could be overcome.
- (191) Members thanked Norway for the ideas presented in the paper. Several Members agreed that a coherent approach was needed toward implementing the provisions of Annex V to the Protocol. New Zealand noted that a prior discussion on the relevance of an area in terms of management and protection plans would alert Members to consider more fully different conservation tools, such as the Environmental Domains Analysis and the Antarctic Conservation Biogeographic Regions. Argentina stated that it was important that steps be taken prior to ASPA/ASMA designation with a view to assessing whether an area requires additional protection to that offered in general terms by the Madrid Protocol. France and the United States pointed out that interim protection tools were needed in case of emergencies, where there was little time for prolonged discussion.
- (192) The Russian Federation reminded the Committee of its previous calls for a coherent approach to ASMAs and ASPAs and it held that preliminary discussions on such sites would depoliticise the matter. It pointed out that the original text of Annex V did not contain references to what should be done prior to the submission of a management plan. The Russian Federation believed that there should be a formal documented process allowing Parties to take decisions for designation of future ASPAs and ASMAs.

- (193) In reference to WP 15 on a proposed new ASMA at Dome A, China stated that whilst it agreed that other management tools should be studied and compared with formal ones, previous work towards management plans should be represented fairly. While expressing an interest in discussing this matter further, China expressed concern that it would place a further burden on the work of the ATCM and the CEP.
- (194) Some Members expressed concerns and reservations with the idea that discussions about the merit of an area as an ASPA/ASMA should precede the submission of a management plan for that area. Chile and the United Kingdom warned that a formalised procedure may discourage Members from putting forward management plans. The United Kingdom encouraged the Committee to take a biogeographic approach to the designation of protected areas.
- (195) While France welcomed the initiative proposed by Norway, it raised the question of whether the suggested process would only tackle the process of identification of ASPAs and ASMAs or the criteria of identification/designation as well. Norway replied that it foresaw Annex V as the formal baseline and that it would not be altered in this respect.
- (196) Bearing in mind the importance of environmental protection, Chile asked the Committee to also take into account that legal instruments adopted by the ATCM did not apply to vessels flagged by a third party. It encouraged Members to increase these parties' awareness of the values the Environment Protocol sought to protect.
- (197) ASOC welcomed WP 33 by Norway, while noting that it was important to avoid delay and discouragement in the submission of protected area proposals. ASOC noted that the proposed approach may facilitate a regional analysis and further coverage of the nine categories of potential ASPAs identified in Annex V, some of which do not require the identification of threats. ASOC also noted that a similar approach – early notification from proponents and a more strategic perspective to site identification – could also be applied to infrastructure development and the expansion of human footprint.
- (198) As a conclusion, Norway thanked Members for their comments and noted that they responded to the original intention to receive the view of the Committee on this issue, in order to inform further discussions taking into account all concerns and views. The Meeting welcomed Norway's offer to continue informal intersessional discussions on the CEP Discussion Forum.

- (199) The United Kingdom introduced WP 35 *The Antarctic Protected Area system: protection of outstanding geological features*, jointly prepared with Argentina, Australia and Spain, and referred to its IP 22 *Antarctic Specially Protected Areas protecting geological features: a review*. It highlighted that few ASPAs had been designated to protect geological features as required by Annex V. It further recommended that Members and SCAR identify outstanding geological features and consider requirements for their protection, including ASPA designation, use of zoning within ASMA and/or the inclusion of specific considerations for protection in other developed management tools such as the Site Guidelines for Visitors.
- (200) The Russian Federation emphasised the importance of the protection of geological features with reference to inadvertent disturbance stemming from tourism and non-governmental activities. In response to a query from the Russian Federation, Argentina and the United Kingdom stated that possible further protection mechanisms for geological features would not inhibit scientific research. Several Members noted that other mechanisms, such as EIAs, could help in this endeavour. Spain stressed that extensive scientific research should be used as a basis for further discussions on the issue. Australia noted that having a better understanding of outstanding geological features would help inform an appropriate level of management or protection, and help avoid inadvertent destruction or damage.
- (201) SCAR highlighted its new Action Group on Geological Heritage and Conservation, and noted that scientific presentations on this issue would be presented at the SCAR Open Science Conference in August 2014.
- (202) ASOC stated that the information requirements of Article 8 to the Protocol, which are precautionary, apply also to scientific research including geological research, and to the protection of geological and geomorphological values.
- (203) The Committee acknowledged the importance of guaranteeing protection of these values and welcomed further discussions on the matter.
- (204) Argentina introduced WP 57 *Contributions to the protection of fossils in Antarctica*, which highlighted the need to establish an appropriate mechanism to prevent cumulative impacts on fossils when conducting EIAs. Argentina emphasised the important contribution that the collection of fossils made to scientific research and encouraged the CEP and ATCM to optimise mechanisms for sharing information and preventing paleontological works

from being conducted without a permit issued by the competent authority. Argentina recalled Resolution 3 (2001) *Collection of meteorites in Antarctica*, which underlined the importance of protecting Antarctic meteorites, and proposed a Resolution to offer similar protection for Antarctic fossils.

- (205) The Committee commended Argentina for identifying the need to prevent cumulative impacts on fossils both through tourist activities and the activities of National Antarctic Programmes. Several Members noted the differences in how permits were implemented in national jurisdictions, and suggested the EIA process may be a more useful mechanism to protect fossils. The Russian Federation highlighted the inconsistencies in the implementation of the Environment Protocol, and urged Members to consider implementing a more harmonised approach to the implementation of those mechanisms in national jurisdictions.
- (206) The United States and New Zealand suggested that a resolution, modelled on Resolution 3 (2001), could be adopted to highlight the need to prevent cumulative impacts of scientific activity to fossils and encourage information sharing on activities involving fossils.
- (207) Germany noted that Argentina raised a very important point. It could see the risks with respect to paleontological values, and reported that it had an environmental impact assessment process and national permitting in place with respect to fossil collection. While not prepared to support the draft Resolution in its entirety, Germany proposed that it would be very useful to at least exchange information, for example by performing a report in case a permitted fossil collection in a Party had taken place.
- (208) The United Kingdom noted the relevance of WP 35 to this discussion and suggested that it was also important to control the collection of other types of geological specimens. It noted that concentrating on fossils alone might result in a two-tiered system and reported that its national legislation applied to the collection of all geological material.
- (209) The United Kingdom highlighted the usefulness of recording in geological databases the geographical position of geological specimen sampling locations.
- (210) Ecuador reported that it also had procedures for fossil extraction, which included permitting and certifying the characteristics of fossils collected in Antarctica and in Ecuador.

- (211) The United Kingdom indicated its unease with asking tour operators to confirm that fossils were collected pursuant to a permit, which it felt was the responsibility of national operators. India felt there was a fine line between tourist souvenir collection and scientific activity and expressed its concern that a permit process might impede scientific activity.
- (212) IAATO noted that tourists on its member vessels received a mandatory briefing informing them that they were prohibited from removing any items, including fossils, from the Antarctic. Vessel operators carrying scientists on board request copies of their permits before allowing the removal of any items.
- (213) SCAR noted that it might not be evident when removing rocks and minerals that fossils were included. SCAR therefore suggested that protection and collection of geological elements should be addressed in a broad context.
- (214) The Chair noted that the majority of Members shared the belief that the protection of fossils in the Antarctic was an important topic and agreed on the usefulness of sharing information on fossil extraction. Several Members reported that they had adopted legislation and tools addressing permitting and collection. However, the Chair also noted that a number of Members had reservations about adopting the Resolution proposed by Argentina.
- (215) Argentina indicated that WP 57 did not propose an Antarctic Treaty permit system on this particular issue, and was not intended to interfere with national activities, but reiterated that it would be useful for palaeontologists to be permitted. In response to a question as to why WP 57 focused on fossils, Argentina responded that unlike other geological materials, fossils were unique and may be one of a kind collection. It noted that permitting could contribute to preventing duplication in field work and urged that palaeontologists at a minimum express the intention to collect fossils and report all collections. It also noted that fossil remains outside of protected areas may also need special protection.
- (216) Argentina expressed its appreciation for the thorough discussion of its proposal by Members and noted that it would take these comments into account in developing a new Working Paper to continue discussion at CEP XVIII. It invited Members to work with Argentina in its efforts.
- (217) The United Kingdom introduced WP 36 *Monitoring vegetation cover in Antarctic Specially Protected Areas using satellite remote sensing: a pilot study*, which presented information on the use of remote sensing techniques

to provide baseline data on the extent of vegetation cover in 43 ASPAs protecting terrestrial vegetation. It mentioned that additional layers of the Antarctic Digital Database were under development to help CEP Members visualise the vegetation cover within these ASPAs (http://www.add.scar.org/aspa_vegetation_pilot.jsp). It recommended that the CEP consider the potential value of remote sensing approaches for: (i) on-going monitoring within ASPAs; (ii) determining the potential effects of climate change on Antarctic vegetation within ASPAs; and (iii) informing the further development of the Antarctic Specially Protected Areas system.

- (218) France thanked the United Kingdom for its paper and for updating SCAR data. France emphasised the possible use of remote sensing studies to monitor the resilience of vegetation and the impact of tourism on those most visited sites which have site guidelines.
- (219) Canada noted that remote sensing had proved efficient and non-invasive in its Arctic monitoring. Brazil noted that hyperspectral data could be combined with satellite remotely sensed data to achieve a more complete monitoring picture. Brazil also reported the use of remote sensing in a jointly conducted programme with Canada and commended the use of multispectral monitoring.
- (220) Germany welcomed WP 36 and pointed out that it is in favour of the use of remote sensing, particularly for monitoring purposes for which it is a highly efficient method. Germany reported on its research project on penguin monitoring. It further stated that ASPA monitoring is also an important environmental task and should be continued. Therefore, Germany fully supported the three recommendations presented by the United Kingdom.
- (221) Argentina and Spain welcomed the use of remote sensing in monitoring ASPAs, especially in very remote areas, but added that it should not replace on-site observations as the different techniques are complementary. In addition, Argentina indicated that the infield studies enable scientists to assess other parameters, such as ecophysiological ones. The Russian Federation agreed that there could be uncertainties in validating remotely sensed data and recommended additional on-site monitoring in protected areas. Australia noted that it had conducted field observations to ground-truth data collected by satellite imagery and would be pleased to pass on its experiences.
- (222) China, Australia and the United States noted the usefulness of remote sensing in monitoring climate change on Antarctic vegetation within

ASPAs, and encouraged its expanded use, particularly in remote areas and in environmentally sensitive areas. Australia welcomed the steps taken by the United Kingdom to make the spatial datasets centrally available via the Antarctic Digital Database, and noted that the approach presented in WP 36 was a very practical way of fostering coordinated and collaborative climate research and monitoring efforts, such as was called for in WP 40.

- (223) SCAR noted that many Members had used remote sensing techniques in protected areas, to collect data, for example, on soils and permafrost, snow and glacial cover, and wildlife populations. SCAR noted that it had a group on the latter issue. Noting the increasing availability of images of the Antarctic region collected by national and international space agencies, it suggested that Members cooperate to share these images, taking into account licence limitations.
- (224) The United Kingdom, in response to a question raised by Germany, informed the Committee that its vegetation images were available through the SCAR website.
- (225) The Committee concluded that remote sensing techniques were of great importance, not only in monitoring impacts within ASPAs but also in assessing information about the potential damage to areas subject to multiple tourist visits.
- (226) In WP 36 the United Kingdom recommended that CEP Members consider the usefulness of this remote sensing approach for: 1) on-going monitoring within ASPAs as a complementary tool; 2) determining potential changes on Antarctic vegetation within ASPAs and more widely; and 3) informing the further development of the Antarctic Protected Areas system. The Committee endorsed these recommendations.
- (227) The Russian Federation introduced WP 59 *Informal intersessional discussion on the need of ASPA values monitoring in connection with ASPA Management Plan reviews*, a report of informal discussions based on WP 21, submitted by the Russian Federation to CEP XVI. It noted that the United Kingdom, Germany, the United States, New Zealand, Australia, Norway, Italy, France, Argentina and ASOC had participated in the discussion, and had agreed that long-term monitoring is a major important tool to assess the status of the environment within ASPAs. At the same time some participants expressed doubts about making monitoring mandatory, because according to them monitoring activities may affect the restricted ASPA values. As to new observation methods – such as remote sensing monitoring – the majority of Parties considered it necessary

to encourage its introduction as a method avoiding environmental impact. The Russian Federation recommended that Members: (a) continue discussion on environmental monitoring within ASPAs; and (b) prepare proposals for amendments to the Guide to the Preparation of Management Plans for Antarctic Specially Protected Areas, Resolution 2 (2011).

- (228) Australia thanked the Russian Federation for leading the intersessional discussion, which had reflected Members' clear recognition of the importance of long-term monitoring of values in ASPAs. It noted that the objective of promoting the informed management of ASPAs, drawing on the best available information, can be advanced by Members continuing to sharing their experiences with environmental monitoring, and in this regard referred to papers submitted to the meeting on the use of unmanned aerial vehicles and satellite-based techniques for monitoring.
- (229) New Zealand welcomed the Russian Federation's paper as a further contribution to the maturing Antarctic protected areas system. It noted that there was general agreement on the importance of monitoring to ensure that protected area management approaches remained relevant.
- (230) The Russian Federation referred to the relevance of Norway's WP 33 regarding preliminary discussions about the creation of new ASPAs and ASMAs in this regard. It also raised concerns regarding collective responsibility for monitoring in ASPAs and ASMAs.
- (231) The Committee endorsed the recommendations in WP 59 and agreed to consider how to accommodate monitoring issues in a future review of protected area guidelines.
- (232) Other papers submitted under this agenda item included:
- IP 24 *Antarctic Specially Protected Areas: compatible management of conservation and scientific research goals* (United Kingdom & Spain)
 - IP 43 *McMurdo Dry Valleys ASMA Management Group Report* (New Zealand & United States)
 - IP 58 *Proposal to afford greater protection to an extremely restricted endemic plant on Caliente Hill (ASPAs 140 – sub-site C), Deception Island* (Spain)
 - IP 67 *Report of the Antarctic Specially Managed Area No. 6 Larsemann Hills Management Group* (Australia, China, India & Russian Federation)

- IP 98 *Romanian activities associated with the Antarctic Specially Managed Area No. 6 Larsemann Hills Management Group* (Romania)
- BP7 rev.1 *Monitoring and Management Report of Narebski Point (ASPA No. 171) during the past 5 years (2009-2014)* (Republic of Korea)

Item 10: Conservation of Antarctic Flora and Fauna

10a) Quarantine and Non-native Species

- (233) Germany introduced WP 4 *Report on the Informal Discussion on Tourism and the Risk of Introducing Non-native Organisms*, which reported on the results of informal discussions led by Germany, and was based on recommendations that had been presented to CEP XVI. As a result, it suggested that: Parties should improve compliance with the Non-native Species Manual; IAATO Members should improve their compliance with IAATO boot washing guidelines; specific microhabitats should be better protected; areas open to tourist visits should be constrained; and the Committee should consider the establishment of an international, long-term soil biological monitoring programme. Additionally, Germany proposed several points for discussion.
- (234) While many Members thanked Germany for its excellent work on this important topic, some issues were raised. China noted that while boot washing seemed to be a widely recognised method, its efficiency should be more rigorously assessed. Bearing in mind the principle of freedom of science in Antarctica, it also stated that measures such as limiting the access to certain areas should not include any prohibition of undertaking scientific research.
- (235) The United States suggested that, while supporting the proposal on boot washing, it was not ready to support constraints on areas that tourists could visit, unless in the context of application of procedures already utilised to manage human activities. The United Kingdom stated that it had doubts concerning the expansion of non-access areas, pointing out the difficulty in identifying which areas to close. It highlighted that many introduced species would relocate without respecting artificial boundaries and that attention should be focused on bio-security.
- (236) France agreed that it is important to ask the question of the effectiveness of cleaning and pointed out that many Members had vast experience on

the subject and that a sharing of expertise could lead to new results. While stating that all of its members were committed to complying with the Non-native Species Manual, IAATO reported that its members carry out thorough biosecurity measures which are supported by a wide body of research on boot-cleaning and decontamination procedures, which could be shared with the CEP. South Africa encouraged Members and IAATO to comply with the various available tools on non-native species. Belgium expressed its strong interest in conserving reference areas where human impacts were either low or absent, noting that this was crucial for later comparisons of microbial diversity and thus was intended for the benefit of science.

- (237) ASOC noted that while all Antarctic activities may have impacts, tourism patterns and dynamics are distinct and likely to result in a certain pattern of impacts. The introduction of non-native species by tourism activities merits more detailed assessment from both scientific as well as environmental management perspectives, notwithstanding that other activities may also result in introductions.
- (238) Argentina drew the Committee's attention to the fact that there was still considerable uncertainty regarding Antarctic microorganisms and their origins. Until this became clearer, it argued that management measures should be adopted with precaution. It recalled IP 83, which reported on the presence of two groups of vagrant bird species in the South Shetland Islands and announced that it would conduct analyses to determine the presence of non-native microorganism that might have been introduced, on two specimens found dead.
- (239) In response to a comment concerning funding, SCAR responded that although it would be willing to support work on non-native organisms, it did not fund scientific activities or environmental monitoring directly, noting that this was done by National Antarctic Programmes.
- (240) The Committee thanked Germany for its work and noted the results of the informal discussions. While stressing the importance of highlighting the risks associated with non-native species and their relationship with tourism, the Committee decided that further discussion and reflection were required.
- (241) Other papers submitted under this agenda item included:
- IP 23 *Colonization status of known non-native species in the Antarctic terrestrial* (United Kingdom)

- IP 83 *Registro de observación de dos especies de aves no nativas en la isla 25 de mayo, Islas Shetland del Sur (Argentina)*

10b) Specially Protected Species

(242) No papers were submitted under this agenda item.

10c) Other Annex II Matters

(243) Papers submitted under this agenda item included:

- IP 11 *Antarctic Conservation Strategy: Scoping Workshop on Practical Solutions (COMNAP & SCAR)*
- IP 19 *Use of hydroponics by National Antarctic Programs (COMNAP)*
- IP 26 *Remote sensing: emperor penguins breeding on ice shelves (United Kingdom & United States)*
- IP 42 *Developing general guidelines for operating in geothermal environments (New Zealand, SCAR, United Kingdom & United States)*
- IP 85 *Estimation of the breeding population of emperor penguins at Snow Hill Island, in the North East of the Antarctic Peninsula (Argentina)*

Item 11: Environmental Monitoring and Report

(244) The United States introduced WP 14 *Advances in creating digital elevation models for Antarctic Specially Managed and Protected areas*, which described the development of digital elevation models (DEMs) for all ASPAs and ASMAs. It encouraged the CEP to consider these models as a powerful tool for research and monitoring of these sensitive regions, and to promote engagement of the National Antarctic Programmes and Parties in providing ground control data as a way to increase the accuracy and utility of these models. The United States informed the meeting that digital elevation models would be made available through a website. In response to a query from Brazil, the United States replied that the satellite imagery used to create the digital elevation models was copyright protected, but was available to interested parties through purchase of licensed agreements. The United States invited other Members to discuss which protected areas should be prioritised in the development of digital models.

- (245) The United Kingdom thanked the United States for the paper and noted that the use of DEMs would increase accuracy in determining the actual borders of ASPAs. India congratulated the United States for its high quality work and informed Members that it had been utilising techniques to combine satellite images and digital data to create higher Resolution DEM of Larseman Hills Area. New Zealand noted the usefulness of satellite images to provide data, especially of areas with difficult access.
- (246) Australia commended the United States for the innovative work, welcomed the United States' commitment to make the spatial data freely available, and expressed its interest in discussing priorities for the development of further DEMs. While supporting Australia, Germany stated that it is developing in its research project a DEM in higher Resolution than presented here, so that it may soon provide corresponding data for ASPA 150, Ardley Island and possibly for other areas. It also stated that it is ready to collaborate with the United States in the development of DEMs.
- (247) The Committee endorsed the three recommendations proposed by WP 14, and:
- 1) noted and acknowledged the usefulness of DEMs as a new technique for research and monitoring in ASMAs and ASPAs;
 - 2) encouraged National Antarctic Programmes that have existing ground control information or that can acquire new ground control in ASMAs or ASPAs to offer those data to the PGC for use in DEM production; and
 - 3) invited Parties to provide comments to the PGC through the United States CEP Representative about which ASMAs and ASPAs should be given higher priority for DEM production.
- (248) New Zealand introduced WP 17 *Advancing Recommendations of the CEP Tourism Study*, jointly prepared with Australia, Norway, the United Kingdom and the United States. It reported on progress made to update previous analyses of potential environmental sensitivities at Antarctic Peninsula visitor sites, with a particular view to informing the CEP's consideration of priority Recommendations 3 and 6 of the CEP Tourism Study.
- (249) Utilising the long-term datasets from the US-based NGO Oceanites' Antarctic Site Inventory, the co-authors of the paper noted that the planned work will:
- a. Describe the suite of characteristics that may be found to be associated with "high sensitivity" sites;

- b. Describe a methodology for assessing site sensitivity that may be applied to less frequently visited sites or new sites that may be visited by Antarctic tourists;
 - c. Demonstrate the methodology's application to (at least) the top 10 most heavily visited sites in Antarctica; and
 - d. Recommend further analyses that might be required.
- (250) IAATO thanked the authors of WP 17 and especially Oceanites for its useful initiative. It indicated its willingness to contribute to the continuing work of Oceanites.
- (251) Norway noted the importance of considering how existing methodologies in other places potentially could inform the Antarctic work. In this regard it made reference to IP 82 which contained information on a site sensitivity analysis project conducted in Svalbard, hoping that it could inform and inspire on-going discussions. It also drew the attention of the Committee to a November 2014 symposium to be held in Tromsø to address issues vital for the understanding of vulnerability in polar areas, in order to improve and work on the various tools needed to quantify, map and present credible and knowledge-based assessments of the vulnerability of species, ecosystems and habitat types in polar areas. The Chair invited Norway to present a report of the symposium at CEP XVIII.
- (252) Norway and the United Kingdom reported that they had supported the work of Oceanites. The United Kingdom described the work as practical, productive and usable, and praised the positive relationship of Oceanites to the Parties, and NGOs.
- (253) The United States praised the past and present international collaborative efforts of Oceanites, including support from IAATO. It indicated that it was looking forward to concrete recommendations and analysis coming from the work.
- (254) Argentina indicated that it had some problems with the term "sensitivity" in referring to sites. It suggested additional debate by Members on the term. It indicated that a broader debate among Parties is needed to reach consensus on the application of the term and the methodology itself.
- (255) Chile agreed that the work by Oceanites was important and generated significant information, but wished to continue discussing the methodology and information sharing. Chile also manifested that it did not feel prepared to

agree with the recommendations contained on WP 17 because the methodology and details of the research were not made available to the Parties yet.

- (256) The Committee encouraged interested Members to continue with the planned work as set out in WP 17 and IP 12 *Developing a New Methodology to Analyse Site Sensitivities* (New Zealand, Australia, Norway, the United Kingdom and the United States), taking account of additional methodologies as appropriate, and to report back to CEP XVIII.
- (257) SCAR presented IP 14 *Report on the 2013-2014 Activities of the Southern Ocean Observing System (SOOS)*, which reported on SOOS achievements in 2013 and planned activities for 2014, and thanked Australia for hosting the SOOS office and New Zealand for its support.
- (258) Other papers submitted under this agenda item included:
- IP 8 *Persistent Organic Pollutants (Pops) in Admiralty Bay - Antarctic Specially Managed Area (ASMA 1): Bioaccumulation and Temporal Trend* (Brazil)
 - IP 28 *Informe de monitoreo ambiental en Base O'Higgins Temporada 2013* (Chile)
 - IP 38 *Proposed Long-Term Environmental Monitoring at Bharati Station (LTEM-BS)* (India)
 - IP 82 *Site Sensitivity Analysis Approach Utilized in the Svalbard Context* (Norway)
 - BP 17 *Remote sensing of environmental changes on King George Island (South Shetland Islands): establishing a new monitoring program* (Poland)

Item 12: Inspection Reports

(259) The following paper was submitted under this agenda item:

- BP 10 *Recommendations of the Inspection Teams to Maitri Station and their Implementation* (India)

Item 13: General Matters

- (260) Brazil introduced WP 9 *Education and Outreach Activities Associated with Antarctic Treaty Consultative Meetings (ATCM)*, jointly prepared with Belgium, Bulgaria, Portugal and the United Kingdom. It recommended that the ATCM endorses the organisation of a workshop to be held during ATCM XXXVIII to facilitate discussion of education and outreach activities that could convey the work of the Antarctic Treaty to a wider audience, and in particular, those activities that occurred in association with ATCMs.
- (261) Bulgaria thanked Brazil, Belgium, Portugal and the United Kingdom for the joint work on the paper and confirmed the holding of the workshop in the framework of the ATCM XXXVIII in Bulgaria, in 2015.
- (262) China indicated that it attached great importance to education and research in China as a means to foster a young generation of Antarctic professionals. China mentioned that it already presented information in schools, universities and the media. The United Kingdom clarified that individuals participating in the workshop would be present in their expert capacities and not as representatives of the ATCM or the CEP. Chile indicated that it would take part in the workshop activities and supported the recommendations proposed in the paper.
- (263) France, while expressing support for the workshop, raised the issue of cost effectiveness and budget limitations regarding outreach activities and public oriented education on Antarctica-related themes.
- (264) Argentina highlighted the importance of educational issues and the need to have a communication strategy. Argentina also commented on its own experience in the elaboration of an educational publication in conjunction with Spain, Peru and Ecuador, which was strictly apolitical.
- (265) Portugal recalled that evaluation processes of workshops had been conducted in the past and reminded the Committee that assessment of results might prove difficult. It mentioned the importance of holding a workshop during ATCM XXXVIII and proposed that other institutions like SCAR, IAATO and COMNAP be involved in its organisation. Portugal felt that a workshop represented a new opportunity to engage Non-consultative Parties. Belgium noted that while some countries had already developed educational programmes on Antarctica-related themes, the proposed workshop might constitute a valuable chance for experience sharing.

- (266) IAATO mentioned that many of the tourists in Antarctica were nationals of CEP Member countries, whose expenditures helped to finance National Antarctic Programmes. IAATO supported the adoption of the recommendations.
- (267) The Committee endorsed the recommendations presented in WP 9:
1. Acknowledge that education and outreach activities are an important issue for the Antarctic Treaty Parties to discuss; and
 2. Endorse the holding of a workshop at ATCM XXXVIII in Bulgaria to facilitate discussion of Antarctic education and outreach activities, especially to exchange experiences, and improve the potential for better coordination in the future through, *inter alia*, the establishment of a Forum.
- (268) COMNAP presented IP 35 *COMNAP Waste Water Management Workshop Information*. Acknowledging the call made at CEP XV for a strengthening of precautionary monitoring of microbial activity in areas near sewage treatment plant discharges, and in the CEP Five-year Work Plan, which indicated that the CEP wished to develop guidelines for best practice disposal of waste including human waste, COMNAP informed the Committee that it was planning to hold a workshop on waste management in August 2014. It would report back to CEP XVIII on the workshop outcomes. It referred Members to BP 13 as an example of the topics that would be discussed at the workshop.
- (269) COMNAP presented IP 46 *COMNAP Practical Training Modules: Module 1 – Environmental Protocol*, which reported on a first training module that had been developed by the COMNAP Training Expert Group (TEG) and combined information from different Antarctic Programmes. It noted that this material was freely available.
- (270) COMNAP presented IP 47 *International scientific and logistic collaboration in Antarctica*, which presented an update of the information provided by COMNAP at ATCM XXXI based on a new survey carried out by COMNAP in January 2014. It also highlighted its objectives for supporting international partnerships, noting that there were obvious barriers to international collaboration and a need for national efforts to overcome such hurdles.
- (271) France congratulated COMNAP on its survey, its third since 2008, and noted that collaboration occurred outside the Treaty area. It also noted that some Members had joint facilities and structures.

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

- *IP 75 Amery Ice Shelf Helicopter Incident (Australia)*
- *BP 13 Progress on the development of a new waste water treatment facility at Australia's Davis Station (Australia)*

Item 14: Election Officers

(273) The Chair noted that Argentina, Australia, Chile and the United States had all nominated candidates for the position of Chair. He noted that the number of candidates presented an unusual situation and that the CEP Rules of Procedure did not provide a detailed election procedure.

(274) The Chair recalled Rule 14 of the CEP Rules of Procedure, which states that decisions on matters of procedure should be taken by a simple majority of the Committee present and voting. The Committee subsequently agreed, by consensus, that election procedures were considered as a procedural matter and could therefore be decided by a simple majority vote.

(275) The Chair outlined the following voting procedure, which was agreed by consensus:

- A quorum was required for a valid election (this would be two thirds of the membership of the CEP).
- The outcome of elections would be decided by (simple) majority vote of the present and voting Members.
- In the case where there were more than two candidates for a position, rounds of voting should be conducted, eliminating the candidate with the least votes in each round. In the case of a tied result in such an elimination round a new vote between these two should be taken (after having identified which candidates have the least number of votes). Should the second result not differ from the first round, then elimination should be decided by the toss of a coin.
- When only two candidates were left, voting should continue until one candidate won a (simple) majority.

(276) The Committee noted that it would be desirable to incorporate this new procedure in a future revision of the Rules of Procedure.

- (277) The Committee elected Mr Ewan McIvor from Australia as CEP Chair and congratulated Ewan for his appointment to the role.
- (278) The Committee thanked Dr Yves Frenot from France for serving as CEP Chair for a second two-year term.
- (279) The Committee elected Ms Birgit Njaastad from Norway as Vice-chair for a second two-year term and congratulated her on her appointment to the role.

Item 15: Preparation for the Next Meeting

- (280) The Committee adopted the Provisional Agenda for CEP XVIII (Appendix 2).

Item 16: Adoption of the Report

- (281) The Committee adopted its Report.

Item 17: Closing of the Meeting

- (282) The Chair closed the Meeting on Friday 2nd May 2014.

Annex 1

CEP XVII Agenda and Summary of Documents

1. OPENING OF THE MEETING	
2. ADOPTION OF THE AGENDA	
SP 1 rev. 4	<i>ATCM XXXV I AND CEP XVI AGENDA AND SCHEDULE</i>
SP 13	<i>CEP XVI SUMMARY OF PAPERS</i>
3. STRATEGIC DISCUSSION ON THE FUTURE WORK OF THE CEP	
WP 1 France	<i>CEP FIVE-YEAR WORK PLAN ADOPTED AT THE XVITH CEP MEETING IN BRUSSELS.</i> This paper, which contains the Five-year Work Plan as it was adopted by the 16 th CEP meeting in Brussels, is submitted to the delegates so that it may be considered and updated at the 17 th CEP meeting.
WP 10 New Zealand, Australia, Belgium, Norway and SCAR	<i>ANTARCTIC ENVIRONMENTS PORTAL: PROGRESS REPORT.</i> Highlighting the need to improve the availability of, and access to, policy-ready information on Antarctic environments to support the implementation of the Protocol, this paper informs on the current status of the Antarctic Environments Portal, which is currently operating in a beta version and will be fully functional in July 2015.
WP 47 rev.1 Argentina & Chile	<i>OUTREACH ACTIVITIES ON OCCASION OF THE 25TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE SIGNING OF THE PROTOCOL ON ENVIRONMENT PROTECTION TO THE ANTARCTIC TREATY.</i> In the framework of the 25th anniversary of the signing of the Protocol on Environmental Protection to the Antarctic Treaty, which will be celebrated in 2016, Argentina proposes to begin an analysis of proposals for education and outreach activities related to the work of the Parties and the Committee for Environmental Protection.
4. OPERATION OF THE CEP	
SP 7 Secretariat	<i>ATCM MULTI-YEAR STRATEGIC WORK PLAN: REPORT OF THE SECRETARIAT ON INFORMATION EXCHANGE REQUIREMENTS AND THE ELECTRONIC INFORMATION EXCHANGE SYSTEM.</i> Following the instructions of the ATCM Multi-year Strategic Work Plan, this paper provides a review of the existing requirements for information exchange and their evolution, a summary of the outcomes of informal discussions on the subject at both the ATCM and CEP, and a list of pending issues.
IP 97 France	<i>CEP XVII – WORK DONE DURING THE INTERSESSION PERIOD.</i> This paper summarises the work done during the 2013-2014 intersession period according to the Action Plan established by CEP XVI in Brussels and circulated by the CEP Chair in its CEP XVII Circular No 1.

5. COOPERATION WITH OTHER ORGANISATIONS	
IP 3 COMNAP	<i>THE ANNUAL REPORT FOR 2013 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 2013.
IP 10 CCAMLR	<i>REPORT BY THE SC-CAMLR OBSERVER TO THE SEVENTEENTH 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 13 SCAR	<i>THE SCIENTIFIC COMMITTEE ON ANTARCTIC RESEARCH (SCAR) ANNUAL REPORT 2013/14.</i> This paper highlights examples of SCAR activities that are of particular interest to Treaty Parties. It also informs on several fellowship and prize schemes that SCAR runs in order to expand capacity in all its Members; on the Prix <i>Biodiversité</i> of the Prince Albert II of Monaco Foundation; and on future SCAR meetings.
BP 9 SCAR	<i>THE SCIENTIFIC COMMITTEE ON ANTARCTIC RESEARCH (SCAR) SELECTED SCIENCE HIGHLIGHTS FOR 2013/14.</i> This Background Paper highlights some recent key science papers published since the last Treaty meeting and should be read in conjunction with Information Paper 13.
BP 14 New Zealand	<i>ANTARCTICA NEW ZEALAND MEMBERSHIP OF THE INTERNATIONAL UNION FOR CONSERVATION OF NATURE (IUCN).</i> In this paper New Zealand informs that in 2012 Antarctica New Zealand became a member of IUCN with the aim of developing collaboration on Antarctic issues with IUCN and its member organisations. New Zealand considers that it has been highly beneficial, and encourages other NAPs to consider IUCN membership.
6. REPAIR AND REMEDIATION OF ENVIRONMENTAL DAMAGE	
WP 28 Australia	<i>ANTARCTIC CLEAN-UP ACTIVITIES: CHECKLIST FOR PRELIMINARY SITE ASSESSMENT.</i> This paper presents a checklist for the site assessment stage, developed by Australia and based on its own experience with Antarctic clean-up activities. Australia recommends that the CEP considers including the checklist in the CEP Clean-up Manual for reference as appropriate by those planning or undertaking clean-up activities.
IP 7 Brazil	<i>REMEDIATION PLAN FOR THE BRAZILIAN ANTARCTIC STATION AREA.</i> This paper informs on the remediation plan undertaken by the Brazilian Antarctic programme at the Comandante Ferraz station, aimed to minimise environmental impacts in areas with soil contamination caused by diesel spills during the accident and the burning of the main building of the station.

BP 18 Argentina	<i>TAREAS DE GESTIÓN AMBIENTAL EN LA BASE BELGRANO II. [ENVIRONMENTAL MANAGEMENT AT BELGRANO II STATION]</i> This paper informs on a major waste clean-up activity at Belgrano II Station in January 2014 and on an environmental assessment in order to explore possible improvements to environmental management.
7. CLIMATE CHANGE IMPLICATIONS FOR THE ENVIRONMENT: STRATEGIC APPROACH	
WP 8 Norway & United Kingdom	<i>REPORT FROM ICG ON CLIMATE CHANGE.</i> This paper presents the results of discussions held by the ICG on climate change established at CEP XVI, whose ultimate goal is to develop a Climate Change Response Work Programme (CCRWP) for the CEP. The paper provides a summary of the discussions and agreements reached during the intersessional period. The group proposes to continue its work in order to present a draft CCRWP at CEP XVIII.
WP 40 United States, Norway & United Kingdom	<i>FOSTERING COORDINATED ANTARCTIC CLIMATE CHANGE MONITORING.</i> To better understand climate processes and change in Antarctica, as well as the managerial and operational implications of such changes, this paper proposes focused efforts to support monitoring of Antarctic and Southern Ocean systems: 1) strengthening coordination of climate research priorities to maximise benefits of research projects; and 2) continuing to support cooperation between the CEP and SC-CAMLR, including via joint workshops.
WP 46 United Kingdom, Germany, Norway & Spain	<i>ANTARCTIC TRIAL OF WWF'S RAPID ASSESSMENT OF CIRCUM-ARCTIC ECOSYSTEM RESILIENCE (RACER) CONSERVATION PLANNING TOOL.</i> This paper recommends that Parties take into consideration resilience in the designation, management and review of protected areas, and that RACER is recognised as one possible tool for use in more productive and diverse parts of the Antarctic to determine key features important for conferring resilience more widely.
IP 29 WMO	<i>WMO-LED DEVELOPMENTS IN METEOROLOGICAL (AND RELATED) POLAR OBSERVATIONS, RESEARCH AND SERVICES.</i> This paper draws the attention of the ATCM to contemporary and practical opportunities to minimise risks associated with extreme weather conditions in Antarctica, focussing discussion on relevant meteorological (and related) observations, research and services, resulting from the work of the WMO and related agencies/institutions. Particular reference is made to initiatives relating to the understanding of the climate system.

<p>IP 39 SCAR</p>	<p><i>SCAR ENGAGEMENT WITH THE UNITED NATIONS FRAMEWORK CONVENTION ON CLIMATE CHANGE (UNFCCC)</i>. This paper informs on the 2013 SCAR activities at the UNFCCC meeting in Bonn and at the UNFCCC Conference of the Parties in Warsaw. It also informs on the plans for 2014, in particular those related to the ACCE group, and on a series of meetings in collaboration with the IPCC to bring climate scientists and policy makers in direct contact in the lead up to the 2015 COP in Paris.</p>
<p>IP 60 SCAR</p>	<p><i>ANTARCTIC CLIMATE CHANGE AND THE ENVIRONMENT – 2014 UPDATE</i>. This paper, prepared by the SCAR ACCE Advisory Group, highlights some notable advances in Antarctic climate science over the last two years. A comprehensive reference list is provided so that more details of particular research can be consulted.</p>
<p>IP 68 ASOC</p>	<p><i>ANTARCTIC CLIMATE CHANGE REPORT CARD 2014</i>. This paper summarises and highlights some climate-related changes and research findings in Antarctica over the past year, in order to assist ATCM/CEP delegates in becoming familiar with the latest scientific findings on this matter.</p>
<p>IP 72 ASOC</p>	<p><i>NEAR-TERM ANTARCTIC IMPACTS OF BLACK CARBON AND SHORT-LIVED CLIMATE POLLUTANT MITIGATION</i>. In this paper ASOC informs on the modelling results of short-lived climate pollutant impacts, and considers that, because of the impact of the local emissions, it would be very helpful for the CEP, ATCM and CCAMLR to work together with COMNAP to construct an emission inventory of black carbon from human activity in the Antarctic.</p>
<p>IP 74 rev. 1 ASOC</p>	<p><i>THE WEST ANTARCTIC ICE SHEET IN THE FIFTH ASSESSMENT REPORT OF THE INTERGOVERNMENTAL PANEL ON CLIMATE CHANGE (IPCC): A KEY THREAT, A KEY UNCERTAINTY</i>. This Information Paper focuses on the IPCC assessment topic of sea level rise, particularly the contribution of ice sheets, especially the unstable West Antarctic Ice Sheet. It examines and discusses the new projections from the Fifth Assessment Report of the IPCC and analyses implications for the Antarctic region and ATS.</p>
<p>IP 94 rev.1 United Kingdom</p>	<p><i>ANTARCTIC TRIAL OF WWF'S RAPID ASSESSMENT OF CIRCUM-ARCTIC ECOSYSTEM RESILIENCE (RACER) CONSERVATION PLANNING TOOL – METHODOLOGY AND TRIAL OUTCOMES</i>. This paper is in support of WP 46 and provides the RACER trial report and outcomes in full, highlighting key features that are likely to persist and could provide resilience for the wider region into the future. It also documents the challenges, limitations and opportunities found through assessing the applicability of RACER for the Antarctic.</p>

8. ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT ASSESSMENT	
a) Draft Comprehensive Environmental Evaluations	
WP 16 China	<i>THE DRAFT COMPREHENSIVE ENVIRONMENTAL EVALUATION FOR THE CONSTRUCTION AND OPERATION OF THE NEW CHINESE RESEARCH STATION, VICTORIA LAND, ANTARCTICA.</i> This paper summarises the objective of the draft CEE for the new Chinese research station and its circulation process, and contains the CEE Non-technical Summary.
WP 22 Belarus	<i>CONSTRUCTION AND OPERATION OF BELARUSIAN ANTARCTIC RESEARCH STATION AT MOUNT VECHERNYAYA, ENDERBY LAND. DRAFT COMPREHENSIVE ENVIRONMENTAL EVALUATION.</i> This paper summarises the objective of the draft CEE for the new Belarusian research station and its circulation process, and contains a Non-technical Summary and a full Draft CEE document.
WP 27 Australia	<i>REPORT OF THE INTERSESSIONAL OPEN-ENDED CONTACT GROUP ESTABLISHED TO CONSIDER THE DRAFT CEE FOR THE “CONSTRUCTION AND OPERATION OF BELARUSIAN ANTARCTIC RESEARCH STATION AT MOUNT VECHERNYAYA, ENDERBY LAND”.</i> This paper informs on the result of the intersessional review by an ICG coordinated by Australia, according to the CEP Procedures, related to the draft CEE prepared for the new Belarusian station.
WP 43 United States	<i>REPORT OF THE INTERSESSIONAL OPEN-ENDED CONTACT GROUP ESTABLISHED TO CONSIDER THE DRAFT CEE FOR THE “PROPOSED CONSTRUCTION AND OPERATION OF A NEW CHINESE RESEARCH STATION, VICTORIA LAND, ANTARCTICA”.</i> This paper informs on the results of the intersessional review by an ICG established in accordance with the CEP Procedures and coordinated by the United States, to consider the draft CEE prepared for the new Chinese station.
IP 37 China	<i>THE DRAFT COMPREHENSIVE ENVIRONMENTAL EVALUATION FOR THE CONSTRUCTION AND OPERATION OF THE NEW CHINESE RESEARCH STATION, VICTORIA LAND, ANTARCTICA.</i> This paper contains the full Draft CEE for the new Chinese station.
IP 54 China	<i>THE INITIAL RESPONSES TO THE COMMENTS ON THE DRAFT CEE FOR THE CONSTRUCTION AND OPERATION OF THE NEW CHINESE RESEARCH STATION, VICTORIA LAND, ANTARCTICA.</i> This paper provides initial responses to the comments received by the ICG participants, a list of main research fields of the new Chinese station, information on risk analysis of wind resistance and snow accumulation, and information on a waste management system based on magnetic pyrolysis.

b) Other EIA Matters	
WP 5 Germany & Poland	<i>UAVS AND THEIR POSSIBLE ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS.</i> In the light of the significantly increasing use of Unmanned Aerial Vehicles (UAVs) for scientific and non-scientific purposes in the Antarctic, this paper draws the attention of the Committee to the possible environmental impacts of using UAVs and invites the Committee to consider the proposed recommendations.
WP 13 United States & Norway	<i>COASTAL CAMPING ACTIVITIES CONDUCTED BY NON-GOVERNMENTAL ORGANIZATIONS.</i> An increase in non-governmental coastal camping activities has occurred for a few competent authorities and potential regulatory challenges or gaps may exist with regulating these activities. This paper summarises information collected on the experiences and responses of competent authorities in approaches taken to address issues related to non-governmental camping activities.
WP 24 United Kingdom	<i>IMPROVEMENTS TO THE ANTARCTIC ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT ASSESSMENT PROCESS.</i> Based on the priority that the CEP Five-year Work Plan gave to the review of the EIA Guidelines, this paper offers a number of possible policy and process issues for discussion. It also encourages Parties to consider the further development of EIA requirements and procedures and other mechanisms that might improve the EIA process.
WP 29 Australia	<i>REVIEW OF THE GUIDELINES FOR ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT ASSESSMENT IN ANTARCTICA.</i> Based on the priority that the CEP Five-year Work Plan gave to the review of the EIA Guidelines, Australia has reviewed CEP discussions on the issue of EIA and related developments, with a view to identifying matters that could be considered by an ICG in discussing this review. Australia also presents possible terms of reference for the ICG.
WP 34 France, Belgium	<i>IEE OR CEE: WHICH ONE TO CHOOSE?</i> Based on an analysis of available information on EIA, this paper discusses the appropriateness of a limited list of activities that should be routinely considered as having more than a minor or transitory impact on the environment and, therefore, would require the systematic preparation of a CEE. Such an approach would reduce the disparities in the assessment of potential impacts for a limited number of activities to be defined. An ICG is proposed to consider this matter.
WP 51 United States	<i>CONSIDERATIONS FOR THE USE OF UNMANNED AIRCRAFT SYSTEMS (UAS) FOR RESEARCH, MONITORING, AND OBSERVATION IN ANTARCTICA.</i> Unmanned aircraft systems are being used worldwide as tools for scientific data collection and environmental monitoring. This paper invites the CEP and ATCM to consider the potential for expanded use of unmanned aircraft in Antarctica and how best to ensure the safety of personnel, infrastructure, wildlife, and the environment.

IP 36 Korea (ROK)	<i>ESTABLISHMENT AND BEGINNING OF PILOT OPERATION OF THE 2ND KOREAN ANTARCTIC RESEARCH STATION “JANG BOGO” AT TERRA NOVA BAY.</i> This paper informs on the second construction phase and opening of Jang Bogo Station in early 2014. It also provides details about waste treatment, environmental monitoring activities and science programmes to be undertaken at the new station.
IP 56 Italy	<i>INITIAL ENVIRONMENTAL EVALUATION FOR THE REALIZATION OF A NEW ACCESS ROAD TO ENIGMA LAKE TWIN OTTER RUNWAY AT MARIO ZUCHELLI STATION, TERRA NOVA BAY, ROSS SEA, ANTARCTICA.</i> This paper presents the environmental evaluation of the second access road, which partially differs from the previous already authorised one. It provides a description of the environment from a geological and morphological point of view, with updated descriptions of flora and fauna and main environmental characteristics, considerations of impacts, and mitigation measures.
IP 57 Italy	<i>TOWARDS THE REALIZATION OF A GRAVEL RUNWAY IN TERRA NOVA BAY: RESULTS OF THE 2013-2014 SURVEY CAMPAIGN.</i> This paper presents an update of the project and summarises the results of the surveys carried out during the last Antarctic summer campaign, outlining the additional activities to be performed in the next 2014-2015 expedition.
IP 63 Russian Federation	<i>RESULTS OF DRILLING OPERATIONS FOR THE STUDY OF THE LOWER PART OF THE GLACIER IN DEEP BOREHOLE AT VOSTOK STATION IN THE SEASON 2013-2014.</i> This paper informs on the technical details associated with the glacial drilling operations during the 2013/14 season at the borehole 5G-3. The results of drilling operations showed that about 45 m of ice remained to be drilled at the “ice-water” boundary, which represents a feasible task, especially since those performing the operation already know the real glacier thickness, which comprises 3769.3 m.
IP 64 Russian Federation	<i>STUDY OF THE WATER COLUMN OF THE SUBGLACIAL LAKE VOSTOK.</i> This paper provides information about the drilling operation in the water column of Lake Vostok and provides an Initial Environmental Evaluation, which is presented for discussion to the CEP Members.
IP 73 ASOC	<i>NEW ANTARCTIC STATIONS: ARE THEY JUSTIFIED?</i> Based on various assessments in the peer-reviewed literature and inspection reports, in this paper ASOC contrasts the scientific research output of ATCPs (in terms of publications in peer-reviewed scientific journals) and considers that all alternatives to building a new station should be carefully considered beforehand.

SP 5 Secretariat	<i>ANNUAL LIST OF INITIAL ENVIRONMENTAL EVALUATIONS (IEE) AND COMPREHENSIVE ENVIRONMENTAL EVALUATIONS (CEE) PREPARED BETWEEN APRIL 1ST 2013 AND MARCH 31ST 2014.</i> This paper informs on the Environmental Impact Assessments prepared during the most recent reporting period.
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 31 Norway	<i>SUBSIDIARY GROUP ON MANAGEMENT PLANS – REPORT ON 2013/14 INTERSESSIONAL WORK.</i> During the 2013/14 intersessional period the Subsidiary Group on Management Plans reviewed management plans for seven ASPA and one ASMA. The SGMP recommends that the CEP approves the management plans for ASPA 141, ASPA 128, ASMA 1 and two new ASPAs at High altitude geothermal sites of the Ross Sea region and at Stornes, Larsemann Hills, Princess Elizabeth Land respectively. The SGMP also advises the CEP that further intersessional work will be conducted with regard to three management plans: ASPA 144, ASPA 145 and ASPA 146.
<i>ii. Draft revised management plans which had not been reviewed by the Subsidiary Group on Management Plans</i>	
WP 3 United States	<i>REVISED MANAGEMENT PLAN FOR ANTARCTIC SPECIALLY PROTECTED AREA No. 139 BISCOE POINT, ANVERS ISLAND, PALMER ARCHIPELAGO.</i> While the changes incorporated in the management plan were numerous, they have been classified as ‘minor’ in nature and in effect. Therefore, the U.S. proposes that the Committee considers it and recommends its adoption by the ATCM.
WP 6 United States	<i>REVISED MANAGEMENT PLAN FOR ANTARCTIC SPECIALLY PROTECTED AREA No. 113 LITCHFIELD ISLAND, ARTHUR HARBOR ANVERS ISLAND, PALMER ARCHIPELAGO.</i> While the changes incorporated in the management plan were numerous, they have been classified as ‘minor’ in nature and in effect. Therefore, the U.S. proposes that the Committee considers it and recommends its adoption by the ATCM.
WP 7 United States	<i>REVISED MANAGEMENT PLAN FOR ANTARCTIC SPECIALLY PROTECTED AREA No. 121 CAPE ROYDS, ROSS ISLAND.</i> While the changes incorporated in the management plan were numerous, they have been classified as ‘minor’ in nature and in effect. Therefore, the U.S. proposes that the Committee considers it and recommends its adoption by the ATCM.

WP 11 Norway	<i>REVIEW OF ANTARCTIC SPECIALLY PROTECTED AREA (ASPA) No. 142 – SVARTHAMAREN.</i> Given that this management plan has been reviewed without substantive changes and changes made were generally editorial in nature, Norway recommends that the CEP approves the management plan and recommends its adoption by the ATCM.
WP 18 Australia & China	<i>REVISION OF THE MANAGEMENT PLAN FOR ANTARCTIC SPECIALLY PROTECTED AREA (ASPA) No. 169 AMANDA BAY, INGRID CHRISTENSEN COAST, PRINCESS ELIZABETH LAND, EAST ANTARCTICA.</i> Since there are no changes to the area boundaries and there are no major changes to the description of the Area, Australia and China recommend that the CEP approves the revised management plan.
WP 19 Australia	<i>REVISION OF THE MANAGEMENT PLAN FOR ANTARCTIC SPECIALLY PROTECTED AREA (ASPA) No. 136 CLARK PENINSULA, BUDD COAST, WILKES LAND, EAST ANTARCTICA.</i> Since there are no changes to the area boundaries and there are no major changes to the description of the Area, Australia recommends that the CEP approves the revised management plan.
WP 21 Australia, China, India & Russian Federation	<i>REVISION OF THE MANAGEMENT PLAN FOR ANTARCTIC SPECIALLY MANAGED AREA (ASMA) No. 6 LARSEMANN HILLS, EAST ANTARCTICA.</i> The ASMA management plan has been revised without changes to the Area boundary, and no major changes have been made to the management provisions. It has been modified to reflect the anticipated designation of a new Antarctic Specially Protected Area at Stornes, within the ASMA. The proponents recommend that the CEP approves the revised management plan.
WP 26 United States	<i>REVISED MANAGEMENT PLAN FOR ANTARCTIC SPECIALLY PROTECTED AREA No. 124 CAPE CROZIER, ROSS ISLAND.</i> The United States informs that extensive revisions have been made to the management plan to bring it up to date. The review includes some changes in the boundary, the expansion of values to be protected, and more explicit reference to the representative qualities of the Area for terrestrial and aquatic habitats in the region. More explicit guidance is now provided on permit conditions and access. The revised management plan is submitted to the Committee for its consideration.

<p>WP 30 Australia</p>	<p><i>PROPOSAL TO MODIFY THE MANAGEMENT ARRANGEMENTS FOR MAWSON'S HUTS AND CAPE DENISON.</i> Australia has conducted a five-yearly review of the management plans for ASPA 162 and ASMA 3. As a result of the review, Australia proposes to enlarge ASPA 162 to cover the area that is currently designated as ASMA 3 and to de-designate the ASMA. A requirement for a permit to enter and conduct activities within an enlarged ASPA would afford greater protection to the historical landscape, artefacts and other historic items associated with the Cape Denison historic site, which is designated as Historic Site and Monument (HSM) 77. It would also simplify the management arrangements for the site, which is also subject to a Visitor Site Guide adopted under Resolution 4 (2011).</p>
<p>WP 52 Chile</p>	<p><i>REVISION OF MANAGEMENT PLAN FOR ANTARCTIC SPECIALLY PROTECTED AREA (ASPAs) No. 150, ARDLEY ISLAND (ARDLEY PENINSULA), MAXWELL BAY, KING GEORGE ISLAND.</i> The management plan has been reviewed and only required minor changes. Therefore, Chile recommends that the CEP approves the revised management plan.</p>
<p>WP 54 Chile</p>	<p><i>REVISION OF MANAGEMENT PLAN FOR ANTARCTIC SPECIALLY PROTECTED AREA (ASPAs) No. 125, FILDERS PENINSULA, KING GEORGE ISLAND.</i> The management plan has been reviewed and only required minor changes. Therefore, Chile recommends that the CEP approves the revised management plan.</p>
<p>WP 58 rev. 1 Korea (ROK)</p>	<p><i>REVISED MANAGEMENT PLAN FOR ANTARCTIC SPECIALLY PROTECTED AREA No. 171, NAREBSKI POINT, BARTON PENINSULA, KING GEORGE ISLAND.</i> The Republic of Korea has conducted the first review of the Management Plan for ASPA 171. Since only minor amendments are required, the Republic of Korea recommends that the CEP approves the attached revised management plan.</p>
<p><i>iii. New draft management plans for protected/managed areas</i></p>	
<p><i>iv. Other matters relating to management plans for protected/managed areas</i></p>	
<p>WP 15 China</p>	<p><i>REPORT OF THE INFORMAL DISCUSSIONS ON THE PROPOSAL FOR A NEW ANTARCTIC SPECIALLY MANAGED AREA AT CHINESE ANTARCTIC KUNLUN STATION, DOME A.</i> This document contains a short report of the informal discussions coordinated by China during the intersessional period on the proposal for a new ASMA at Chinese Antarctic Kunlun Station, in Dome A. China recommends that the informal discussions continue for another intersessional period and that results be presented at CEP XVIII.</p>

WP 25 United Kingdom	<i>THE STATUS OF ANTARCTIC SPECIALLY PROTECTED AREA No. 114 NORTHERN CORONATION ISLAND, SOUTH ORKNEY ISLANDS.</i> Considering the limited amount of information about the values of the area, the significant physical restrictions on access, and that recently collected information from satellite remote sensing data showed little evidence of exceptional terrestrial biological habitat, the United Kingdom seeks the views of the CEP on whether the additional protection afforded by ASPA status within the area is still appropriate.
BP 11 New Zealand	<i>INITIATION OF A REVIEW OF ASPA 104: SABRINA ISLAND, NORTHERN ROSS SEA, ANTARCTICA.</i> New Zealand informs that although the management plan for ASPA 104 Sabrina Island is due for review, it is not in a position to revise the management plan at this stage, though a review has been initiated.
b) Historic Sites and Monuments	
IP 16 France	<i>JUDGMENT OF THE REGIONAL COURT OF PARIS DATED 6 FEBRUARY 2014 REGARDING THE CARRYING OUT OF UNDECLARED AND UNAUTHORISED NON-GOVERNMENTAL ACTIVITIES IN THE AREA OF THE TREATY AND THE DAMAGE CAUSED TO THE WORDIE HOUSE HUT (HSM NO 62).</i> This paper informs on the sentence given to the skipper of the yacht <i>l'Esprit d'Equipe</i> for the damage committed in 2010 to the hut Wordie House at HSM No. 62.
IP 25 United Kingdom, New Zealand & United States	<i>THE 1912 ASCENT OF MOUNT EREBUS BY MEMBERS OF THE TERRA NOVA EXPEDITION: THE LOCATION OF ADDITIONAL CAMPSITES AND FURTHER INFORMATION ON HSM 89.</i> This paper informs on the locations of three additional campsites located on Mount Erebus. The ongoing research initiative hopes to locate all the campsites from the Heroic Age on Mount Erebus, and to discuss and develop ways in which they can be conserved and utilised for further historical and scientific research.
c) Site Guidelines	
WP 23 United Kingdom	<i>HORSESHOE ISLAND VISITOR SITE GUIDELINES: PROPOSED REVISION.</i> After confirmation of the presence of asbestos in HSM 63 Base Y, the United Kingdom recommends that the Visitor Site Guidelines for Horseshoe Island be updated to reflect: i) the known presence of asbestos-containing materials in the loft; ii) that the loft should not be accessed by visitors; and iii) that visitors should report any significant damage to the roof to the British Antarctic Survey.
WP 30 Australia	<i>PROPOSAL TO MODIFY THE MANAGEMENT ARRANGEMENTS FOR MAWSON'S HUTS AND CAPE DENISON.</i> (see the summary under item 9.a.ii)

IP 18 UK, USA, Argentina & Australia	<i>SITE GUIDELINES: MAPPING UPDATE.</i> Further to two papers presented at ATCM XXXVI on revised and new Guidelines for Visitors, this paper provides an overview of the subsequent activity to improve the maps for those revised and new Site Guidelines.
IP 27 rev. 1 United States	<i>ANTARCTIC SITE INVENTORY: 1994-2014.</i> This paper provides an update on results of the ASI project, through February 2014. Initiated in 1994, this programme includes data and information collected across all heavily visited tourism locations, sites believed to be most sensitive to potential environmental disruption; and all sites covered by site-specific visitor guidelines that Antarctic Treaty Parties have adopted.
IP 59 United Kingdom, Argentina, Australia & United States	<i>NATIONAL ANTARCTIC PROGRAMME USE OF LOCATIONS WITH VISITOR SITE GUIDELINES IN 2013-14.</i> This paper provides an overview of information provided by Parties on visits by their National Antarctic Programme personnel of locations with ATCM Site Guidelines in place, during the 2013-14 season.
IP 86 Argentina	<i>POLÍTICA DE GESTIÓN DEL TURISMO PARA LA BASE CIENTÍFICA CARLINI. [TOURISM MANAGEMENT POLICIES AT CARLINI SCIENTIFIC STATION].</i> This paper informs on a set of guidelines prepared by the Argentine Antarctic programme for Carlini Station aimed to improve the efficiency of tourism management, as well as to protect the science activities developed there and the natural values of the area.
d) Human footprint and wilderness values	
IP 69 ASOC	<i>ANTARCTIC RESOLUTION AT THE 10TH WORLD WILDERNESS CONGRESS.</i> This paper informs on the Resolution <i>The Antarctic Treaty Area as a Contiguous Wilderness Area</i> approved by the 10 th World Wilderness Congress (WILD 10), hosted by the WILD Foundation in October 2013.
IP 71 rev. 1 ASOC	<i>MANAGING HUMAN FOOTPRINT, PROTECTING WILDERNESS: A WAY FORWARD.</i> In this paper ASOC reviews the work done to address footprint and wilderness issues and recommends next steps for immediate action so the CEP can make timely progress on these issues in advance of celebrations for the 25th anniversary of the Protocol in 2016.
e) Marine Spatial Protection and Management	
WP 39 Belgium & France	<i>THE CONCEPT OF "OUTSTANDING VALUES" IN THE MARINE ENVIRONMENT UNDER ANNEX V OF THE PROTOCOL.</i> This paper contends that there is a need for Parties to develop a more coherent approach to the implementation of Annex V, Article 3 in order to account for the impact of land-based activities and associated logistic support on the marine environment. The paper also discusses the concept of "outstanding values" as they apply to the marine environment where activities regulated by the ATCM and CEP take place, and suggests the formation of an intersessional contact group.

IP 49 Netherlands	<i>THE ROLE OF THE ANTARCTIC TREATY CONSULTATIVE MEETING IN PROTECTING THE MARINE ENVIRONMENT THROUGH MARINE SPATIAL PROTECTION.</i> This paper examines the responsibility of the ATCM in relation to marine spatial protection and identifies the legal instruments that are available to implement this responsibility. The paper also provides an overview of the actual use of these instruments and the interactions that have taken place between the ATCM, the CEP and CCAMLR regarding the harmonisation of marine spatial protection efforts.
f) Other Annex V Matters	
WP 33 Norway	<i>BACKGROUND AND INITIAL THOUGHTS AND QUESTIONS: NEED FOR AND DEVELOPMENT OF PROCEDURES CONCERNING ASPA AND ASMA DESIGNATION.</i> Based on discussions at the last CEP meetings, this paper proposes that the ATCM/CEP takes a close look at its practices for establishing protected and managed areas in Antarctica, ensuring that the rationale for designating new areas is indeed present and clear. The paper presents an overview of past practices and some initial thoughts on the way forward for the CEP's consideration, as a first step in bringing the discussion on this topic/task forward.
WP 35 United Kingdom, Argentina, Australia, Spain	<i>THE ANTARCTIC PROTECTED AREA SYSTEM: PROTECTION OF OUTSTANDING GEOLOGICAL FEATURES.</i> This paper recalls the commitment under Annex V to seek to designate ASPAs that protect examples of outstanding geological features. The paper informs that few ASPAs have been designated primarily to protect geological values, and recommends that the CEP encourages Members and SCAR to identify outstanding geological features and consider requirements for their protection, including ASPA designation, use of zoning within ASMAs and/or the inclusion of specific considerations for protection in other developed management tools, such as the Site Guidelines for Visitors.
WP 36 United Kingdom	<i>MONITORING VEGETATION COVER IN ANTARCTIC SPECIALLY PROTECTED AREAS USING SATELLITE REMOTE SENSING: A PILOT STUDY.</i> This paper informs on the use of remote sensing techniques to provide baseline data on the extent of vegetation cover in 43 ASPAs protecting terrestrial vegetation. The paper recommends that the CEP considers the potential usefulness of this remote sensing approach for: (i) on-going monitoring within ASPAs; (ii) determining the potential effects of climate change on Antarctic vegetation within ASPAs and more widely; and (iii) informing the further development of the Antarctic Protected Areas system.

<p>WP 57 Argentina</p>	<p><i>CONTRIBUTIONS TO THE PROTECTION OF FOSSILS IN ANTARCTICA.</i> Considering that the collection of fossils has served as an important contribution to the understanding of the past on the Antarctic continent, this paper highlights the need to establish an appropriate mechanism to preserve scientific heritage and natural resources, and proposes a draft Resolution for consideration.</p>
<p>WP 59 Russian Federation</p>	<p><i>INFORMAL INTERSESSIONAL DISCUSSION ON THE NEED OF ASPA VALUES MONITORING IN CONNECTION WITH ASPA MANAGEMENT PLAN REVIEWS.</i> This paper informs on the intersessional discussions led by the Russian Federation on the CEP discussion forum and recommends to continue discussions on environmental monitoring within ASPAs at the CEP XVII and to call Parties and Observers to prepare proposals for amendments in the Guide to the Preparation of Management Plans for Antarctic Specially Protected Areas.</p>
<p>IP 22 United Kingdom</p>	<p><i>ANTARCTIC SPECIALLY PROTECTED AREAS PROTECTING GEOLOGICAL FEATURES: A REVIEW.</i> This paper informs on a review of existing and proposed ASPA management plans that was undertaken to ascertain the level of protection afforded to geological features within the ASPA system. This paper supplements the information contained within WP 35.</p>
<p>IP 24 United Kingdom & Spain</p>	<p><i>ANTARCTIC SPECIALLY PROTECTED AREAS: COMPATIBLE MANAGEMENT OF CONSERVATION AND SCIENTIFIC RESEARCH GOALS.</i> This paper informs that research was done on the management of conservation and scientific research in ASPAs, and that researchers have recommended that the reason for the designation of ASPA status is made clearer, thereby facilitating more effective management of activities within those areas.</p>
<p>IP 43 New Zealand & United States</p>	<p><i>McMURDO DRY VALLEYS ASMA MANAGEMENT GROUP REPORT.</i> This paper is a summary of the work of the McMurdo Dry Valleys ASMA 2 management group since the Management Plan was revised and adopted in Measure 10 (2011). The United States and New Zealand encourage interested national programmes to become involved in the management group.</p>
<p>IP 58 Spain</p>	<p><i>PROPOSAL TO AFFORD GREATER PROTECTION TO AN EXTREMELY RESTRICTED ENDEMIC PLANT ON CALIENTE HILL (ASPA 140 – SUB-SITE C), DECEPTION ISLAND.</i> This paper informs on the exceptional biological significance of sub-site C in ASPA 140 and encourages Parties and the CEP to recognise its sensitivity and work together to consider some additional management measures within the ASPA management plan.</p>
<p>IP 67 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 ASMA 6 Management Group’s activities during 2013-14.</p>

IP 98 Romania	<i>ROMANIAN ACTIVITIES ASSOCIATED WITH THE ANTARCTIC SPECIALLY MANAGED AREA No.6 LARSEMANN HILLS MANAGEMENT GROUP.</i> In this paper, related to IP 67 and WP 21, Romania expresses its intention to be again an active member of the Management Group of ASMA 6.
BP 7 rev.1 Korea (ROK)	<i>MONITORING AND MANAGEMENT REPORT OF NAREBSKI POINT (ASPA No. 171) DURING THE PAST 5 YEARS (2009-2014).</i> This paper informs on ecological monitoring and management activities carried out since 2009/10 at ASPA 7 by the Korea Polar Research Institute and the Korean Ministry of Environment.
10. CONSERVATION OF ANTARCTIC FLORA AND FAUNA	
a) Quarantine and Non-native Species	
WP 4 Germany	<i>REPORT ON THE INFORMAL DISCUSSION ON TOURISM AND THE RISK OF INTRODUCING NON-NATIVE ORGANISMS.</i> This paper presents the results of informal discussions led by Germany based on the recommendations that Germany had presented to the CEP XVI. It invites the CEP to take note of the results of the ICG and to discuss key points on potential sources of introduction of NNS expressed by some members of the group. It encourages Parties to consider opportunities to incorporate the results of the ICG into on-going or planned work, or to develop further proposals for the consideration of the CEP.
IP 23 United Kingdom	<i>COLONISATION STATUS OF KNOWN NON-NATIVE SPECIES IN THE ANTARCTIC TERRESTRIAL ENVIRONMENT (UPDATED 2014).</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 have been no new reports of NNS becoming established within Antarctica; however, there has been further development of the colonisation potential and biology of some of the non-native species described previously.
IP 83 Argentina	<i>REGISTRO DE OBSERVACIÓN DE DOS ESPECIES DE AVES NO NATIVAS EN LA ISLA 25 DE MAYO, ISLAS SHETLAND DEL SUR. [REGISTER OF OBSERVATION OF TWO NON-NATIVE SPECIES ON KING GEORGE ISLAND, SOUTH SHETLAND ISLANDS]</i> This paper informs on the finding of two groups of non-native species birds near the Argentine station Carlini in King George Island, South Shetlands Islands; and the measures adopted in order to prevent potential disease transmission to native fauna.
b) Specially Protected Species	
c) Other Annex II Matters	
IP 11 COMNAP & SCAR	<i>ANTARCTIC CONSERVATION STRATEGY: SCOPING WORKSHOP ON PRACTICAL SOLUTIONS.</i> This paper informs on the joint SCAR/COMNAP Workshop held in September 2013 to identify practical National Antarctic Programme-led responses to short and longer-term conservation challenges in Antarctica. The Workshop's Report is attached to the paper.

<p>IP 19 COMNAP</p>	<p><i>USE OF HYDROPONICS BY NATIONAL ANTARCTIC PROGRAMS.</i> This paper updates the information on national programmes' use of hydroponics provided in ATCM XXXVI. It is provided to inform any revisions of the guidelines on hydroponics which the CEP agreed to include in the Non-native Species Manual.</p>
<p>IP 26 United Kingdom & United States</p>	<p><i>REMOTE SENSING: EMPEROR PENGUINS BREEDING ON ICE SHELVES.</i> This is a report of a new breeding behaviour discovered in emperor penguins whereby colonies may form on ice shelves rather than on sea-ice as is more normally the case. The potential benefit of breeding on ice shelves should be taken into consideration when predicting the population trajectory for this species.</p>
<p>IP 42 New Zealand, SCAR, United Kingdom & United States</p>	<p><i>DEVELOPING GENERAL GUIDELINES FOR OPERATING IN GEOTHERMAL ENVIRONMENTS.</i> This paper informs, in relation to recent work on the development of a Code of Conduct for the Erebus ice caves and the proposed new ASPA for high altitude geothermal sites in the Ross Sea region, on a workshop planned to begin discussions around developing general guidelines for operating in geothermal environments in Antarctica.</p>
<p>IP 85 Argentina</p>	<p><i>ESTIMACIÓN DE LA POBLACIÓN REPRODUCTIVA DE PINGÜINO EMPERADOR, APLENODYTES FORSTERI, DE LA ISLA CERRO NEVADO, AL NORESTE DE LA PENÍNSULA ANTÁRTICA. [ESTIMATION OF THE BREEDING POPULATION OF EMPEROR PENGUINS AT SNOW HILL ISLAND, IN THE NORTHEAST OF THE ANTARCTIC PENINSULA]</i> Recalling the recent discussions in the CEP of different observation techniques of emperor penguin colonies in the context of the impact that climate change may have on the species, this paper informs on the results of a census of the Emperor penguin colony at Snow Hill using aerial photographs and counting techniques in the field.</p>
<p>11. ENVIRONMENTAL MONITORING AND REPORTING</p>	
<p>WP 14 United States</p>	<p><i>ADVANCES IN CREATING DIGITAL ELEVATION MODELS FOR ANTARCTIC SPECIALLY MANAGED AND PROTECTED AREAS.</i> This paper describes the development of digital elevation models for all of the ASMAs, and invites the CEP to consider these models as a powerful tool for research and monitoring of these sensitive regions and to encourage an active role for the National Antarctic Programmes and Treaty Parties in helping to increase the accuracy and utility of these models.</p>

<p>WP 17 Australia, New Zealand, Norway, United Kingdom & United States</p>	<p><i>ADVANCING RECOMMENDATIONS OF THE CEP TOURISM STUDY.</i> The proponents have been working with Oceanites to identify opportunities to utilise the Antarctic Site Inventory's long-term dataset, as well as the scientific resources of Oceanites' partner academic institutions, to advance the recommendations from the 2012 CEP Tourism Study. This paper reports on planned work to update previous analyses of potential environmental sensitivities at Antarctic Peninsula visitor sites, with a particular view to informing the CEP's consideration of priority Recommendations 3 and 6 of the CEP Tourism Study.</p>
<p>IP 8 Brazil</p>	<p><i>PERSISTENT ORGANIC POLLUTANTS (POPs) IN ADMIRALTY BAY - ANTARCTIC SPECIALLY MANAGED AREA (ASMA 1): BIOACCUMULATION AND TEMPORAL TREND.</i> This paper informs on the studies on the contribution of POPs to Admiralty Bay that have been carried out through the Brazilian Antarctic programme in order to assess environmental impacts. The paper analyses the sources, predominant pollutants and temporal trends.</p>
<p>IP 12 Australia, New Zealand, Norway, United Kingdom & United States</p>	<p><i>DEVELOPING A NEW METHODOLOGY TO ANALYSE SITE SENSITIVITIES.</i> This paper has attached a preliminary report on work planned by Oceanites and partner institutions to develop a new methodology to analyse site sensitivities at visitor sites in Antarctica. The report does not necessarily reflect the views of the proponents, but is submitted as a reference for the Committee's on-going discussions of tourism management and, in particular, Recommendations 3 and 6 from the 2012 CEP Tourism Study.</p>
<p>IP 14 SCAR</p>	<p><i>REPORT ON THE 2013-2014 ACTIVITIES OF THE SOUTHERN OCEAN OBSERVING SYSTEM (SOOS).</i> This report highlights SOOS achievements in 2013 and planned activities for 2014.</p>
<p>IP 28 Chile</p>	<p><i>INFORME DE MONITOREO AMBIENTAL EN BASE O'HIGGINS TEMPORADA 2013 [REPORT OF ENVIRONMENTAL MONITORING AT O'HIGGINS BASE IN THE 2013 SEASON]</i> This paper informs on a monitoring programme at O'Higgins Base which was carried out on a monthly basis with the objective of obtaining information about the functioning of the base's waste water treatment plant.</p>
<p>IP 38 India</p>	<p><i>PROPOSED LONG-TERM ENVIRONMENTAL MONITORING AT BHARATI STATION (LTEM-BS).</i> This paper describes the proposed Environmental Monitoring of Bharati Station and its environs to be initiated as a long-term programme.</p>
<p>IP 82 Norway</p>	<p><i>SITE SENSITIVITY ANALYSIS APPROACH UTILIZED IN THE SVALBARD CONTEXT.</i> This paper provides a short summary of a Svalbard focused project, aiming to develop a tool to assess the sensitivity of tourist visited sites.</p>

<p>BP 17 Poland</p>	<p><i>REMOTE SENSING OF ENVIRONMENTAL CHANGES ON KING GEORGE ISLAND (SOUTH SHETLAND ISLANDS): ESTABLISHING A NEW MONITORING PROGRAM.</i> This paper presents preliminary information on a new monitoring programme in Admiralty Bay using fixed-wing Unmanned Aerial Vehicles that is being planned for 2014/2015 and 2015/2016 seasons and that will collect geospatial environmental data needed for monitoring effects of climate change.</p>
<p>12. INSPECTION REPORTS</p>	
<p>BP 10 India</p>	<p><i>RECOMMENDATIONS OF THE INSPECTION TEAMS TO MAITRI STATION AND THEIR IMPLEMENTATION.</i> This paper describes the various actions that have already been taken and are being implemented at Maitri Station with regard to the suggestions and observations made by two Inspection Teams in 2012 and 2013 respectively.</p>
<p>13. GENERAL MATTERS</p>	
<p>WP 9 Brazil, Belgium, Bulgaria, Portugal & United Kingdom</p>	<p><i>EDUCATION AND OUTREACH ACTIVITIES ASSOCIATED WITH ANTARCTIC TREATY CONSULTATIVE MEETINGS (ATCM).</i> Noting the increasing importance of Antarctic issues in global science, this paper recommends that the ATCM endorse the organization of a workshop to be held prior to ATCM XXVIII to facilitate discussion of education and outreach activities that can convey the work of the Antarctic Treaty to a wider audience, and in particular, those activities that occur in association with ATCMs.</p>
<p>IP 35 COMNAP</p>	<p><i>COMNAP WASTE WATER MANAGEMENT WORKSHOP INFORMATION.</i> This paper informs on a workshop that COMNAP will hold in August 2014 to continue with waste management discussions held by national Antarctic programmes, based on the call made by CEP XV for a strengthening of precautionary monitoring of microbial activity in areas near sewage treatment plant discharges; and on the CEP's five-year work plan that indicates that the CEP wishes to develop guidelines for best practice disposal of waste including human waste.</p>
<p>IP 46 COMNAP</p>	<p><i>COMNAP PRACTICAL TRAINING MODULES: MODULE 1 – ENVIRONMENTAL PROTOCOL.</i> This paper presents a first training module that has been developed by the COMNAP Training Expert Group, which combines information from different Antarctic programmes. The COMNAP TEG intends to consider if there are other topics/themes of common training interest that could be prepared into subsequent training modules to be shared and made freely available.</p>

<p>IP 47 COMNAP</p>	<p><i>INTERNATIONAL SCIENTIFIC AND LOGISTIC COLLABORATION IN ANTARCTICA.</i> This paper presents an update of the information provided by COMNAP at the ATCM XXXI, based on a new survey carried out by COMNAP on January 2014, and informs on COMNAP's objectives to support international partnership.</p>
<p>IP 75 Australia</p>	<p><i>AMERY ICE SHELF HELICOPTER INCIDENT.</i> This paper informs on the response to a helicopter incident on the Amery Ice Shelf in East Antarctica in December 2013, which resulted in injuries to three people and irreparable damage to the aircraft.</p>
<p>BP 13 Australia</p>	<p><i>PROGRESS ON THE DEVELOPMENT OF A NEW WASTE WATER TREATMENT FACILITY AT AUSTRALIA'S DAVIS STATION.</i> This paper provides an update on Australia's progress with this project, and outlines some of the features of the planned new secondary level and advanced level waste water treatment plants.</p>
<p>14. ELECTION OF OFFICERS</p>	
<p>15. PREPARATION FOR NEXT MEETING</p>	
<p>16. ADOPTION OF THE REPORT</p>	
<p>17. CLOSING OF THE MEETING</p>	

Appendix 1

CEP Five-year Work Plan

Issue / Environmental Pressure Actions	CEP Priority	Intersectoral Period	CEPXXVIII 2015	Intersectoral Period	CEPXXIX 2016	Intersectoral Period	CEPXX 2017	Intersectoral Period	CEPXXI 2018
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, activity-differentiated risk assessments to mitigate the risks posed by terrestrial non-native species. 4. Develop a surveillance strategy for areas at high risk of non-native species establishment. 5. Give additional attention to the risks posed by intra-Antarctic transfer of propagules.	1	Prepare for review of manual-consider informal discussion group	Review non-native species manual						
	Tourism and NGO activities Actions: 1. Provide advice to ATCM as requested. 2. Advance recommendations from ship-borne tourism ATME.	1	Partners 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.					
Global Pressure: Climate Change Actions: 1. Consider implications of climate change for management of Antarctic environment. 2. Advance recommendations from climate change ATME. 3. Establish a Climate Change response work programme.	1	ICG on Climate Change develops a Climate Change Response Programme	Standing agenda item ICG report SCAR provides update	ICG on Climate Change develops a Climate Change Response Programme	Standing agenda item SCAR provides update	ICG on Climate Change develops a Climate Change Response Programme	Standing agenda item SCAR provides update		
	Progressing new and revised protected / managed area management plans Actions: 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 Informal discussion led by Norway on procedures for CEP consideration of ASPAs and ASMA's Initiate the work on developing guidelines to ASMA's preparation.	Consideration of SGMP / report	SGMP / conducts work as per agreed work plan Continue the work on developing guidelines to ASMA's preparation.	Consideration of SGMP / report			

ATCM XXXVII Final Report

Issue / Environmental Pressure Actions	CEP Priority	Intercessional Period	CEP XVIII 2015	Intercessional Period	CEP XIX 2016	Intercessional Period	CEP XX 2017	Intercessional Period	CEP XXI 2018
Marine spatial protection and management	1	Start developing terms of reference for a CEP-SC-CAMLR joint workshop	Report from the ICG on outstanding values in the marine environment	CEP-SC-CAMLR workshop					
Actions:		1. Cooperation between the CEP and SC-CAMLR on common interest issues. 2. Cooperate with CCAMLR on Southern Ocean bioregionalisation and other common interests and agreed principles. 3. Identify and apply processes for spatial marine protection. Advance recommendations from climate change ATME.							
Operations of the CEP and Strategic Planning	1	Informal discussions on the achievements of the CEP	Consideration of the report on the inter-annual work on the achievements of the CEP 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				
Actions:		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).							
Repair or Remediation of Environmental Damage	2	Consider low wilderness aspects could be taken into account in the EIA guidelines	Consider further request by the ATCM for final advice						
Actions:		1. Respond to further request from the ATCM related to repair and remediation, as appropriate 2. Monitor progress on the establishment of Antarctic-wide recovery of sites of past activity. 3. Consider guidelines for repair and remediation 4. Members develop practical guidelines and supporting resources for inclusion in the clean-up manual							
Human footprint / wilderness management	2	Develop methods for improved protection of wilderness under Annexes I and V.							
Actions:		1. Develop methods for improved protection of wilderness under Annexes I and V.							
Monitoring and state of the environment reporting	2	Identify key environmental indicators and tools. Establish a process for reporting to the ATCM. SCAR to support information to COMNAP and CEP.	Report from COMNAP and SCAR on the use of unmanned aerial vehicles (UAVs)						
Actions:		1. Identify key environmental indicators and tools. 2. Establish a process for reporting to the ATCM. 3. SCAR to support information to COMNAP and CEP.							

Issue / Environmental Pressure Actions	CEP Priority	Intercessional Period	CEP XVIII 2015	Intercessional Period	CEP XIX 2016	Intercessional Period	CEP XX 2017	Intercessional Period	CEP XXI 2018
Biodiversity knowledge	2								
Actions:									
1. Maintain awareness of threats to existing biodiversity.									
2. Advance recommendations from climate change ATME.									
Site specific guidelines for tourist-visited sites	2								
Actions:									
1. Review site specific guidelines as required.									
2. Provide advice to ATCM as required.									
3. Review the format of the site guidelines									
Overview of the protected areas system	2								
Actions:									
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.									
Outreach and education	2								
Actions:									
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.									
Implementing and Improving the EIA provisions of Annex I	2								
Actions:									
1. Refine the process for considering CEEs and advising the ATCM accordingly.									
2. Develop guidelines for assessing cumulative impacts.									
3. Review EIA guidelines and consider wider policy and other issues.									
4. Consider application of strategic environmental assessment in Antarctica.									
5. Advance recommendations from climate change ATME.									

Issue / Environmental Pressure Actions	CEP Priority	Intersessional Period	CEP XVIII 2015	Intersessional Period	CEP XIX 2016	Intersessional Period	CEP XX 2017	Intersessional Period	CEP XXI 2018
Maintain the list of Historic Sites and Monuments	3	Secretariate update list of HSMs	Standing item	Secretariate update list of HSMs	Standing item	Secretariate update list of HSMs	Standing item	Secretariate update list of HSMs	
Actions:									
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.									
Exchange of Information	3	Contribute to the ICG established by the ATCM, as required	Secretariat Report		Secretariat Report		Secretariat Report		
Actions:									
1. Assign to the Secretariat.									
2. Monitor and facilitate easy use of the EIES.									
3. Review environmental reporting requirements									
Specially protected species	3								
Actions:									
1. Consider proposals related to specially protected species.									
2. Consider the means by which the CEP is kept informed of the status of specially protected species.									
Emergency response action and contingency planning	3	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		
Actions:									
1. Review inspection reports as required.									
Waste	3	COMNAP workshop on waste water management	Consideration of COMNAP's report						
Actions:									
1. Develop guidelines for best practice disposal of waste including human waste.									
Energy management	4								
Actions:									
1. Develop best-practice guidelines for energy management at stations and bases.									

Appendix 2

Provisional Agenda for CEP XVIII

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. Marine Spatial Protection and Management
 - e. 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

