

# **Committee for Environmental Protection**

## **Report of the Twentieth Meeting of the Committee for Environmental Protection (CEP XX)**

**Beijing, China, 22 – 26 May 2017**



**Table of contents**

<b>Item 1: Opening of the Meeting</b> .....	<b>5</b>
<b>Item 2: Adoption of the Agenda</b> .....	<b>6</b>
<b>Item 3: Strategic Discussions on the Future Work of the CEP</b> .....	<b>7</b>
<b>Item 4: Operation of the CEP</b> .....	<b>7</b>
CEP advice to the ATCM on supporting the work of the CEP .....	<b>8</b>
<b>Item 5: Cooperation with other Organisations</b> .....	<b>9</b>
CEP advice to the ATCM on outcomes from the 2016 Joint CEP/SC-CAMLR Workshop on Climate Change and Monitoring.....	<b>10</b>
<b>Item 6: Repair and Remediation of Environment Damage</b> .....	<b>10</b>
<b>Item 7: Climate Change Implications for the Environment</b> .....	<b>11</b>
7a) Strategic Approach .....	11
7b) Implementation and Review of the Climate Change Response Work Programme .....	13
CEP advice to the ATCM on implementation of the Climate Change Response Work Programme .....	14
<b>Item 8: Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA)</b> .....	<b>15</b>
8a) Draft Comprehensive Environmental Evaluations.....	15
8b) Other EIA Matters .....	15
CEP advice to the ATCM on policy issues associated with the Environmental Impact Assessment process .....	16
<b>Item 9: Area Protection and Management Plans</b> .....	<b>17</b>
9a) Management Plans .....	17
CEP advice to the ATCM on revised management plans for ASPAs and ASMAs.....	19
9b) Historic Sites and Monuments.....	20
9c) Site Guidelines.....	21
9d) Marine Spatial Protection and Management.....	21
9e) Other Annex V Matters.....	22
CEP advice to the ATCM on guidance material for Antarctic Specially Managed Areas (ASMAs).....	23
CEP advice to the ATCM on SCAR’s Code of Conduct for the Exploration and Research of Subglacial Aquatic Environments .....	23
CEP Advice to the ATCM on the Guidelines: A Prior Assessment process for the designation of ASPAs and ASMAs .....	24
CEP advice to the ATCM on an update to the Antarctic Conservation Biogeographic Regions .....	24
<b>Item 10: Conservation of Antarctic Flora and Fauna</b> .....	<b>28</b>
10a) Quarantine and Non-native Species .....	28
10b) Specially Protected Species .....	30
10c) Other Annex II Matters.....	30
CEP advice to the ATCM on Unmanned Aerial Vehicles (UAV) / Remotely Piloted Aircraft Systems (RPAS) .....	32
CEP advice to the ATCM on protection mechanisms for the Snow Hill Island emperor penguin colony .....	33
<b>Item 11: Environmental Monitoring and Reporting</b> .....	<b>34</b>
CEP advice to the ATCM on recommendations from the 2012 CEP Tourism Study .....	34
<b>Item 12: Inspection Reports</b> .....	<b>36</b>
<b>Item 13: General Matters</b> .....	<b>37</b>
CEP advice to the ATCM on Green Expeditions .....	37
<b>Item 14: Election Officers</b> .....	<b>38</b>
<b>Item 15: Preparation for the Next Meeting</b> .....	<b>38</b>
<b>Item 16: Adoption of the Report</b> .....	<b>38</b>
<b>Item 17: Closing of the Meeting</b> .....	<b>38</b>
<b>Appendix 1. CEP Five-Year Work Plan 2017</b> .....	<b>39</b>
<b>Appendix 2. Subsidiary Group on Climate Change Response – Framework</b> .....	<b>49</b>
<b>Appendix 3. Procedures for intersessional CEP consideration of draft CEEs</b> .....	<b>51</b>
<b>Appendix 4. Guidelines: A prior assessment process for the designation of ASPA and ASMAs</b> .....	<b>53</b>
<b>Appendix 5. Preliminary Agenda for CEP XXI (2018)</b> .....	<b>57</b>



# Report of the Twentieth Meeting of the Committee for Environmental Protection (CEP XX)

**Beijing China, May 22 – 26, 2017**

- (1) Pursuant to Article 11 of the Protocol on Environmental Protection to the Antarctic Treaty, Representatives of the Parties to the Protocol (Argentina, Australia, Belarus, Belgium, Brazil, Bulgaria, Canada, Chile, China, Czech Republic, Ecuador, Finland, France, Germany, Italy, Japan, Malaysia, Monaco, Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway, Peru, Poland, Portugal, Republic of Korea, Romania, the Russian Federation, South Africa, Spain, Sweden, Ukraine, the United Kingdom, the United States, Uruguay, and Venezuela) met in Beijing, China, from 22 to 26 May 2017, for the purpose of providing advice and formulating recommendations to the Parties in connection with the implementation of the Protocol.
- (2) In accordance with Rule 4 of the CEP Rules of Procedure, the meeting was also attended by representatives of the following Observers:
  - Contracting Parties to the Antarctic Treaty which are not a Party to the Protocol: Colombia, Switzerland, Turkey, and the Slovak Republic
  - the Scientific Committee on Antarctic Research (SCAR), the Scientific Committee for the Conservation of Antarctic Marine Living Resources (SC-CAMLR), and the Council of Managers of National Antarctic Programs (COMNAP); and
  - scientific, environmental and technical organisations: the Antarctic and Southern Ocean Coalition (ASOC), the International Association of Antarctica Tour Operators (IAATO), and the World Meteorological Organization (WMO).

## ***Item 1: Opening of the Meeting***

- (3) The CEP Chair, Mr Ewan McIvor (Australia), opened the meeting on Monday 22 May 2017 and thanked China for organising and hosting the meeting in Beijing.
- (4) The Chair recalled the 25<sup>th</sup> anniversary of the adoption of the Protocol on 4 October 2016, and noted that the related publication endorsed at CEP XIX, *25 Years of the Protocol on Environmental Protection to the Antarctic Treaty*, had been released on that date. He also noted that many Parties and organisations had celebrated and promoted this significant milestone in international efforts to protect Antarctica.
- (5) Highlighting that this was the 20<sup>th</sup> meeting of the CEP, the Chair noted that the Committee would continue to play an important role in supporting the Parties, which had reaffirmed their ‘strong and unwavering commitment to the objectives and purposes of the Antarctic Treaty and its Environmental Protocol’ in the Santiago Delegation on the 25th Anniversary of the signing of the Protocol on Environmental Protection to the Antarctic Treaty.
- (6) The Chair acknowledged the work of the many current and past representatives of CEP Members and Observers. On behalf of the Committee, he presented awards in special recognition of those colleagues attending CEP XX who had maintained a close association with the Committee since its first meeting in Tromsø, Norway, in 1998: José Maria Acero (Secretariat, Argentina); Neil Gilbert (New Zealand, United Kingdom); Valerii Lukin (Russian Federation); Birgit Njåstad (Norway); Christo Pimpirev (Bulgaria); Ricardo Roura (ASOC); David Walton (Secretariat, SCAR) and Victoria Wheatley (United States, IAATO).
- (7) The Committee joined the Chair in thanking and congratulating those long-serving colleagues, and other current and past representatives, for their contributions to the work of the Committee.
- (8) On behalf of the Committee, the Chair welcomed Malaysia as a new Member, following the entry into force of the Protocol for Malaysia on 16 September 2016. The Chair noted that the CEP now comprised 38 Members.

PRELIMINARY VERSION

- (9) The Chair also noted the advice presented in the Depositary's report that the Protocol would enter into force for Switzerland on 1 June 2017, and Turkey's advice in IP 94 *Ratification of Protocol on Environmental Protection to the Antarctic Treaty by Turkey* that it had ratified the Protocol.
- (10) The Committee joined the Chair in welcoming Malaysia as a new Member, and looked forward to welcoming Switzerland and Turkey as Members in the near future.
- (11) The Chair summarised the work undertaken during the intersessional period (IP 157 *Committee for Environmental Protection (CEP): Summary of Activities during the 2016/17 intersessional period*). He noted that excellent progress had been made on the actions arising from CEP XIX, and thanked all Members and Observers involved in this significant body of work.

**Item 2: Adoption of the Agenda**

- (12) The Committee adopted the following agenda and confirmed the allocation of 30 Working Papers (WP), 67 Information Papers (IP), 5 Secretariat Papers (SP) and 6 Background Papers (BP) to the agenda items:
1. Opening of the Meeting
  2. Adoption of the Agenda
  3. Strategic Discussions on the Future Work of the CEP
  4. Operation of the CEP
  5. Cooperation with other Organisations
  6. Repair and Remediation of Environment Damage
  7. Climate Change Implications for the Environment
    - a. Strategic approach
    - b. Implementation and Review of the Climate Change Response Work Programme
  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

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

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

*CEP Five-Year Work Plan*

- (14) The Committee briefly considered the Five-Year Work Plan, adopted at CEP XIX (SP 2), at the end of each agenda item.
- (15) The Committee revised and updated its Five-Year Work Plan (Appendix 1). The major changes reflected actions agreed during the Meeting, including: the proposed establishment of a Subsidiary Group on Climate Change Response; intersessional contact groups (ICG) on reviewing the Antarctic Clean Up Manual and developing guidelines for the environmental aspects of Unmanned Aerial Vehicles (UAV) / Remotely Piloted Aircraft Systems (RPAS); and further work on Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA) matters.

**Item 4: Operation of the CEP**

- (16) New Zealand introduced WP 25 *Antarctic Environments Portal*, jointly prepared with Australia, Japan, Norway, the United States, and SCAR, and referred to IP 14 *Antarctic Environments Portal: Content Management Plan*. WP 25 provided an update on the operation of the Antarctic Environments Portal and highlighted developments since CEP XIX. New Zealand noted in particular recent progress in the long-term management and operation of the Portal, including the agreement by the 2016 SCAR Delegates Meeting that the SCAR Secretariat would explore cost-neutral options for SCAR to take over operational management of the Portal after 2018. A Content Management Plan for the Portal had been prepared (IP 14), with the aims of both providing a structured approach to the development of content and facilitating a dialogue with the CEP regarding topics for publication. The co-authors recommended the Committee consider opportunities for supporting SCAR's future management of the Portal, and review and provide comments and suggestions on the Content Management Plan.
- (17) The Committee expressed its continued support for the Portal as an important source of up-to-date scientific information integral to the work of the CEP, and thanked the co-authors of the papers for their continued efforts in the management and development of the Portal.
- (18) The Committee supported the decision taken by SCAR, in principle, to assume the management of the Portal after 2018. It agreed to consider further opportunities to support SCAR's management of the Portal.
- (19) The Committee welcomed France's contribution for the translation of Portal content into French as an example of support in kind, and welcomed the offer made by the Netherlands during the meeting to financially support the Portal in the future. The Committee encouraged Members to consider further opportunities to support the management of the Portal and to consult with SCAR over this.
- (20) The Committee expressed general support for the Content Management Plan, and recalled that the objectives of the Portal were to ensure that all content presented through the Portal was neutral, objective, based on peer-reviewed science, and relevant to priorities identified by the Committee. In that regard, the Committee noted the important role played by the Portal's editorial committee. The Committee also welcomed SCAR's advice that in addition to its close involvement in the development of Portal content, it would continue to provide scientific advice to the CEP through papers submitted to annual meetings.
- (21) The Committee recognised the importance of keeping the Portal content up to date through review and revision as necessary. It noted that the editorial arrangements for the Portal included periodic revision and updating of existing content, and welcomed further opportunities to consider the Content Management Plan at future CEP meetings. Regarding the issues identified in the current Content Management Plan, some Members noted their intention to encourage their scientists to participate in the preparation of summaries and it was suggested that plastics and ocean acidification were two issues of particular interest.
- (22) The CEP Chair introduced WP 34 *Supporting the work of the Committee for Environmental Protection (CEP): A paper by the CEP Chair*. In conjunction with the 20th meeting of the CEP, the paper sought to initiate a discussion among the Members about ways to ensure the Committee remained well-placed to support the Parties' efforts to comprehensively protect the Antarctic environment. It noted that the CEP, over the years, had continually developed ways to enhance its effectiveness. It additionally highlighted the increasing importance of

the CEP's work in light of the ongoing, new, and emerging environmental challenges facing Antarctica. In light of these objectives and trends, the CEP Chair invited Members to consider: whether a list of CEP 'science needs' (such as that presented in Attachment A to WP 34) could help promote and support science to better address and understand the environmental challenges facing Antarctica; and whether access to modest funding could help the Committee better deliver high quality and timely advice and recommendations on priority issues to the ATCM.

- (23) Welcoming the CEP Chair's paper, the Committee agreed that it was important to continually consider ways to ensure that the CEP remained well-placed to provide high quality advice and recommendations to the Parties. Regarding the first issue raised in WP 34, Members recognised the importance to the Committee that its work retained close links to science. It agreed that a list of CEP science needs would help with promoting and supporting science to better understand and address the environmental challenges facing Antarctica, support collaboration and prioritisation of science, and help to ensure that the CEP would receive relevant science input. The Committee also agreed that such a list could be useful for highlighting to the ATCM environmental research and monitoring needs, in keeping with its function under Article 12(k) of the Protocol, and for informing Parties' ongoing discussions on Antarctic science priorities. It was noted that further consideration could be given to presenting the list in a format that would be suitable for informing ATCM discussions, and keeping it updated through annual review. Some Members noted that they were already using the list presented in WP 34 for discussions about their national Antarctic science priorities. SCAR and WMO noted their continuing efforts to conduct and support research relevant to the scientific needs of the CEP. SCAR indicated that it would take the Committee's discussions into consideration in planning its future science programmes.
- (24) The Committee agreed to review the list of science needs contained in WP 34 at CEP XXI before passing it to the ATCM. It agreed that the review could consider opportunities to identify new and emerging science needs, to link the list to the CEP's Five-Year Work Plan, and to explore possible links to the Content Management Plan of the Environments Portal.
- (25) The Committee also acknowledged the need for additional mechanisms to help the CEP address its increasing workload, and agreed that its work could be strengthened by access to modest financial support, particularly where it might improve or expedite provision of advice to the ATCM. It noted, however, that it would be necessary to give further consideration to possible mechanisms for obtaining and utilising any such funding, taking into account that the source of the funds would ensure that the Committee's independence was maintained. In the discussion Members suggested also giving thought to opportunities for in-kind support and also the possibility of establishing special funds, such as those used by SC-CAMLR. While Members noted the importance of considering additional ways of involving experts in the CEP's work, a reservation was raised on whether it would be an appropriate role for the Committee to support a fellowship programme.
- (26) The Committee welcomed the Chair's offer to undertake further work during the intersessional period, in consultation with the Secretariat and interested Members, to further develop the concept of a mechanism for the CEP to obtain modest funding to support its work. The Committee looked forward to further discussions on this matter at CEP XXI.

### **CEP advice to the ATCM on supporting the work of the CEP**

- (27) The Committee considered ways to ensure that the CEP could remain well placed to deliver high quality environmental advice and recommendations to the Parties, and agreed to advise the ATCM that:
- It had agreed that a list of science needs would help with promoting and supporting science to better understand and address the environmental challenges facing Antarctica, which would be useful for its work, as well as the ATCM's discussions on Antarctic science priorities. In this regard, the Committee would review the list of CEP science needs contained in WP 34 at CEP XXI.
  - It had acknowledged the need for additional mechanisms to help the CEP address its increasing workload, and agreed that its work could be strengthened by access to modest financial support. In this regard, the Committee had welcomed the offer by the CEP Chair to undertake further work during the intersessional period, in consultation with the Secretariat and interested Members, to consider options for obtaining and managing possible CEP funding.
- (28) Turkey presented IP 94 *Ratification of Protocol on Environmental Protection to the Antarctic Treaty by Turkey*, to inform the Committee of Turkey's impending ratification of the Environment Protocol in 2017. During the

meeting Turkey advised the Committee that on 24 May 2017 it had completed its ratification process of the Protocol together with all six annexes. The Protocol and its six annexes had been published in Turkey's Official Gazette issue number 30075 and had become part of the Turkish legislation. Turkey noted that it soon hoped to become a full member of SCAR, and that it was interested to develop cooperation with other Parties.

- (29) The Committee welcomed Turkey's advice that it had acceded to the Environment Protocol and that ratification would be finalised shortly. The Committee looked forward to welcoming Turkey as a member of the Committee.

### **Item 5: Cooperation with other Organisations**

- (30) COMNAP presented IP 9 *Annual Report for 2016/2017 of the Council of Managers of National Antarctic Programs (COMNAP)*, and emphasised a number of highlights from the period since CEP XIX, including the review of its Antarctic Unmanned Aerial Systems (UAS) Operator's Handbook (IP 77), a revision of the COMNAP database, and progress in updating the COMNAP Station Catalogue. COMNAP reminded the Members of its Antarctic Research Fellowship for early career researchers, technicians and engineers, and encouraged Members to publicise the Fellowship to potential applicants.
- (31) SCAR presented IP 35 *The Scientific Committee on Antarctic Research Annual Report 2016-2017 to Antarctic Treaty Consultative Meeting XL* which provided a synopsis of SCAR's key outcomes and activities for the period, including those of its three science groups and six research programmes. It noted that SCAR had welcomed Austria, Colombia, Thailand and Turkey as new associate members from 2016. SCAR also drew attention to the new format of its Annual Report which was intended to make the report more accessible to a general audience.
- (32) The United Kingdom presented IP 50 *Report by the CEP Observer to the XXXIV SCAR Delegates Meeting*, which highlighted aspects of the XXXIV SCAR Delegates Meeting of particular relevance to the work of the CEP. These included SCAR's continued commitment to playing an active role in supporting the Antarctic Environments Portal, and to providing updates to the Antarctic Climate Change and the Environment report. It also noted SCAR would continue to provide reports and updates on matters relevant to the work of the CEP.
- (33) The Committee thanked COMNAP, SCAR and the United Kingdom for their reports. The Committee also congratulated Prof. Steven Chown for his election as President of SCAR, and acknowledged Prof. Jeronimo Lopez-Martinez for his achievements while SCAR President.
- (34) CCAMLR presented IP 53 *Report by the SC-CAMLR Observer to the Twentieth Meeting of the Committee for Environmental Protection*. The paper reported on five issues of common interest to the CEP and Scientific Committee of the Commission for the Conservation of Antarctic Marine Living Resources (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. It also noted that SC-CAMLR and its working groups had considered the report of the 2016 Joint CEP / SC-CAMLR Workshop on Climate Change and Monitoring and had endorsed the recommendations contained within the workshop report.
- (35) CCAMLR also reported that a Scientific Committee Symposium had been held on 13-14 October 2016, where SC-CAMLR had agreed that a work plan with short, medium, and long-term objectives was required, and that the CEP Five-Year Work Plan would form a useful template for its development. Further, SC-CAMLR had noted the need for broader engagement with the global scientific community, and was considering joint workshops and integration of medium to long-term work priorities with organisations such as the Scientific Committee on Oceanic Research and SCAR. CCAMLR also highlighted the agreement to establish the Ross Sea Region Marine Protected Area (MPA) in Conservation Measure 91-05 and that a three day Ross Sea Region MPA Research and Monitoring Plan Workshop was held in Italy in late April 2017.
- (36) The Committee thanked the SC-CAMLR observer for the report, and welcomed the Scientific Committee's endorsement of the recommendations arising from the 2016 joint CEP / SC-CAMLR workshop. The Committee looked forward to further engagement with SC-CAMLR both in this area and in other areas of mutual interest to ensure a coordinated approach to shared priorities.
- (37) The CEP Chair recalled that at CEP XIX the Committee had endorsed the recommendations arising from the Joint CEP / SC-CAMLR Workshop on Climate Change and Monitoring held in Punta Arenas, Chile, in May

2016, and had recognised the importance of monitoring progress on implementation of these recommendations. He further noted that ATCM XL would consider the outcomes of the joint workshop, and invited the Committee to consider providing updated advice to the ATCM on this matter.

### **CEP advice to the ATCM on outcomes from the 2016 Joint CEP/SC-CAMLR Workshop on Climate Change and Monitoring**

(38) The Committee recalled its advice to ATCM XXXIX that it had endorsed the recommendations arising from the Joint CEP / SC-CAMLR Workshop on Climate Change and Monitoring held in Punta Arenas, Chile, in May 2016, and had recognised the importance of monitoring progress on implementation of these recommendations. Noting that the ATCM Multi-Year Strategic Work Plan included an action for ATCM XL to consider the outcomes of the joint workshop, the Committee agreed to advise the ATCM that:

- SC-CAMLR had also welcomed the workshop report and endorsed the recommendations arising;
- actions by the CEP to advance the workshop recommendations were largely being addressed in conjunction with its ongoing work to implement the Climate Change Response Work Program; and
- with reference to workshop Recommendation 16, it had agreed to update its Five-Year Work Plan to include an action on planning for a future joint workshop, including a review of the implementation of the recommendations from the 2016 workshop.

(39) The WMO presented IP 112 *WMO Annual Report 2016-2017* and IP 116 *Southern Hemisphere Key Activities and Special Observing Periods during the Year of Polar Prediction*. These papers highlighted a number of WMO initiatives of potential interest to the CEP, and in particular provided an update on the Year of Polar Prediction (YOPP), and the planned development of the Antarctic Polar Regional Climate Centre (PRCC) Network. A special Observing Period for YOPP was planned in Antarctica from 16 Nov 2018 to 15 Feb 2019, which would act as a focus to enhance routine observations in an attempt to close the gaps in the observing system over an extended period of time. The success of YOPP would depend on the enthusiasm and support of Parties.

(40) The Committee thanked the WMO and reiterated its previous expression of support for the Year of Polar Prediction, and looked forward to further reports from the WMO to inform its discussions on the implications of climate change for the Antarctic environment.

#### *Nomination of CEP Representatives to other organisations*

(41) The Committee nominated:

- Dr Yves Frenot (France) to represent the CEP at the 29th COMNAP Annual General Meeting, to be held in Brno, Czech Republic, from 29 July to 2 August 2017; and
- Dr Polly Penhale (United States) to represent the CEP at the 36th meeting of SC-CAMLR, to be held in Hobart, Australia, from 16-20 October 2017.

### **Item 6: Repair and Remediation of Environment Damage**

(42) Australia introduced WP 28 *Review of the Antarctic Clean-Up Manual*, jointly prepared with the United Kingdom. In keeping with an action identified in the CEP Five-Year Work Plan, the co-authors proposed the establishment of an ICG to review and revise the Antarctic Clean-Up Manual. This would provide an opportunity to consider this topic collectively and systematically.

(43) The Committee thanked Australia and the United Kingdom for their paper and agreed on the importance of keeping the Clean-Up Manual up to date to reflect the current state of knowledge.

(44) The Committee agreed to establish an ICG to review the Antarctic Clean-Up Manual, with the following Terms of Reference:

1. Collate information on developments and advances in matters relevant to the clean-up of Antarctic past waste disposal sites, past work sites, and contaminated sites;

PRELIMINARY VERSION

2. Review the Antarctic Clean-Up Manual appended to Resolution 2 (2013), as updated in 2014, and suggest any modifications and additional guidance; and
  3. Report to CEP XXI.
- (45) The Committee welcomed the offer from Dr Phillip Tracey (Australia) to serve as convener.
- (46) The Committee also welcomed the other papers reported under this agenda item, which reported on actions taken by Parties consistent with their clean-up obligations under Annex III to the Protocol, and also with key guiding principles in the Clean-Up Manual. The Committee noted that these papers as well as related papers to previous meetings would be useful references for the ICG discussions.
- (47) The Republic of Belarus presented IP 3 *The experience in the reduction of the sources of waste generation in the Belarusian Antarctic Expedition*. Belarus described the steps it had taken to improve the management of fuel at its new station, in compliance with Annex III to the Protocol, including installation of a double-skinned fuel tank to avoid the use of 200-litre barrels. Belarus thanked the Russian Federation for technical assistance, as well as COMNAP, and highlighted the importance of international networks for small countries and small expeditions.
- (48) Italy presented IP 74 *Clean-up and removal of Italy installations at Sitry airfield camp along the avio-route MZS-DDU, Antarctica*, which described the operations to dismantle the Sitry airfield camp, a landing point between the Italian Mario Zucchelli Station and the French Station Dumont D'Urville. Italy reported that eleven buried drums and a Weatherhaven tent were left on the site and that, as the environmental impact of a dedicated traverse would be greater, no dedicated operation was planned to retrieve them. No significant leakage from the buried fuel drums was expected considering the high quality of drums used. If future activities required going near the site again, it would complete the work.
- (49) The following papers were also submitted under this agenda item:
- IP 48 *Clean-up of Scientific Equipment and Infrastructure from Mt. Erebus, Ross Island, Antarctica* (United States).
  - IP 49 *Report on Clean-up at Metchnikoff Point, Brabant Island* (United Kingdom).
  - IP 108 *Gestión de los desechos sólidos generados en la Estación Maldonado - XXI Campaña Antártica (2016-2017)* (Ecuador).

## **Item 7: Climate Change Implications for the Environment**

### **7a) Strategic Approach**

- (50) Referring to WP 13 *Antarctica and the Strategic Plan for Biodiversity 2011-2020*, Japan drew the Committee's attention to the fact that 22 May is the International Day for Biological Diversity.
- (51) SCAR presented IP 80 rev. 1 *Antarctic Climate Change and the Environment – 2017 Update*, which provided an update on the Antarctic Climate Change and the Environment Report, initially published in 2009 and updated in 2013. The paper detailed recent scientific advances in the understanding of climate change across the Antarctic continent and the Southern Ocean, and the associated impacts on terrestrial and marine biota. Research highlights included: a reduction of sea ice around the West Antarctic Peninsula; indications of improvement with regard to the ozone hole; the warming of oceans around Antarctica; southward transport of a boreal sea-star that was a potentially high-risk invader of the sub-Antarctic and Antarctic; and fast ice changes and associated impacts upon Adélie penguin populations. The paper noted the importance of undertaking further species-specific research in clarifying ecosystem responses to climate change.
- (52) The Committee thanked SCAR for continuing to provide annual updates to its Antarctic Climate Change and the Environment Report and acknowledged the considerable work that was involved in preparing IP 80 rev 1. The Committee strongly supported SCAR's move to present the report in a format accessible to a broad audience. It was noted that the summary information presented in the IP 80 rev.1 could usefully inform the preparation and review of content in the Environments Portal. The Committee reiterated the importance of scientific research as outlined in this paper for its work to understand and address the environmental implications of climate change. The Committee welcomed the advice that the WMO would be cooperating with SCAR on future update reports.

PRELIMINARY VERSION

- (53) WMO presented IP 115 *The Polar Climate Predictability Initiative of the World Climate Research Programme*. The paper reported on the work of the Polar Climate Predictability Initiative (PCPI) and on its six core themes, each related to a different aspect of polar predictability. The focus of the PCPI was on finding elements of the climate system that contribute to predictability, and how those processes could be improved in models. The PCPI aimed to advance understanding of the sources of polar climate predictability on timescales ranging from seasonal to multi-decadal. WMO noted that this work was relevant to the CCRWP, and also had links to the IPCC and the SCAR AntClim21 Scientific Research Programme.
- (54) WMO also presented IP 119 *Regional climate downscaling through the Antarctic-CORDEX project*. It reported on the work of the Antarctic Coordinated Regional Downscaling Experiment (CORDEX), to develop regional climate downscaling of Antarctica to provide an accurate description of regional- to local-scale climate phenomena and their variability and changes. WMO noted that there were currently 10 groups from 7 countries involved in CORDEX, and encouraged all interested Members to participate.
- (55) WMO presented IP 118 *Progress Update on WMO Polar Regional Climate Centres*. The WMO was taking steps to develop an Antarctic PRCC network that would generate regional climate products including climate monitoring and prediction in support of regional and national climate activities. One important goal was to address the needs of National Antarctic Programmes. The WMO would organise an Antarctic scoping workshop in 2018 to explore shared objectives at the technical level and a better understanding of the necessity for and desired form and function of an Antarctic Regional Climate Centre and would extend an invitation to the CEP and other interested organisations. The WMO invited Members, Experts and Observers to support the initiative, and assist the WMO to connect with their National Meteorological Services and National Antarctic Programmes.
- (56) The Committee acknowledged the wide range of climate activities undertaken by the WMO in the Antarctic region, many of which were likely to be relevant to the Committee's work on climate change issues. The Committee encouraged interested Members and Observers to engage with the WMO in support of these various initiatives.
- (57) ASOC presented IP 147 *Climate Change Report Card*. ASOC noted that it annually prepared a Climate Change Report Card to summarise key events and findings related to Antarctic Climate Change. ASOC recommended that the ATCM and CEP and its Members:
- Invest in robust monitoring of the Antarctic region to understand total patterns and anomalies of the Earth's climate system.
  - Invest in ecological monitoring, which is imperative for understanding responses to environmental changes among species and ecosystems, including from immediate and diffuse human impacts.
  - Develop a mechanism for ATCM reporting of Antarctic climate information to the broader public.
  - Develop precautionary or rapid-response management plans in place to address sudden climate-related events. For example, CCAMLR recently agreed Conservation Measure (CM) 24-04, *Establishing time-limited Special Areas for Scientific Study in newly exposed marine areas following ice-shelf retreat or collapse*. The ATCM may wish to consider similar measures for terrestrial or coastal areas newly exposed by ice-shelf retreat or collapse.
  - Establish protected areas that can be used as reference areas to attribute changes to climate change with no or minimal interference from local and regional activities.
- (58) The Committee welcomed IP 147 and noted that ASOC may wish to consider the suggestion raised by the United Kingdom to identify possible linkages to the CCRWP in future update reports. The Committee noted that a number of the recommendations raised in IP 147 related to the ongoing work of the CEP to implement the CCRWP.
- (59) ASOC also presented IP 152 rev. 1 *Tracking Antarctica - A WWF report on the state of Antarctica and the Southern Ocean*. ASOC noted that the report provided a scientific update on the state of Antarctica and the Southern Ocean. The report was launched in October 2016. ASOC highlighted that a key finding of the report was that increasing human activities would magnify the effects of climate change and increase the vulnerability of Antarctic ecosystems, mammals, fish, and birds. ASOC also noted that the report identified ways to respond to these challenges based on the latest scientific evidence. ASOC informed the Committee that the report would be

updated every two years.

- (60) The Committee noted that this report provided further motivation for its ongoing work on climate change, including through the CCRWP. The Committee thanked ASOC and its member organisation WWF for the paper.
- (61) Australia presented IP 84 *Climate change impacts on Antarctic ice-free areas*. The paper summarised a forthcoming publication in *Nature*, which quantified the potential impacts of climate change on Antarctic ice-free areas, home to over 99% of Antarctic terrestrial biodiversity. It reported that the publication explored the potential implications of physical changes for Antarctic terrestrial biodiversity, including increased competition and the spread of invasive species. The findings of the publication were directly relevant to the CEP's work on several priority issues, particularly efforts to prepare for, and build resilience to, the environmental impacts of a changing climate.
- (62) The Committee recognised that the papers submitted under this agenda item addressed priority areas in the CCRWP, and would be useful references as the Committee discusses ways to draw on the best available science to understand and address climate change implications for the environment.
- (63) The Russian Federation recalled that at CEP XIX it discussed changing sea ice conditions in the Antarctic. It noted that until the 2015-16 summer, sea ice extent had been increasing in the Antarctic, but the 2016-17 season experienced a sea ice minimum. Further, it highlighted the importance of paying attention to all factors that influence sea ice dynamics in the Antarctic, to avoid drawing incorrect conclusions.
- (64) WMO noted that it was well documented that sea ice extent around Antarctica had on average seen a relatively small increase until recent years, while in contrast sea ice extent in the Arctic had been consistently decreasing. WMO explained that as the ozone hole starts to repair, sea ice extent is expected to decrease further in Antarctica, though uncertainties are large.
- (65) SCAR noted that the 2017 Antarctic Climate Change update (IP 80 rev. 1) addressed changes in Antarctic sea ice both in the text and in Figure 1. SCAR emphasised that the time series in Figure 1 was insufficient to make specific future predictions.
- (66) The following papers were also submitted under this agenda item:
- IP 13 *U.K./U.S. Research Initiative on Thwaites: The Future of Thwaites Glacier and its Contribution to Sea-level Rise* (United States, United Kingdom).
  - IP 52 *Integrating Climate and Ecosystem Dynamics in the Southern Ocean (ICED) programme* (United Kingdom).
  - SP 8 *Actions Taken by the CEP and the ATCM on the ATME Recommendations on Climate Change* (ATS).

## **7b) Implementation and Review of the Climate Change Response Work Programme**

- (67) New Zealand introduced WP 2 *Informal Intersessional Discussion: Implementation of the Climate Change Response Work Programme (CCRWP)*. Noting that implementation of the CCRWP was encouraged by Parties as a matter of priority through Resolution 4 (2015), and that CEP discussions to date had not concluded on how to implement the programme, the paper contained five recommendations. These included: that the CEP consider options for establishing a Subsidiary Group to review and manage the CCRWP; and that the group develop mechanisms to support good participation and efficient handling of the work, including Secretariat support for translation of key texts and technical support for coordinating and communicating updates. New Zealand also noted that the group would provide advice to the CEP on actions, that innovative working methods would be required to support broad participation, and that further work was required to undertake an update to the CCRWP itself to support clear communication of the CCRWP with Members, Observers, Experts and the ATCM.
- (68) SCAR presented IP 69 *Mapping SCAR affiliated research to the CEPs Climate Change Response Work Programme (CCRWP)*, prepared over the 2016-17 intersessional period in response to a request from the Committee at CEP XIX. The paper noted that as SCAR affiliated research covered all the key issues of the CCRWP and was truly interdisciplinary, including the physical, biological and social sciences, SCAR groups were

well placed to contribute to the CCRWP. SCAR noted that clear and timely communication between the CEP and SCAR on the priorities and objectives of the CCRWP would maximise the likelihood of the potential of SCAR's contribution to the CCRWP being realised.

- (69) The Committee thanked New Zealand for leading the intersessional discussions on the implementation of the CCRWP and for preparing the report in WP 2. The Committee acknowledged all Members and Observers that actively participated in the discussions, and expressed broad support for the recommendations in the paper.
- (70) Regarding operational mechanisms, it was suggested that a Subsidiary Group could utilise the CEP discussion forum, which would facilitate the desired inclusive and transparent approach to managing related intersessional work. It was also suggested that enhancing the format of the CCRWP itself could assist with the aims of improving effective communication with stakeholders and with the ATCM. It was further noted that, in addition to work that may be conducted within a Subsidiary Group, it would be important for the Committee to continue to allocate dedicated time (or even a workshop) during future meetings to consider the CCRWP in order to facilitate wide engagement by Members.
- (71) The Committee agreed that key texts, for example texts for discussion and or draft annual updates of the CCRWP be translated, on a case-by-case basis. Noting that the Subsidiary Group would generally conduct its business remotely, the Committee considered that translation of key texts would meet the requirements of Rule 21.
- (72) The Committee agreed, subject to ATCM approval under Rule 10 of the CEP Rules of Procedure, to establish a Subsidiary Group on Climate Change Response (SGCCR) in accordance with the framework presented in Appendix 2.
- (73) The Committee agreed to appoint Ms Birgit Njaastad (Norway) as the convener of the SGCCR.
- (74) CEP XX tasked the SGCCR, in addition to the agreed ToR, to develop operating mechanisms in the 2017/18 intersessional period to support good participation and efficient handling of work, including through Secretariat support for translation of key texts and technical support for coordinating and communicating updates.
- (75) CEP XX noted that the SGCCR may, in future:
- Consider innovative ways of operating that engage a wide group of Members, including, for example, facilitating dedicated sessions or workshops as needed.
  - Address recommendations 18 (Give consideration to taking a more regional approach in the application of environmental management tools, in addition to the current continent-wide approach) and 29 (Remain alert to the development of climate change related conservation tools elsewhere in the world that may also have application in an Antarctic context (e.g. climate change adaptation plans, risk assessment tools and mechanisms for assisted translocation of endangered species)) from the 2010 Antarctic Treaty Meeting of Experts (ATME) on Climate Change.
- (76) The Committee emphasised the importance of ensuring broad participation and engagement by CEP Members in the work of the Subsidiary Group.
- (77) The Committee expressed appreciation for SCAR's significant efforts to provide a comprehensive report on the substantial body of SCAR-affiliated work related to the CCRWP. The Committee acknowledged the points raised in IP 69 and noted that SCAR-affiliated research covered all issues related to the CCRWP. The Committee also noted the challenge of feeding the results from the numerous ongoing SCAR initiatives into the framework of the CCRWP, moving from having an overview of the work to seeing how the outcomes of the work would provide answers to CCRWP tasks. The Committee agreed that effective communication between the CEP and SCAR on the implementation of the CCRWP remained important.
- (78) The Committee welcomed the WMO's offer to submit a similar paper to CEP XXI, mapping its own activities to the issues and needs identified in the CCRWP.

**CEP advice to the ATCM on implementation of the Climate Change Response Work Programme**

- (79) Noting the ATCM's request in Resolution 4 (2015) to receive annual updates from the CEP on implementation

of the Climate Change Response Work Programme, the Committee requested the ATCM to:

- Approve the establishment of a Subsidiary Group on Climate Change Response (SGCCR) in accordance with Rule 10 of the CEP Rules of Procedure to support the implementation of the CCRWP, as outlined in Appendix 2.
- Request Secretariat support for translation of key texts and technical support for coordinating and communicating updates to support good participation and efficient handling of work.
- Note that it had welcomed a comprehensive report from SCAR on the work of its subsidiary and affiliated groups relevant to the issues and needs identified in the CCRWP, which clearly indicated that SCAR groups are well placed to contribute.
- Also note that it had welcomed an offer from the WMO to provide a report to CEP XXI on its activities relevant to the CCRWP.

- (80) The CEP Chair referred to SP 8 *Actions Taken by the CEP and the ATCM on the ATME Recommendations on Climate Change*. The Committee noted that Recommendations 18-30 were related to the work of the CEP, and that all of these except recommendations 18 (on consideration of taking a more regional approach in the application of environmental management tools) and 29 (on remaining alert to the development of climate change related conservation tools elsewhere in the world) had been incorporated into the CCRWP. Therefore, the Committee agreed that addressing recommendations 18 and 29 would be recorded as future work for the Subsidiary Group on Climate Change Response, and that further updates from the Secretariat were not required by the CEP. The Committee noted that the ATCM may still wish to be updated on progress against recommendations, particularly recommendations 1-17.
- (81) United Kingdom presented IP 71 *Agreement by CCAMLR to establish time-limited Special Areas for Scientific Study in newly exposed marine areas following ice shelf retreat or collapse in the Antarctic Peninsula region*, jointly prepared with Belgium, Finland, France, Germany, Italy, Netherlands, Poland, Spain, and Sweden. It described the mechanism for the designation of Special Areas for Scientific Study under CCAMLR Conservation Measure 24-04, and the management measures that would apply, consistent with Recommendation 26 from the Antarctic Treaty Meeting of Experts (ATME) on Climate Change (2010).
- (82) The Committee welcomed CCAMLR CM 24-04 as a positive contribution towards the delivery of Recommendation 26 from the 2010 ATME.

## **Item 8: Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA)**

### **8a) Draft Comprehensive Environmental Evaluations**

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

### **8b) Other EIA Matters**

- (84) The United Kingdom introduced WP 41 *Environmental Impact Assessments – Update on broader policy discussions*, prepared jointly with Australia, Belgium, New Zealand and Norway. The paper noted that informal intersessional discussions had examined the broader environment impact assessment (EIA) policy issues identified during the ICG convened during the 2014/15 and 2015/16 intersessional periods to review the *Guidelines for Environmental Impact Assessment in Antarctica*. The United Kingdom noted that the paper was not an attempt to summarise the discussions, but rather to distil and advance the salient points and areas of general agreement. The issues presented in the paper were divided into three categories, based on how easily they could be addressed. The paper presented six recommendations to the CEP relating to: the terms of reference for intersessional discussions examining CEEs; the establishment of a central repository for practical EIA guidance and resources, additional to the EIA guidelines; the effectiveness of Resolution 1 (2005); standard approaches to environmental baseline surveys; adding other EIA related tasks to the CEP Five Year Work Plan; and seeking ATCM advice on EIA priorities.
- (85) The Committee thanked the United Kingdom and the co-authors for their work in the preparation of the paper and noted its importance, and expressed general support for the recommendations. In addition, a number of Members and ASOC expressed interest in participation in further discussions on the matter.

PRELIMINARY VERSION

- (86) The Committee agreed to update the *Procedures for intersessional CEP consideration of draft CEEs* (Appendix 3) to include the following standard ToR:
- Whether the CEE: i) has identified all the environmental impacts of the proposed activity; and ii) suggests appropriate methods of mitigating (reducing or avoiding) those impacts.
- (87) The Committee also agreed to include the following actions in the CEP Five-Year Work Plan:
- Members and Observers work to progress and coordinate information that will assist development of guidance on identifying and assessing cumulative impacts.
  - Ask SCAR to provide guidance on how to undertake an environmental baseline conditions survey, and consider their advice in due course.
  - Encourage Members to provide feedback on the utility of the revised set of *Guidelines for Environmental Impact Assessment in Antarctica* in the preparation of EIAs.
  - Consider potential changes required to the EIA database to improve its utility with a view to giving proposals to the Secretariat.
- (88) With respect to the 2<sup>nd</sup> bullet point, SCAR indicated its willingness to support the CEP by providing this guidance, however it cautioned that the scope of the advice provided would be dependent upon the resources available to support this work.
- (89) The Committee agreed on the benefit of having collated generally applicable resource material to assist in the preparation of EIAs and to be used alongside the revised EIA guidelines. As there was no consensus on how this material might be presented (whether as a centralised repository of information, an annex to the revised EIA guidelines, or as an EIA manual), no actions were added to the CEP Five-Year Work Plan. The Committee encouraged Members to share their experiences and resources and noted that the presentation of material could be considered in the future once sufficient material had been collated.
- (90) The Committee agreed that Resolution 1 (2005) remained up-to-date and continued to provide highly useful information.

**CEP advice to the ATCM on policy issues associated with the Environmental Impact Assessment process**

- (91) The Committee considered a report on intersessional discussions about broader policy issues related to the EIA provisions of Annex I, as identified by the ICG convened during the 2014/15 and 2015/16 intersessional periods to review the *Guidelines for Environmental Impact Assessment in Antarctica*, and agreed to advise the ATCM that:
- It recommended that all Parties provide the information requested in Resolution 1 (2005) in an appropriate and timely manner.
  - It requested advice from the ATCM on the extent to which the CEP should begin work on:
    - Creating an appropriate and effective method within the Antarctic Treaty system of preventing an environmentally-damaging project proceeding.
    - Potential application for Antarctica of ‘screening and scoping’ processes commonly applied as part of the EIA process for large projects in other parts of the world.
    - Processes for regular independent review of CEE-level activities (including the assessment of compliance with any Permit Condition imposed by the Competent Authority).
- (92) Belarus presented IP 5 *Towards establishing of values of critical loads and thresholds for the Antarctic environment*, which noted that while the unique ecosystems of the Antarctic area are particularly sensitive to anthropogenic impact, the terms ‘load’, ‘limit’, ‘threshold’ and similar had rarely occurred in the CEP documents. Belarus highlighted that data from the SCAR Scientific Research Programmes, such as State of the Antarctic Ecosystem (AntEco) and Antarctic Thresholds – Ecosystem Resilience and Adaptation (AnT-ERA), could help establish thresholds. Belarus suggested that the CEP consider adding the task of developing a methodological

## PRELIMINARY VERSION

background and informational basis for the assessment of critical load levels when it revises guidance for the preparation of Comprehensive Environmental Evaluations (CEEs).

- (93) Germany presented IP 41 *Final Modernization of Gondwana Station, Terra Nova Bay, northern Victoria Land*, which noted that the work to renovate Gondwana Station had been completed in October and November 2016. It reported that the station was ready to support scientific research in northern Victoria Land for at least 25 to 30 years.
- (94) Italy presented IP 70 *Final Comprehensive Environmental Evaluation for the construction and operation of a gravel runway in the area of Mario Zucchelli Station, Terra Nova Bay, Victoria Land, Antarctica*. The paper presented the final CEE, which had been approved by the Italian Ministry of Environment and Protection of Land and Sea, and allowed for submission by the Italian Ministry of Foreign Affairs and International Cooperation. It noted that the final CEE addressed feedback received from the Committee at CEP XIX. Italy concluded that the benefits of the proposed infrastructure, in terms of more reliable and cost effective management of the Italian scientific and logistic operations, as well as increased safety and cooperation with neighbouring Antarctic programs, would outweigh the environmental impacts. Italy reiterated that it was committed to trying to minimise, as much as possible, potential environmental impacts related to the construction of the gravel runway.
- (95) The Republic of Korea congratulated Italy for the completion of its final CEE and noted that Italy had reconsidered and withdrawn the use of explosives in the construction of the runway, to minimise impact on a nearby penguin colony. The Republic of Korea expressed a desire to collaborate with Italy to reduce the cumulative impacts of their usage of the area.
- (96) The Committee thanked Italy for the presentation of IP 70, outlining its response to how the comments on the draft CEE raised at CEP XIX had been addressed in the final CEE.
- (97) Ecuador presented IP 106 *Environmental Compliance Audit of the XX Ecuadorian Antarctic Expedition (2015-2016)*, which reported on its first Environmental Compliance Audit to assess the environmental impact of activities undertaken at its station Maldonado during its 20th expedition.
- (98) The following papers were also submitted under this agenda item:
- SP 7 rev. 2 *Annual list of Initial Environmental Evaluations (IEE) and Comprehensive Environmental Evaluations (CEE) prepared between April 1st 2016 and March 31st 2017* (ATS).
  - BP 3 *Information on the Progress of the Renovation of the King Sejong Korean Antarctic Station on King George Island, South Shetland Islands* (Republic of Korea).

## **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*

- (99) The convener of the Subsidiary Group on Management Plans (SGMP), Patricia Ortúzar (Argentina) introduced the first part of WP 45 *Subsidiary Group on Management Plans Report of activities during the intersessional period 2016-2017* on behalf of the SGMP. The convener thanked all active participants in the SGMP for their hard work and reminded the Committee that all Members were welcome to join the SGMP. In accordance with terms of reference #1 to #3, the SGMP had been prepared to consider the following five draft Antarctic Specially Protected Area (ASPAs) management plans referred by the CEP for intersessional review:
- ASPA 125: Fildes Peninsula, King George Island (25 de Mayo) (Chile).
  - ASPA 144: Chile Bay (Discovery Bay), Greenwich Island, South Shetland Islands (Chile).
  - ASPA 145: Port Foster, Deception Island, South Shetland Islands (Chile).
  - ASPA 146: South Bay, Doumer Island, Palmer Archipelago (Chile).

PRELIMINARY VERSION

- ASPA 150: Ardley Island, Maxwell Bay, King George Island (25 de Mayo) (Chile).

(100) The SGMP advised the CEP that the five management plans were still under review by the proponent, so revised versions of the plans were not yet available for the SGMP for review.

*ii) Revised draft Management Plans which have not been reviewed by the Subsidiary Group on Management Plans*

(101) The Committee considered revised management plans for seven ASPAs and one Antarctic Specially Managed Area (ASMA). In each case the proponent(s) summarised the suggested changes to the existing management plan and recommended its approval by the Committee and referral to the ATCM for adoption.

- WP 7 rev.1 *Revision of the Management Plan for Antarctic Specially Protected Area (ASPAs) No. 111 Southern Powell Island and adjacent islands, South Orkney Islands (United Kingdom).*
- WP 8 *Revision of the Management Plan for Antarctic Specially Protected Area (ASPAs) No. 140 Parts of Deception Island, South Shetland Islands (United Kingdom).*
- WP 9 rev.1 *Revision of the Management Plan for Antarctic Specially Protected Area (ASPAs) No. 129 Rothera Point, Adelaide Island (United Kingdom).*
- WP 10 rev.1 *Revision of the Management Plan for Antarctic Specially Protected Area (ASPAs) No. 110 Lynch Island, South Orkney Islands (United Kingdom).*
- WP 11 rev.1 *Revision of the Management Plan for Antarctic Specially Protected Area (ASPAs) No. 115 Lagotellerie Island, Marguerite Bay, Graham Land (United Kingdom).*
- WP 12 rev.1 *Revision of the Management Plan for Antarctic Specially Protected Area (ASPAs) No. 109 Moe Island, South Orkney Islands (United Kingdom).*
- WP 14 rev.1 *Updated Management Plan and maps for Antarctic Specially Managed Area No. 5 Amundsen-Scott South Pole Station, South Pole (United States and Norway).*
- WP 38 *Revision of the Management Plan for Antarctic Specially Protected Area (ASPAs) No. 165 Edmonson Point, Wood Bay, Ross Sea (Italy).*

(102) With respect to WP 7 rev.1 (ASPAs 111), WP 8 (ASPAs 140), WP 9 rev.1 (ASPAs 129), WP 10 rev.1 (ASPAs 110), WP 11 rev.1 (ASPAs 115) and WP 12 rev.1 (ASPAs 109), the United Kingdom noted that the management plans had been reviewed and revised with reference to the *Guide to the Preparation of Management Plans for Antarctic Specially Protected Areas* (the Guide), and only minor changes to the existing plans were proposed. Plans for ASPAs that included bird colonies had been updated with a statement clarifying that overflight of bird colonies within the Area by remotely piloted aircraft systems (RPAS) shall not be permitted unless for scientific or operational purposes, and in accordance with a permit issued by an appropriate national authority. References to the Antarctic Conservation Biogeographic Regions (Resolution 6 (2012)) and to the Antarctic Important Bird Areas (Resolution 5 (2015)) had been added. The management plan for ASPAs 140 was revised to better protect botanical values; specifically, the status of Site J Perchú Cone was changed to a Prohibited Zone (as has been done already at other geothermal sites) and reference to the SCAR Code of Conduct for Activity within Terrestrial Geothermal Environments in Antarctica was added.

(103) With respect to WP 14 rev.1 (ASMA 5) the United States and Norway noted that revisions had been made in consultation with more than 50 members of the science community, with the Amundsen-Scott South Pole Station management team, and with input from non-governmental visitor groups including IAATO. Revisions to the management plan included adjustments to sector boundaries to reflect new survey data, the renaming of several pre-existing zones to “restricted zones” to maintain consistency with CEP discussions on zoning, the simplification of the quiet sector by removing the “quiet circle”, and providing a list and locations of designated HSMs in lieu of the Historic Zone.

(104) With respect to WP 38 (ASPAs 165) Italy noted that only minor changes were proposed, including a revision of Map 4 to highlight the penguin colonies and add a new seasonal campsite and a walking path. Other changes made included updating activities, references, and census information to reflect recently conducted scientific studies.

- (105) To address comments raised during the meeting regarding the revised provisions relating to the use of UAV / RPAS, the Committee agreed minor changes to the revised management plans for ASPA 109, ASPA 110, ASPA 111, ASPA 115, and ASPA 129. The Committee also agreed a minor change proposed during the meeting to a map contained in the revised management plan for ASMA 5. With these changes, the Committee approved all of the revised management plans that had not been reviewed by the SGMP.

**CEP advice to the ATCM on revised management plans for ASPAs and ASMAs**

- (106) The Committee agreed to forward the following revised management plans to the ATCM for approval by means of a Measure:

#	Name
ASPA 109	Moe Island, South Orkney Islands
ASPA 110	Lynch Island, South Orkney Islands
ASPA 111	Southern Powell Island and adjacent islands, South Orkney Islands
ASPA 115	Lagotellerie Island, Marguerite Bay, Graham Land
ASPA 129	Rothera Point, Adelaide Island
ASPA 140	Parts of Deception Island, South Shetland Islands
ASPA 165	Edmonson Point, Wood Bay, Ross Sea
ASMA 5	Amundsen-Scott South Pole Station, South Pole

*iii) New draft management plans for protected/managed areas*

- (107) No new draft management plans for protected/managed areas were submitted.

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

- (108) China introduced WP 35 *Report of the Informal Discussion for the intersessional period of 2016/17 on the Proposal for a new Antarctic Specially Managed Area at Chinese Antarctic Kunlun Station, Dome A*. Following discussions at previous CEP meetings, and informal intersessional discussions, on China's proposal to designate an ASMA at the Chinese Antarctic Kunlun Station, Dome A, the paper reported on further informal discussions led by China during the 2016/17 intersessional period, regarding management options for the Dome A area. China expressed its thanks to the seven Members who participated in the informal discussions.
- (109) The paper presented China's responses to comments provided by several participants, noting that: it considered that the protection and management of Dome A should be maintained within the framework of the Antarctic Treaty system and its management tools; it agreed that the Committee should encourage Members planning to carry out activities in the area to consult China early in the planning stages, consistent with the provisions of Article 6.1 of the Protocol and Recommendation XV-17 (1989); and it appreciated that several Members had shared their experiences with managing their Antarctic stations, but it continued to have some concerns about the suggestion of applying China's national procedures.
- (110) China indicated its willingness to learn about potential alternative management options for the region and reiterated its view that an ASMA was the most appropriate tool to proactively manage and protect the scientific and environmental values at Dome A. China informed the Committee that it intended to develop a draft Code of Conduct as the first possible management option for Dome A, and offered to lead informal intersessional discussion during 2017/18 based on the draft. China recommended that the CEP support the proposal, and encouraged interested and concerned Members and organisations, such as SCAR and COMNAP, to participate.
- (111) The Committee thanked China for leading the intersessional discussions and for the report presented in WP 35. It also thanked Members who had contributed to the discussions. The Committee recalled earlier discussions on this

topic and welcomed the progress that had been made. The Committee also welcomed China's continuing engagement with others on options for the management of the Dome A area.

- (112) Argentina expressed its view that all areas needed to be protected by tools provided in the Protocol and those adopted by the ATCM, rather than relying on national procedures, and that any code of conduct should relate to the management of activities and conduct of personnel in an area rather than management of the area itself.
- (113) The Committee welcomed China's offer to draft a Code of Conduct for Dome A and to lead intersessional discussions based on that draft. Some Members expressed reservations about the idea that a Code of Conduct would be approved by the means of a Resolution. China clarified that it did not intend the Code of Conduct to be adopted by Resolution at this stage, but noted that international interest in scientific research at Dome A was increasing, and that it may be appropriate to consider such a procedure in the future. The Committee encouraged interested Members and Observers to contribute to this work, and looked forward to receiving a further report on progress.

## 9b) Historic Sites and Monuments

- (114) Norway introduced WP 47 *Report of the intersessional contact group established to develop guidance material for conservation approaches for the management of Antarctic heritage objects*, jointly prepared with the United Kingdom. It reported on the first period of the ICG established at CEP XIX to develop guidance for conservation approaches for the management of Antarctic heritage objects. The ICG discussed overarching principles, inputs and considerations for the list of themes presented in ICG term of reference #2, fine-tuned some key overarching principles, and started discussions on a framework for the guidance material to be developed. It reported on some key issues discussed during the ICG including: that the understanding of the terms "sites" and "monuments" needed further consideration; that considering the concepts of general heritage values and specific historic values separately could be useful; that the introduction of concept of the universality must be treated carefully; and that guidance material should provide an overview of the broad suite of management options available, with an emphasis on how to assess site/monuments against these various options. The co-authors recommended that the Committee: request the ICG to continue its work in the 2017-2018 intersessional period; and agree to modified Terms of Reference for the further work of the ICG ahead of producing guidance material for CEP XXI.
- (115) The Committee thanked Norway and the United Kingdom for leading the first period of intersessional work in the ICG, and acknowledged the contributions of other Members and Observers that had participated. The Committee welcomed the report on the progress of the ICGs discussions. It recognised that the ICG was dealing with complicated issues and discussions.
- (116) The Committee noted that the need to balance between the provisions of Annex III regarding clean-up and Annex V regarding the protection of historic sites was integral to the work of the ICG.
- (117) The Committee noted that several points raised during the meeting could be given further consideration during the continuing ICG discussions, including: that an overarching vision would be useful; further discussion would be required on identifying levels of significance for sites and monuments and on the concept of universality; further consideration of how to share and commemorate events and actions represented by sites and monuments; and the importance of considering environmental impacts during further work in the context of heritage management.
- (118) The Committee agreed that the ICG would continue during the 2017/18 intersessional period, with the following terms of reference:
1. To finalise discussions and draft guidelines for the consideration of the CEP relating to the assessment of Heritage and Historic Sites in Antarctica, based on the discussion conducted in the 2016-17 intersessional period and informed by the discussions at CEP XX. These guidelines should cover:
    - providing guidance for considering whether a site/object merits HSM designation; and
    - providing guidance to management options for HSMs.
  2. To liaise in this work with international and national heritage experts as appropriate.
  3. To produce guidance material for consideration at CEP XXI.
- (119) The Committee thanked Norway and the United Kingdom for their agreement to continue leading the work of the ICG during the next intersessional period, encouraged broad participation during the second round of exchanges and looked forward to receiving a further report at CEP XXI.

(120) The following paper was also submitted under this item:

- BP 4 *Antarctic Historic Resources: Ross Sea Heritage Restoration Project. Conservation of Hillary's Hut, Scott Base, Antarctic HSM 75* (New Zealand).

### 9c) Site Guidelines

- (121) IAATO presented IP 164 *Report on IAATO Operator Use of Antarctic Peninsula Landing Sites and ATCM Visitor Site Guidelines, 2016-17 Season*, which reported the data collected by IAATO from IAATO Operator Post Visit Report Forms for the 2016-2017 season. IAATO noted that overall tourism levels in Antarctica had increased from the peak season of 2007-08, and were likely to exceed these numbers during the 2017/18 season. It noted the increase was not uniform, with a few sites providing the majority of the increase, and others seeing a decrease in activity. IAATO emphasised that over 95% of all landed tourism activity in the Antarctic Peninsula continued to be focused on traditional commercial ship-borne tourism. It mentioned that the increase in passenger numbers was largely due to new vessels being operated with higher passenger capacity. IAATO highlighted that all of the top visited sites were covered either by ATCM Visitor Site Guidelines or National Programme management guidelines.
- (122) The Committee thanked IAATO for the report and welcomed its continued commitment to reporting to the CEP on IAATO operator landing site and Visitor Site Guidelines use.

### 9d) Marine Spatial Protection and Management

- (123) Argentina presented IP 127 *Update on the process of designation of a Marine Protected Area (MPA) in the West Antarctic Peninsula and Southern Arc of Scotia (Domain 1)* jointly prepared with Chile. It reported on the activities led by Argentina and Chile to identify priority areas in the West Antarctic Peninsula and Southern Scotia Arc (Domain 1). The activities were a result of multinational efforts with multiple contributions of data and experiences. The co-authors hoped to present an MPA proposal for Domain 1 at the upcoming Meeting of the CCAMLR Working Group on Ecosystem Monitoring and Management (WG-EMM), and encouraged the Committee to support CCAMLR's activity with regards to the process of designation of MPAs. They further encouraged the Committee to note the importance of the work led by Argentina and Chile, in collaboration with several Members, with the purpose of identifying priority conservation areas in Domain 1, and invited more Members to collaborate with Argentina and Chile in achieving a greater understanding of extraction activities in Domain 1, so as to achieve an effective MPA design.
- (124) Welcoming Argentina and Chile's proposed presentation to WG-EMM, ASOC, on behalf of the International Union for Conservation of Nature (IUCN), informed the Committee of the upcoming fourth International Marine Protected Areas Congress (IMPAC4) in La Serena-Coquimbo, Chile, in September 2017, and a special session on Antarctic MPAs to be held at the meeting.
- (125) The Committee thanked Argentina and Chile for presenting the paper. It noted that substantive discussion on the designation of MPAs in the Convention Area appropriately occurred within CCAMLR, but welcomed the report on the progress of the planning work in Domain 1 led by Argentina and Chile.
- (126) The United Kingdom and the United States noted that they had already contributed to developing the proposal along with other Members, and expressed their interest in contributing and collaborating with Argentina and Chile in the ongoing work. The Committee noted comments raised during the discussion, including an encouragement to the co-sponsors of the work to consider flexibility in the further development of proposals. It encouraged interested Members to collaborate with Argentina and Chile on the ongoing work in the areas highlighted in the paper.
- (127) The Committee noted that it might be useful in the future to consider and discuss means and opportunities to look at the connectivity between ocean and land, and if and how complementary measures within the framework of the Environment Protocol, in particular Annex V, could support and strengthen marine protection initiatives.
- (128) Several Members also took the opportunity to note the progress on marine spatial protection by CCAMLR including the designation of the Ross Sea Region MPA.

**9e) Other Annex V Matters**

- (129) The SGMP convener, Patricia Ortúzar (Argentina), introduced the second part of WP 45 *Subsidiary Group on Management Plans Report of activities during the intersessional period 2016-2017*. The SGMP had continued work on developing guidance documents for ASMAs, in accordance with terms of reference 4 and 5 on improving management plans, and the process for their intersessional review. This work was led by the SGMP Members from Norway and the United States and was reported in WP 16 *Guidance Material for Antarctic Specially Managed Area (ASMA) designations*. Argentina also presented the proposed SGMP work plan for the 2017/18 intersessional period.
- (130) Norway introduced WP 16 *Guidance Material for Antarctic Specially Managed Area (ASMA) designations*, prepared jointly with the United States. The paper presented the results of the SGMP's work, in accordance with the work plan agreed at CEP XIX, to finalise the development of guidance on determining whether an area could merit designation as an ASMA, and to initiate development of guidance on how to prepare and present a management plan if an ASMA designation is warranted. It reported that discussions were constructive and fruitful and that nine Members and Observers were involved in the process. It proposed that the Committee consider the two sets of guidelines, adjust them as appropriate, and agree to adopt and submit them to the ATCM to encourage their dissemination and use by means of a Resolution.
- (131) Noting its role as a non-governmental organisation in issues of environmental protection and management in Antarctica, ASOC expressed its interest in continuing to be involved in discussions about potential ASMAs.
- (132) The Committee endorsed the *Guidance for assessing an area for a potential Antarctic Specially Managed Area designation* and the *Guidelines for the preparation of ASMA management plans*, as modified to address comments raised during the meeting.
- (133) The Committee agreed that in a future revision of the *Guidance for assessing an area for a potential Antarctic Specially Managed Area designation* it could be useful to include a schematic or table that would illustrate / summarise the process of assessing and drawing conclusions with regard to assessing an area for potential ASMA designation. It was noted that this could further improve the guidelines and facilitate the decision-making process.
- (134) The United Kingdom noted that while it was prepared to remove a paragraph relating to place names from the original draft of the *Guidelines for the preparation of ASMA management plans*, in order to ensure the adoption of those Guidelines, it nevertheless wished to highlight the excellent work conducted by SCAR in the development and maintenance of the SCAR Composite Gazetteer of Antarctica. It also noted that it highly valued the gazetteer and believed it was the appropriate place for submitting new place names.
- (135) The Committee thanked the SGMP for its advice, encouraged further participation among Members, and agreed to adopt the following SGMP work plan for 2017/18:

<b>Terms of Reference</b>	<b>Suggested tasks</b>
ToR 1 to 3	Review draft management plans referred by CEP for intersessional review and provide advice to proponents (including the five postponed plans from the 2016/17 intersessional period)
ToR 4 and 5	Work with relevant Parties to ensure progress on review of management plans overdue for five-yearly review
	Consider further improvements to the Guidance for assessing an area for a potential Antarctic Specially Managed Area designation
	Review and update SGMP work plan
Working Papers	Prepare report for CEP XXI against SGMP ToR 1 to 3
	Prepare report for CEP XXI against SGMP ToR 4 and 5

**CEP advice to the ATCM on guidance material for Antarctic Specially Managed Areas (ASMAs)**

- (136) The Committee endorsed the *Guidance for assessing an area for a potential Antarctic Specially Managed Area designation* and the *Guidelines for the preparation of Antarctic Specially Managed Area management plans* and agreed to forward to the ATCM for approval a draft Resolution encouraging their dissemination and use.
- (137) The CEP Chair recalled that CEP XIX had endorsed SCAR's *Code of Conduct for Activities within Terrestrial Geothermal Environments in Antarctica*, and had agreed that it would be beneficial to similarly encourage the dissemination and use of other SCAR Codes of Conduct through a Resolution of the ATCM.
- (138) SCAR introduced WP 17 *SCAR's Code of Conduct for the Exploration and Research of Subglacial Aquatic Environments*, which provided reviewed and revised guidance on the planning and undertaking of exploration and research in subglacial aquatic environments. SCAR highlighted that broad and extensive consultation had been undertaken in the review and revision of this non-mandatory Code of Conduct, including with policy makers, environmental managers and scientific experts, and through SCAR subsidiary bodies, including the Standing Committee on the Antarctic Treaty System (SCATS). Noting that no substantive changes had been made, SCAR recommended that the CEP consider the revised Code of Conduct, and if agreed, encourage the dissemination and use of the Code of Conduct when planning and undertaking activities in subglacial aquatic environments.
- (139) The Committee thanked SCAR for submitting the paper and for the broad consultation with stakeholders to review and improve the non-mandatory Code of Conduct. With minor modifications to incorporate proposals raised during the meeting, the Committee agreed to encourage the dissemination and use of the Code of Conduct when planning and undertaking activities in subglacial aquatic environments.

**CEP advice to the ATCM on SCAR's Code of Conduct for the Exploration and Research of Subglacial Aquatic Environments**

- (140) The Committee endorsed *SCAR's Code of Conduct for the Exploration and Research of Subglacial Aquatic Environments*, and agreed to forward it to the ATCM for approval by a draft Resolution on encouraging its dissemination and use.
- (141) SCAR introduced WP 18 *SCAR's Environmental Code of Conduct for Terrestrial Scientific Field Research in Antarctica*, which presented reviewed and revised guidance on the planning and undertaking of terrestrial scientific field research in Antarctica. SCAR informed the Committee that broad and extensive consultation was undertaken in the review and revision of this non-mandatory Code of Conduct, including with policy makers, environmental managers and scientific experts, and through SCAR subsidiary bodies, including the SCATS. SCAR reported that minor edits, additions and improvements had been made to the Code of Conduct. It recommended that the CEP consider the Code of Conduct and, if agreed, encourage its dissemination and use when planning and undertaking terrestrial scientific field research in Antarctica.
- (142) The Committee thanked SCAR for its work to review and improve this Code of Conduct. It emphasised the importance of having such a Code of Conduct, noting how such guidance for specific types of activities in Antarctica contributed to enhancing the overall protection of Antarctica. It also noted that the current version of the Code had been valuable.
- (143) Although some Members expressed support for the Code of Conduct to be adopted as it was presented, other Members considered that further consultation was required, including by National Antarctic Programmes, which support the activities of field researchers.
- (144) The Committee welcomed SCAR's willingness to undertake further consultations, including with COMNAP, with a view to presenting a new revision for consideration at CEP XXI.
- (145) The Committee also welcomed SCAR's advice that it would present its *Code of Conduct for the Use of Animals for Scientific Purposes in Antarctica* for the Committee's consideration at CEP XXI.
- (146) Argentina noted the usefulness of having these Codes presented to the Committee as working papers, in that way allowing for their official translation into the four official languages of the Antarctic Treaty.
- (147) The United Kingdom introduced WP 21 *ASPA/ASMA prior assessment process*, prepared jointly with Norway.

## PRELIMINARY VERSION

Recalling discussions at CEP XIX, the co-authors reported on intersessional consultations that had been held with interested Members, and presented a revised non-mandatory template for prior assessment of ASPAs. They recommended that the CEP recognise the benefits of providing for a standardised presentation of information on proposed new ASPA designations, where the proponent(s) decide it would be helpful to engage the Committee in a prior assessment discussion, and agree that the *Guidelines: A prior assessment process for the designation of ASPAs and ASMAs* (Appendix 3 to CEP XVIII report) should be amended to include the non-mandatory ASPA prior assessment template.

- (148) The Committee thanked the United Kingdom and Norway for the paper and for the intersessional consultation with interested Members. The Committee emphasised that the purpose of the template was to provide a practical and non-mandatory means of facilitating provision of information consistent with the prior assessment guidelines and not to delay or impede proposals to designate new areas, nor to imply prior approval of a new area designation.
- (149) In response to a query from IAATO, the United Kingdom stated that the intention was that information provided in the template in general would be based on sound scientific evidence. Some minor changes were suggested and incorporated in the final version of the template.
- (150) The Committee noted that an ASMA template, although a more complex matter, could also be of value, and encouraged interested Members to consider the development of such a template.

### **CEP Advice to the ATCM on the Guidelines: A Prior Assessment process for the designation of ASPAs and ASMAs**

- (151) The Committee agreed to advise the ATCM that it had updated the *Guidelines: A Prior Assessment process for the designation of ASPAs and ASMAs* adopted at CEP XVIII, to include a non-mandatory ASPA prior assessment template to facilitate the provision of information consistent with the Guidelines (Appendix 4). This new version of the Guidelines replaced the version that had been appended to the CEP XVIII report in 2015.
- (152) Australia introduced WP 29 *Proposed update to the Antarctic Conservation Biogeographic Regions*, and referred to IP 15 *Antarctic biogeography revisited: updating the Antarctic Conservation Biogeographic Regions*, both jointly submitted with New Zealand and SCAR. The papers summarised a recent revision of the Antarctic Conservation Biogeographic Regions (ACBRs) adopted under Resolution 6 (2012). The revision reflected updates in underlying spatial layers, including the most current representation of Antarctica's ice-free areas, together with the results of new analyses justifying the inclusion of an additional (16<sup>th</sup>) biologically distinct area in the Prince Charles Mountains region. It reported that the revised spatial layer was available from the Australian Antarctic Data Centre and would be provided to the Antarctic Treaty Secretariat for general access and use. The co-authors recommended that the CEP endorse the revised Antarctic Conservation Biogeographic Regions (ACBRs Version 2), forward the draft Resolution presented in WP 29 to the ATCM for adoption, and request that the Antarctic Treaty Secretariat make the updated data layer available via its website.
- (153) The Committee thanked Australia, New Zealand and SCAR for their work on WP 29 and IP 15 and recalled its endorsement at CEP XV of the ACBRs as an important framework for its discussions relating to spatial values and environmental protection in Antarctica, and the ATCM's subsequent adoption of the ACBRs through Resolution 6 (2012) as a dynamic model to guide the work of the Committee.
- (154) The Committee agreed on the importance of continuing to update the framework, including to ensure that it incorporated up-to-date information about the biodiversity of Antarctic ice-free areas, drawing on the best available sources. Accordingly, the Committee agreed to endorse the revised ACBRs, and requested the Antarctic Treaty Secretariat to make the updated spatial data layer available on its website. The Committee also noted the advice from New Zealand that the updated spatial data layer would be made available through the map presented on the Antarctic Environments Portal website.

### **CEP advice to the ATCM on an update to the Antarctic Conservation Biogeographic Regions**

- (155) The Committee considered the results of recent research to revise the Antarctic Conservation Biogeographic Regions adopted under Resolution 6 (2012). To ensure that the work of the CEP and Parties is based on the most up-to-date understanding of the spatial distribution of Antarctic terrestrial biodiversity, the Committee recommended that the ATCM adopt the revised Antarctic Conservation Biogeographic Regions (ACBRs Version

2) and forwarded a draft Resolution to the ATCM for adoption to replace Resolution 6 (2012).

- (156) The United Kingdom introduced WP 37 *Antarctic Specially Protected Areas and Important Bird Areas*, jointly submitted with Australia, New Zealand, Norway and Spain. Recalling that Resolution 5 (2015) requested the CEP to update the ATCM on the extent to which Important Bird Areas (IBAs) in Antarctica were, or should be, represented in the network of ASPAs, this paper reported that two recent analyses of IBAs had examined the extent to which representative and potentially vulnerable bird colonies were currently represented within the ASPA Network. Those analyses were presented in IP 16 *Representation of Important Bird Areas in the network series of Antarctic Specially Protected Areas* (submitted by the United Kingdom, New Zealand and Norway) and IP 17 *High resolution mapping of human footprint across Antarctica and its implications for the strategic conservation of bird life* (submitted by the United Kingdom and Spain). The co-authors of WP 37 highlighted the importance of protecting bird colonies across a range of Antarctic bird species, and that a more consistent approach needed to be taken to protect all native Antarctic bird species. The co-sponsors also clarified that it should not be assumed that all IBAs should receive ASPA designation nor that bird colonies which were not IBAs should not be considered for ASPA designation. The co-authors recommended that the Committee consider these analyses and encouraged further intersessional work between interested Members to: develop criteria for assessing the suitability of bird colonies for ASPA designation, including identifying what constitutes “major colonies of breeding birds” as set out in Article 3(2)(c) of Annex V to the Protocol; and recommend to the Committee IBAs that meet those criteria.
- (157) The Committee thanked the authors of the papers submitted to the meeting for their work to support and advance the Committee’s consideration of the request in Resolution 5 (2015). The Committee agreed with the recommendation in WP 37 to undertake intersessional work to develop criteria for assessing the suitability of bird colonies for ASPA designation, including to identify what constitutes ‘major colonies of breeding birds’ as set out in Article 3.2(c) of Annex V to the Protocol, and to recommend to the Committee a list of IBAs that meet those criteria.
- (158) The Committee welcomed the offer of the United Kingdom to lead discussions during the intersessional period in consultation with interested Members and Observers. Many Members expressed their interest in participating in such intersessional work. The Committee noted that points raised by Members in the discussion during the meeting could be considered further during the intersessional work, including: the importance of also considering relevant information other than presented in IP 16 and IP 17, including peer-reviewed, ground-truthed studies and ongoing research such as that referred to by several Members; current protection and management mechanisms at sites that were not designated as ASPAs; and the relevance of the mechanisms available in Annex II, which played an important role in the protection of Antarctic bird colonies. On the latter point, the Committee welcomed the recent entry into force of the revision of Annex II.
- (159) With reference to IP 17, the Committee highlighted the importance of considering the assessment presented in the light of the results of ground truthing through field research and monitoring, and also with consideration to the characteristics of particular sites, and the results of human impact studies. The Committee also noted the comment made by the Netherlands regarding the potential wider relevance of the results presented in this paper for the Committee’s further discussions on the issue of the expanding human footprint and protection and wilderness in Antarctica, and its call for further work.
- (160) The Committee noted comments made by Argentina regarding the methods and results contained in the scientific paper attached to IP 17. Argentina expressed that the values for human footprint associated with the bird colony near Esperanza Station did not incorporate ground-based data and other relevant information, which could lead to misleading results. Argentina considered that this assessment should therefore be used with caution.
- (161) Belgium introduced WP 42 *Prior assessment of a proposed Antarctic Specially Protected Area (ASPAs) in the Sør Rondane Mountains*. Belgium notified the Committee that it had carried out a prior assessment for a proposed ASPA, in accordance with the provisions of Annex V to the Protocol and the *Guidelines: A prior assessment process for the designation of ASPAs and ASMAs* (see Appendix 3 to the CEP XVIII Report). Belgium requested further guidance from Members regarding the next steps in the process, including the drafting of a Management Plan. Belgium recommended that the Committee: agree that the values within the proposed ASPA in the Sør Rondane Mountains merit special protection; endorse the development of a Management Plan for the Area to be led by Belgium; and encourage interested Members to work with Belgium informally during the intersessional period in the development of a Management Plan for potential submission at CEP XXI.

PRELIMINARY VERSION

- (162) The Committee welcomed the information presented by Belgium consistent with the *Guidelines: A prior assessment process for the designation of ASPAs and ASMAs* and the associated non-mandatory template. The Committee noted that the paper provided an early opportunity for the Members to engage in the process of considering the proposal and aiding its development. At the same time, the Committee emphasised that the Guidelines were non-mandatory and were not intended to provide or imply prior designation approval by the Committee.
- (163) The Committee agreed that the environmental and scientific values found at the Sør Rondane Mountains site, including generally poorly studied organisms, merited further consideration for potential designation as an ASPA enhancing the representation of ASPAs in ACBR 6. It was also noted that information provided to ATCM XL indicated a potential increase in traffic in the area in the future, which could underpin the need to protect pristine areas in this region. The Committee welcomed Belgium's intention to further consider the development of a draft management plan for the area, and noted that several Members had expressed an interest to contribute to the work. It encouraged other interested Members and Observers to work with Belgium in the intersessional period.
- (164) The Committee noted a range of areas and topics for possible further consideration by Belgium. These included: consideration of further explanation of the values of the area in light of the provisions of the Annex V, including its 'outstanding values'; consideration of the merit of designating the area as an ASPA in light of existing management arrangements; consideration of the implications of a possible increase of activities in the area; consideration of historical activities which could inform the identification of possible inviolate areas that may warrant further specific protection; the possible exclusion of ice-covered areas between the ice-free areas; the possible inclusion of Utsteinen Ridge within the proposed area; the identification of possible risks associated with interactions between the station activities and the area in question; and the provision of further information about the presence of a petrel colony and the possible presence of endemic microbes, invertebrates and lichens.
- (165) As a general observation, the Committee suggested that Members using the prior assessment template in future could provide a description of the values of the area under consideration, in addition to identifying the presence or absence of particular types of values.
- (166) The Committee thanked Belgium for its work and looked forward to hearing about future progress. Belgium thanked the Committee for the positive response to WP 42 and noted that it intended to take all observations into account.
- (167) ASOC presented IP 149 *ASOC update on Marine Protected Areas in the Southern Ocean 2016-2017*, which reported on the discussions of Marine Protected Areas (MPAs) that took place at CCAMLR XXXV in October 2016. ASOC observed that with the adoption of the Ross Sea Region Marine Protected Area, CCAMLR could now address the adoption of additional MPAs in the Southern Ocean. ASOC stated that further progress on the designation of MPAs for East Antarctica and the Weddell Sea could be made at CCAMLR XXXVI in October 2017, and noted that the MPA proposals for these two regions were first submitted in 2010 and 2016 respectively. ASOC also noted that an Antarctic tour operator had issued a statement supporting current and future MPAs in the Southern Ocean, and expressed its hope that other tour operators would follow suit. ASOC recommended that the CEP note the progress made by CCAMLR on the adoption of the MPAs in the Southern Ocean and encourage CCAMLR to continue its work on this issue to completion, and recommended that the CEP consider developing a similar process of systematic conservation planning with a view to expanding the network of terrestrial and marine protected areas in Antarctica. ASOC further noted that in due time, the ATCM, CEP and CCAMLR should look at further harmonisation of their work on marine spatial protection.
- (168) IAATO thanked ASOC for providing a useful summary that could be of interest for those outside the CCALMR processes. Acknowledging ASOC's comment, IAATO reported that its Secretariat was collecting information on this issue to facilitate decision making among IAATO Members.
- (169) ASOC presented IP 153 *Considerations for the systematic expansion of the protected areas network*, in which ASOC noted that the system of ASPAs was still inadequate to protect the values listed in Annex V to the Protocol. ASOC suggested that in order to expand the ASPA system, the ATCM should initiate a systematic conservation planning process to identify and designate new ASPAs. ASOC advised the CEP that it had compiled an online database of datasets that it hoped could be useful in designating new ASPAs. ASOC recommended that the Committee: continue to populate the list of relevant available metadata to improve the classification of Antarctic Environments created using Environmental Domains Analysis and its application to protected area systematic development; initiate a five to ten year systematic conservation planning process aiming to establish a network of

PRELIMINARY VERSION

protected areas in the Antarctic Treaty Area in accordance with Annex V, Articles 3 (1) and (2); and complement this process with the use of other area-based protection instruments, including ASMAs and those available under other instruments of the Antarctic Treaty system (such as CCAMLR MPAs).

- (170) The Committee thanked ASOC for its papers and noted that some of the matters addressed in IP 153 were already raised in the CCWRP as a subject for future attention. The Committee agreed that the expansion of the protected areas network was an important issue that it was committed to examine in the future.
- (171) SCAR presented IP 166 *Systematic Conservation Plan for the Antarctic Peninsula*, jointly prepared with IAATO. SCAR and IAATO noted that they had recently agreed to undertake a collaborative effort to develop a systematic conservation plan for the Antarctic Peninsula, particularly with a view to managing the long-term sustainability of Antarctic tourism. In noting this was a new initiative, SCAR invited interested Members to collaborate in the process.
- (172) The Committee thanked SCAR and IAATO for the advice presented in IP 166. Several Members and Observers expressed interest in contributing to the initiative including through sharing experiences from other relevant work, and also to contribute to discussions on setting conservation goals and considering interactions between this work and other work underway or planned by the CEP and its Members. The Committee noted IAATO's advice that the initiative was part of a multi-dimensional strategy IAATO was developing for managing future growth, including site management, and encouraged interested Members to contact SCAR or IAATO, which had welcomed collaboration.
- (173) Portugal presented IP 23 *Historical and geo-ecological values of Elephant Point, Livingston Island, South Shetland Islands*, jointly submitted with Brazil, Spain, United Kingdom. It provided information on the high ecological value and historical significance of the ice-free area of Elephant Point (Livingston Island, South Shetland Island, Antarctica), and highlighted the importance of all five values outlined in Annex V to the Protocol (environmental, scientific, historic, aesthetic and wilderness). Portugal noted that the paper was intended to inform the Committee's considerations on the protection and management of this area, possibly by designation as an ASPA, or by incorporating it within the nearby ASPA 126 Byers Peninsula, Livingston Island.
- (174) IAATO informed the Committee that the site at Elephant Point, Livingston Island was used by tour operators. IAATO reported that the site had received about 1900 visitors last season, and that, in the absence of specific site guidelines, landings were managed using the *General Guidelines for Visitors to the Antarctic* (annexed to Resolution 3 (2011)), and IAATO mechanisms. IAATO offered to contribute expert knowledge of the site to future discussions, as required.
- (175) The Committee expressed its interest in receiving further updates as the co-authors continued to develop protection and management options for Elephant Point.
- (176) Australia presented IP 25 *Report of the Antarctic Specially Managed Area No. 6 Larsemann Hills Management Group*, jointly submitted with China, India, and the Russian Federation. The paper briefly reported on the activities carried out during 2015-16 by the Management Group established to oversee the implementation of the management plan for ASMA 6 Larsemann Hills. Key issues addressed by the group included: aviation coordination; collaboration on scientific research; and planned improvements to the main access route in the area. Australia also noted that China would chair the next period of the Management Group.
- (177) New Zealand presented IP 86 *Use of UAS for Improved Monitoring and Survey of Antarctic Specially Protected Areas*, which presented a summary of recent work undertaken by New Zealand scientists who used remotely piloted aircraft systems to conduct high resolution surveys at two Antarctic Specially Protected Areas in the Ross Sea region: Botany Bay (ASPA 154) and Cape Evans (ASPA 155). New Zealand reported that the survey work at Botany Bay would be completed in the 2017/18 season, and an updated management plan would be prepared on the basis of the survey results and submitted to CEP XXI.
- (178) The United Kingdom noted that New Zealand's approach in using UAV / RPAS to monitor and survey ASPAs pointed the way to the future for monitoring protected areas in Antarctica, and that such technology would enhance the opportunity to develop better understanding of protected areas.
- (179) The following papers were also submitted under this agenda item:

PRELIMINARY VERSION

- IP 34 *Workshop on Environmental Assessment of the McMurdo Dry Valleys: Witness to the Past and Guide to the Future* (United States).
- IP 44 *Significant change to ASPA No 151 Lions Rump, King George Island (Isla 25 de Mayo), South Shetland Islands* (Poland).
- IP 73 *Deception Island Antarctic Specially Managed Area (ASMA No. 4) - 2017 Management report* (United States, Argentina, Chile, Norway, Spain, and the United Kingdom).

## **Item 10: Conservation of Antarctic Flora and Fauna**

### **10a) Quarantine and Non-native Species**

- (180) The United Kingdom introduced WP 5 *Non-native Species Response Protocol*, prepared jointly with Spain, which presented a non-mandatory Response Protocol to facilitate decision-making in the event that a suspected non-native species is discovered in the Antarctic Treaty area. The paper noted that the CEP had repeatedly recognised the importance of developing further guidelines to help Parties respond to potential non-native species introductions.
- (181) The co-authors recommended that the Committee discuss the Response Protocol over the intersessional period, with the aim of adopting the Response Protocol into the CEP Non-native Species Manual at CEP XXI.
- (182) The Committee thanked the United Kingdom and Spain for presenting the proposed non-mandatory Response Protocol, and noted that this work related to needs and actions identified in the CEP Non-native Species Manual, the CEP Five-Year Work Plan and the Climate Change Response Work Programme. The Committee highlighted the value of including such a Response Protocol in the Non-native Species Manual.
- (183) Several Members indicated that they would agree to adopt the Response Protocol as presented in WP 5. Other Members wished to undertake further discussions on the document. The Committee welcomed the offer by the United Kingdom and Spain to consult with interested Members during the intersessional period to further revise the Response Protocol, with the aim of incorporating it into the CEP Non-native Species Manual at CEP XXI.
- (184) The Committee noted that, as appropriate, a number of comments raised by Members could be given further consideration during the intersessional discussions, including: requirements relating to environmental impact assessment of response actions; questions about non-native species that may be recently discovered but may have been in place for some time; and the idea of developing an illustrative guide to aid identifying particular species in the field to complement the manual.
- (185) As a broader comment, Norway suggested that the Committee might in the future consider circumstances under which non-native species response actions could constitute emergency response actions, in accordance with provisions of the Protocol, and thus not require prior environmental impact assessment.
- (186) The Committee noted the very kind offer from SCAR to bring forward information to CEP XXI regarding existing work and expertise that would be available for identifying non-native species.
- (187) Regarding the process for updating the Non-Native Species Manual, the Committee agreed that:
- the manual was intended to be a dynamic tool, able to be readily updated to reflect best practice;
  - it would request the Secretariat to update the online version of the manual following each meeting, as appropriate, to reflect any changes agreed by the Committee;
  - such changes would be marked in a way that indicated that they had been endorsed by the Committee, but had not been formally adopted by the ATCM;
  - the Committee would include an action in its Five-Year Work Plan to periodically undertake a full review of the manual, and would present the resulting revision to the ATCM for adoption by means of a Resolution.
- (188) In accordance with this agreement, the Committee requested the Secretariat to update the online version of the

PRELIMINARY VERSION

Non-Native Species Manual as appropriate to reflect the Committee's agreement to:

- update the Antarctic Conservation Biogeographic Regions (WP 29);
- endorse *SCAR's Code of Conduct for the Exploration and Research of Subglacial Aquatic Environments* (WP 17); and
- incorporate a link to the Non-Native Species manual developed by Argentina for its national Antarctic programme activities (IP 128 rev.1).

- (189) The Republic of Korea introduced WP 26 *Non-native flies in sewage treatment plants on King George Island, South Shetland Islands*, prepared jointly with the United Kingdom, Chile and Uruguay. It noted that at CEP XIX, the Committee agreed that Parties with stations on King George Island should check their waste water treatment plants for non-native invertebrate infestations and, if present, should join collaborative research efforts to determine the origin of these species and identify practical and coordinated management response for fly eradication or control. It reported on the distribution of flies in the natural environment and within stations and the first steps in a coordinated international response to manage the flies.
- (190) The Committee welcomed WP 26 and thanked the co-authors for the update on matters discussed at CEP XIX. The Committee congratulated the Parties involved for their ongoing efforts to eradicate this non-native fly from sewage treatment plants in certain stations on King George Island. The Committee encouraged Parties with stations on King George Island to check their facilities for non-native flies and to undertake both continuous and periodic monitoring to indicate if there are any non-native flies inhabiting the environment. It also encouraged Parties to jointly develop coordinated standardised monitoring and eradication programmes to effectively control the spread of the flies and to join the collaborative research project. In that regard the Committee noted that Argentina and China, which also had stations on the island, had expressed their willingness to be involved in this collaborative effort.
- (191) The Committee also noted the advice from COMNAP that its Members had developed a non-native species checklist and training modules on non-native species matters, and that it would stand ready to assist in these ongoing efforts, if requested.
- (192) In response to a query, the Republic of Korea noted that it had cleaned the sewage tanks at its station and used insect traps, but that these actions had unfortunately proven unsuccessful in eradicating the flies, so it would be undertaking further work to consider other eradication options. The Committee looked forward to receiving a report on these matters at a future meeting.
- (193) Poland presented IP 47 *Eradication of a non-native grass Poa annua L. from ASPA No 128 Western Shore of Admiralty Bay, King George Island, South Shetland Islands*. This paper presented the results of a research study on the eradication of the non-native species *Poa annua* from ASPA 128 and from Arctowski station. Follow-up activities from the 2016/2017 Antarctic season were also reported, and it was noted that if eradication were to be completed, it must be a long term project.
- (194) The Committee thanked Poland for presenting this paper. Recalling its earlier request to receive updates on this activity and welcoming the ongoing eradication and monitoring activities, the Committee congratulated Poland on its continuing efforts, and noted that it was looking forward to further updates from Poland on the success of this activity.
- (195) Argentina presented IP 128 rev.1 *Prevention of the Introduction of Non-native Species to the Antarctic Continent: Argentine Antarctic Program Operations Manual*. The paper reported that Argentina had developed a manual to prevent dissemination of non-native species by its National Antarctic Programme, which conducted a broad range of scientific and logistics operations. The manual was developed in specific fact-sheets and organised in relation to logistic means (cargo storage depots, aircrafts and vessels) and in relation to the assigned personnel (logistic and scientific). It highlighted that this was the first written document on this topic in this language, and that all original material was presented in Spanish, making it useful for other Spanish speaking programmes. Argentina wished to share this tool with other Members, and proposed that the CEP consider this Manual and include it in the Guidelines and Resources section of the CEP Non-native Species Manual.
- (196) The Committee thanked Argentina for presenting its manual for preventing the introduction of non-native species through its National Antarctic Programme activities. Several Members noted that having this material

available in Spanish was a very useful and valuable contribution that could be used and adopted by other Spanish speaking National Antarctic Programmes as they deemed appropriate. The Committee supported Argentina's proposal to include the manual in the CEP Non-native Species Manual in the Guidelines and Resources section.

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

- IP 54 *Detection and eradication of a non-native Collembola incursion in a hydroponics facility in East Antarctica* (Australia).

### 10b) Specially Protected Species

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

### 10c) Other Annex II Matters

(199) SCAR introduced WP 13 *Antarctica and the Strategic Plan for Biodiversity 2011 to 2020*, prepared jointly with Monaco and Belgium. The paper provided a summary of the outcomes and recommendations from the meeting held by SCAR, the Principality of Monaco and partners in June 2015 to assess Antarctic and Southern Ocean biodiversity and its conservation status in the context of the Strategic Plan for Biodiversity 2011-2020 and its Aichi Targets. The main conclusions of the assessment were that: the five goals of the Strategic Plan and the Aichi Targets resonated well with the extensive and inclusive work being undertaken through the ATS to ensure comprehensive protection of the Antarctic environment; and that the ATS agreements offered an unparalleled opportunity to improve conservation over the next five years, especially given the Santiago Declaration of ATCM XXXIX-CEP XIX and support for conservation from all organisations involved in the region. The co-authors recommended that the Committee consider the development, in collaboration with its partners, of an integrated biodiversity strategy and action plan for Antarctica and the Southern Ocean. This would help give effect to the pledge of the Antarctic Treaty Consultative Parties to further strengthen their efforts to preserve and protect the Antarctic terrestrial and marine environments, and form the basis for an Antarctic and Southern Ocean contribution to a truly global assessment of the state of biodiversity and its management in 2020. Belgium suggested that the portal *biodiversity.aq* could play a key-role in this process.

(200) The Committee thanked SCAR, Belgium and Monaco for the paper and their continuing efforts to assess the status of biodiversity in Antarctica and the Southern Ocean. Some Members supported the recommendation that the CEP consider the development of an integrated biodiversity strategy and action plan for Antarctica and the Southern Ocean. Some of those Members noted that this work was in-line with Article 3(2) of the Treaty. Other Members, while not supporting this recommendation, expressed their support for work at the CEP towards an improved understanding of biodiversity and its conservation in the Antarctic, including the continuation of the planned work by SCAR, Monaco and Belgium, and welcomed the advice by SCAR that it was progressing with its conservation strategy.

(201) The Committee noted that an enhanced understanding of the state of Antarctic biodiversity would also contribute to global efforts to conserve biodiversity, and emphasised that the Antarctic Treaty system was the appropriate framework for the conservation of biodiversity in the Antarctic Treaty area. It underlined that many measures were currently in place to ensure that all of Antarctica had a high level of protection and conservation in accordance with the provisions of the Environment Protocol and the CAMLR Convention. The Committee recalled that much of its work was directed to the protection and conservation of Antarctic biodiversity including actions identified in the Five-Year Work Plan and the CCRWP. The Committee welcomed the efforts by SCAR, Belgium, Monaco, and other Members to develop evidence-based tools and approaches, including through a further workshop planned for July 2017, to assist the CEP in addressing challenges to Antarctic biodiversity conservation, and encouraged those involved to bring back their findings for its consideration.

(202) ASOC expressed its appreciation for the co-authors' work in assessing the state of biodiversity in Antarctica, and drawing attention to where more work was needed. It particularly noted that the warming and acidification of the Southern Ocean, and the related impacts on ecosystem services, made it imperative to work to manage and safeguard these global services. ASOC highlighted the need for more work in designating protected areas for both land and marine environments, and in particular ensuring that those areas designated at land and sea are representative of areas important for biodiversity. ASOC supported the co-author's recommendation of having the CEP develop an integrated biodiversity strategy and action plan for Antarctica and the Southern Ocean. ASOC noted that by 2020 it hoped significant progress would have been made on implementing the strategy and action plan.

*Unmanned Aerial Vehicles / Remotely Piloted Aircraft Systems*

- (203) The Committee recalled that it had discussed the environmental impacts of the use of unmanned aerial vehicles (UAV) / remotely piloted aircraft systems (RPAS) in Antarctica, had welcomed SCAR's earlier agreement to report to CEP XX on the impacts of such devices on wildlife, and had agreed to give further consideration at CEP XX to developing guidance for the environmental aspects of the use UAV / RPAS in Antarctica. Recalling that the topic had been discussed for a number of years, the Committee additionally noted that the ATCM Multi-Year Strategic Work Plan included an action for ATCM XL to consider related advice from the CEP.
- (204) SCAR introduced WP 20 *State of Knowledge of Wildlife Responses to Remotely Piloted Aircraft Systems (RPAS)*, and referred to BP 1 *Best Practice for Minimising Remotely Piloted Aircraft System Disturbance to Wildlife in Biological Field Research*, which presented a synthesis from 23 published scientific research papers on wildlife responses to RPAS. Consistent with the SCAR recommendations in ATCM XXXVIII - WP 27, the paper supported the conclusion that there would not be a one-size-fits-all solution to the mitigation of wildlife responses to RPAS, and that guidelines would clearly need to be site- and species-specific and consider the type of RPAS used, including noise output. SCAR recommended that the Committee consider implementation of preliminary best practice guidelines for all RPAS use in the vicinity of wildlife in Antarctica, as presented in WP 20, until further information became available. It also identified priorities for future studies on wildlife response to RPAS in the Antarctic.
- (205) Germany presented IP 38 *Use of UAVs in Antarctica, A competent authority's perspective and lessons learned*, which gave the perspective of the German national competent authority on the different aspects of the use of UAVs in Antarctica. Based on its experiences on the authorisation and use of drones in Antarctica by different stakeholders, Germany noted that it considered that there was a need for guidelines for the use of UAVs in Antarctica. It also encouraged other National Competent Authorities to share their experiences with their own authorisation or permitting procedures for UAV operations.
- (206) Poland presented IP 45 *UAV remote sensing of environmental changes on King George Island (South Shetland Islands): update on the results of the third field season 2016/2017*, which provided an update on the third successfully completed field season of a monitoring programme using fixed-wing UAVs to collect geospatial environmental data. Polish scientists had used a piston engine UAV for collecting data on penguin and pinniped population size and distribution and for mapping vegetation communities, and had made observations of overflight impact on elephant seals. Poland thanked Chile for its assistance in the performance of its UAV activities.
- (207) Poland presented IP 46 *UAV impact – problem of a safe distance from wildlife concentrations*, which discussed a research study on the disturbance of nesting Adélie penguins by UAVs, as well as experiences gained during three Antarctic seasons of using fixed-wing UAVs for collecting diverse environmental data. On environmental grounds, it noted that much of the applicable pre-testing of camera and sensors was done in Poland prior to its use in the field. Affixed to the paper, Poland also presented draft guidelines prepared by the Polish Antarctic Program for the future use of fixed-wing UAVs near wildlife colonies.
- (208) COMNAP presented IP 77 *Update from the COMNAP Unmanned Aerial Systems Working Group (UAS-WG)*. It noted that the paper had two points of particular relevance to CEP discussions. First, the survey of National Antarctic Programmes' RPAS use in Antarctica showed that 80% of the countries had domestic legislation related to RPAS and of those, 33% applied them in their Antarctic operations. Second, the paper highlighted the many scientific and environmental management uses of RPAS.
- (209) SCAR noted that considerable research was presently underway on the use of RPAS in the Antarctic. With regard to the matter of RPAS distances from bird colonies, SCAR stressed the guidelines presented in WP 20 were of a precautionary nature although at the same time based on scientific evidence. SCAR noted that it would continue to focus on evidence-based science, and welcomed support for further research on the issue.
- (210) The Committee thanked SCAR for the comprehensive report on the state of knowledge of wildlife responses to RPAS use in the Antarctic, and also thanked the authors of the other papers submitted to inform the Committee. The Committee again recognised the benefits of using UAV / RPAS for research and monitoring, including the potential reduction of environmental risks. It acknowledged the value of the precautionary best-practice guidelines for RPAS use in the vicinity of wildlife in Antarctica presented in WP 20 and agreed to encourage the dissemination and use of those guidelines as an interim measure pending the further development of broader

PRELIMINARY VERSION

guidance on the environmental aspects of UAV / RPAS use in Antarctica. The Committee noted that further intersessional work might consider: the environmental impacts associated with the use of UAV / RPAS in the Antarctic other than those associated with wildlife disturbance; site- and species-specific guidance on their use; and how scientific project use of UAV / RPAS could be assessed in the future.

(211) The Committee supported SCAR's recommendation that future studies on wildlife response to UAV / RPAS in the Antarctic should consider:

- A range of species including flying seabirds and seals.
- Both behavioural and physiological responses.
- Demographic effects, including breeding numbers and breeding success.
- Ambient environmental conditions, for example, wind and noise.
- The effects of RPAS of different sizes and specifications.
- The contribution of RPAS noise to wildlife disturbance.
- Comparisons with control sites and human disturbance.
- Habituation effects.

(212) The Committee noted that the list of science needs identified in WP 34 could be updated accordingly as part of the review of the list at CEP XXI.

(213) COMNAP noted that it had welcomed SCAR's advice, which it had shared with its members, and which it would use as a reference for future reviews of the COMNAP UAS Handbook, adding that it agreed that situation specific RPAS guidelines were encouraged. IAATO advised that its members had agreed to continue the ban on recreational use of UAV / RPAS in coastal areas.

(214) The Committee decided to establish an ICG to develop guidelines for the environmental aspects of the use of UAVs / RPAS in Antarctica. It noted that the work of the ICG could draw on ATCM XL - WP 20 (SCAR), ATCM XL – IP 77 (COMNAP) and other papers submitted on the subject to CEP meetings, as well as the results of ongoing scientific research and experiences of national competent authorities.

(215) The Committee agreed that the ICG would operate in accordance with the following terms of reference:

1. review and update the available information regarding the environmental aspects of UAV / RPAS including experiences on the use by national programmes and IAATO;
2. collect information from Competent Authorities regarding the environmental aspects of their authorisation/ permitting procedures for UAV / RPAS operations;
3. develop, on the basis of a precautionary approach, guidance for the environmental aspects of UAV/RPAS use in Antarctica, taking into account different purposes (e.g. scientific, logistic, commercial and leisure) and the type of UAV / RPAS, including site- and species-specific conditions;
4. report the outcome including a proposal for guidelines to CEP XXI.

(216) The Committee welcomed the offer from Dr Heike Herata (Germany) to act as ICG convenor.

(217) SCAR, COMNAP and IAATO expressed their commitment to continue to contribute the work of the Committee on these matters, including through the ICG.

**CEP advice to the ATCM on Unmanned Aerial Vehicles (UAV) / Remotely Piloted Aircraft Systems (RPAS)**

(218) Noting the ATCM Multi-Year Strategic Work Plan included an action to consider advice from the Committee on

UAVs / RPAS, the Committee agreed to advise the ATCM that it had:

- encouraged the dissemination and use of the precautionary best-practice guidelines for unmanned aerial vehicles (UAV) / remotely piloted aircraft systems (RPAS) use in the vicinity of wildlife in Antarctica, as presented in WP 20;
- agreed that future studies on wildlife response to UAV / RPAS in the Antarctic should consider the matters identified in WP 20; and
- agreed to establish an intersessional contact group to develop guidelines for the environmental aspects of the use of UAVs / RPAS in Antarctica for consideration for CEP XXI.

- (219) Argentina introduced WP 44 *Protection Mechanisms for the Snow Hill Island Emperor Penguin Colony, North East of the Antarctic Peninsula*, which proposed the evaluation of different mechanisms of protection for the Snow Hill Island emperor penguin colony, in the current context of climate change and anthropogenic pressures. Argentina noted that it was necessary to start a debate on the different mechanisms of additional protection for the colony. In the framework of the Antarctic Treaty system (ATS), it pointed out different ways to provide additional protection such as the designation of Specially Protected Species (SPS), the creation of Antarctic Specially Protected Areas (ASPA), and the regulation of visitors through the establishment of Site Guidelines. In highlighting its belief that there were sufficient elements to propose the protection of the colony through the designation of an ASPA, Argentina noted that the actual designation was a process that could take several years. Until it was determined if it was necessary to implement this protection mechanism or another more restrictive measure, according to a preventive approach, Argentina presented a series of specific guidelines for behaviour on the ground for the Snow Hill Island emperor penguin colony that could be adopted and applied immediately. Argentina recommended that the CEP: evaluate the relevance of providing additional protection to the Snow Hill Island emperor penguin colony; consider the behavioural guidelines provided in the Annex to WP 44, until the need to develop more restrictive mechanisms of protection is evaluated; and provide assistance in the identification of alternative mechanisms of protection that had not been considered in WP 44.
- (220) SCAR drew the Committee's attention to the recently published work of Robin Cristofari and others, entitled *Full circumpolar migration ensures unity in the Emperor penguin*, published in the journal *Nature Communications* in 2016. This work suggested that emperor penguins were a single demographic unit, which implied that local actions related to emperor penguins could be influenced by processes occurring in distant regions of the continent. The United Kingdom noted its intention to present evidence to CEP XXI in relation to emperor penguin colony variation in the Peninsula region which it hoped would add to this analysis.
- (221) The Committee thanked Argentina for the paper and agreed on the importance of evaluating the relevance of providing additional protection to the Snow Hill Island emperor penguin colony. The Committee agreed to recommend the application of the *Guidelines for Behaviour Near the Snow Hill Island Emperor Penguin Colony*, presented in WP 44, as an interim measure until the need to develop more restrictive mechanisms of protection was evaluated.
- (222) The Committee agreed to support Argentina to undertake further work to develop protection mechanisms for the colony, and encouraged other interested Members and Observers to contribute to that work. The Committee encouraged Members to continue scientific work on emperor penguins in order to monitor population trends in the colonies. The Committee also welcomed IAATO's advice that it would circulate the behavioural guidelines among its Members and provide feedback to the CEP regarding the application of those guidelines. The Committee welcomed SCAR's advice regarding the recent relevant research that could be taken into consideration when Argentina and the Committee were further considering these matters. The Committee looked forward to receiving an update from Argentina at a future meeting.

#### **CEP advice to the ATCM on protection mechanisms for the Snow Hill Island emperor penguin colony**

- (223) The Committee agreed to advise the ATCM that it had welcomed WP 44 and had agreed to recommend the application of the *Guidelines for Behaviour Near the Snow Hill Island Emperor Penguin Colony* as an interim measure until the need to develop more restrictive mechanisms of protection was evaluated.
- (224) Spain presented IP 20 *The role of monitoring, education and EIA in the prevention of vegetation trampling within ASPA No. 140, Site C: Caliente Hill*, prepared jointly with the United Kingdom. The paper summarised how the extremely rare plant communities located on the geothermally heated ground within Site C: Caliente Hill

of ASPA 140 Parts of Deception Island had been subject to cumulative trampling impacts. It reported that the co-authors had developed a high precision mapping system and had mapped each community, and would send this information to all tourist operators and scientists active in the region. The co-authors encouraged other Parties active in the area to educate their scientists and logistical support personnel entering the area on the vulnerability of the plant communities, and to incorporate measures to mitigate potential trampling impact in the environmental impact assessment for the proposed field research.

- (225) Germany drew the Committee's attention to IP 37 *Bird Monitoring in the Fildes Region* and IP 39 *Study on monitoring penguin colonies in the Antarctic using remote sensing data*, and highlighted that the full reports of each of the research projects were available online at the following links: IP 37 <http://www.umweltbundesamt.de/publikationen/monitoring-the-consequences-of-local-climate-change> and IP 39 <https://www.umweltbundesamt.de/publikationen/monitoring-penguin-colonies-in-the-antarctic-using>.
- (226) The following paper was also submitted under this agenda item:
- IP 75 *A report on the development and use of the UAS by the US National Marine Fisheries Service for surveying marine mammals* (United States).

### **Item 11: Environmental Monitoring and Reporting**

- (227) The Committee recalled that ATCM XXXIX had requested the CEP to develop a series of 'best estimate' trigger levels to assist in guiding monitoring efforts, as outlined in Recommendation 7 of the 2012 CEP Tourism Study. It noted that Recommendation 7 referred to Recommendation 3, which was the subject of ongoing work to develop a methodology to assess the sensitivity of sites used by visitors.
- (228) Australia presented IP 83 rev.1 *Update on work to develop a methodology to assess the sensitivity of sites used by visitors*, jointly prepared with New Zealand, Norway, the United Kingdom and the United States, and in conjunction with IAATO. This paper provided a further update on work since CEP XIX to develop a methodology to assess the sensitivity of sites used by visitors (Recommendation 3), and on planned next steps. Following discussion of this topic at CEP XIX in 2016, suggestions on the further development of the draft methodology for site sensitivity were received from other Members and Observers. The authors planned to revise the methodology, drawing on these suggestions, and then conduct 'desktop' testing, in preparation for potential field trials. The paper also presented the co-authors' initial views regarding Recommendation 7 of the 2012 CEP Tourism Study on 'best estimate' trigger levels to assist in guiding monitoring efforts. They noted that identification of trigger levels to guide site monitoring and management efforts would appropriately be informed by an analysis of sites' sensitivity to visitation, and so continued work to further develop the site sensitivity methodology would be a relevant next step for advancing both Recommendation 3 and Recommendation 7.
- (229) The Committee thanked the authors for the paper and welcomed their ongoing efforts to develop a methodology to assess the sensitivity of sites used by visitors, noting that this work would contribute to advancing both Recommendation 3 and Recommendation 7 from the CEP tourism study.
- (230) IAATO advised that it remained willing to contribute to the process if required.

### **CEP advice to the ATCM on recommendations from the 2012 CEP Tourism Study**

- (231) The Committee noted that ATCM XXXIX had requested the CEP to develop a series of 'best estimate' trigger levels to assist in guiding monitoring efforts, as outlined in Recommendation 7 of the 2012 CEP Tourism Study. It had considered a report on ongoing work in accordance with Recommendation 3, to develop a methodology for assessing the sensitivity of sites to tourist visitation, and noted that this work would also be relevant to address Recommendation 7.
- (232) The WMO presented IP 113 *The Global Cryosphere Watch and CryoNet*. It explained that the Global Cryosphere Watch (GCW), when fully operational, would enable an assessment of the cryosphere and its changes, and provide wide access to cryosphere information. It also reported on the GCW's network of standardised observing stations (CryoNet) and that eight countries' operating stations in Antarctica had committed stations for inclusion in the GCW observing network. The WMO encouraged Members and Observers to consider contributing to the GCW by: considering if any of the observing stations they manage and operate in Antarctica

could be proposed as CryoNet sites or stations; and informing GCW if they were aware of existing sources of cryospheric data for Antarctica that could contribute to GCW and be made discoverable through the GCW Data Portal.

- (233) The WMO also presented IP 114 *The Polar Space Task Group: Coordinating Space Data in the Antarctic Region*. It outlined the work of the Polar Space Task Group (PSTG), whose mandate included acquisition and distribution of satellite datasets, and support of the development of products for cryospheric and polar scientific research and applications. These products included a large combination of complementary satellite radar altimetry, synthetic aperture radar images, optical images, and gravimetric datasets. Other tools developed to allow ease of access to these datasets were the TU Dresden Antarctic ice sheet gravimetric mass balance time-series plotting tool ([https://data1.geo.tu-dresden.de/ais\\_gmb/](https://data1.geo.tu-dresden.de/ais_gmb/)), and the ENVEO CryoPortal (<http://cryoportal.enveo.at/>). The Group also produced atmospheric and sea ice products.
- (234) The Committee reiterated the value of the WMO's climate-related activities in the Antarctic region.
- (235) Portugal presented IP 22 *Trace element contamination and availability within the Antarctic Treaty Area*, jointly prepared with Chile, Germany, the Russian Federation and the United Kingdom. This paper built on earlier reports of trace elements in soil and seawater samples collected from Fildes Peninsula and within ASPA 150 Ardley Island, and reported that contamination originated from specific anthropogenic sources and may have a negative effect on native biota. The proponents encouraged Members to share their monitoring data to help inform future monitoring research and policy development, and consider the implementation of appropriate contamination controls and remediation methods.
- (236) SCAR presented IP 68 *Update on activities of the Southern Ocean Observing System (SOOS)*, which highlighted future efforts, summarised activities and identified key challenges facing SOOS. It noted that the SOOS Working Group on Censusing Animal Populations from Space (CAPS) aimed to develop a cost-effective remote sensing-based method for monitoring animal populations from space, of relevance to the Committee's discussion on these matters. It also reported that in 2018 there would be a SOOS-sponsored international conference "Marine Ecosystem Assessment for the Southern Ocean (MEASO)" which would aim to assess the status and trend of habitats, key species and ecosystems in the Southern Ocean. It highlighted that SOOS was completely aligned with the objectives of the Committee and was vital to understanding the Southern Ocean and its conservation.
- (237) WMO highlighted the significant value of SOOS and emphasised the importance of ensuring its continuing funding. It also acknowledged Australia and Sweden for their continuing support.
- (238) The Committee reiterated the value of the work being undertaken by SOOS to facilitate the collection and delivery of observations on dynamics and change in Southern Ocean systems.
- (239) New Zealand presented IP 76 *Supporting the analysis of environments and impacts: A tool to enable broader-scale environmental management*. It provided an update on a New Zealand research project to develop a tool to assist in the planning, permitting, and implementation of Antarctic activities while limiting adverse impacts on the Antarctic environment. New Zealand highlighted that it would be a user-friendly tool and invited Members to continue their involvement in the development of this tool.
- (240) The Committee thanked New Zealand for the paper, welcomed the continuing development of the tool and looked forward to further reports on its development tool.
- (241) SCAR presented IP 81 *Report of Oceanites, Inc.*, which described the activities of Oceanites, Inc. since ATCM XXXIX, including: results from the latest, 23rd consecutive field season of the Antarctic Site Inventory; recent scientific papers; update on Oceanites' Mapping Application for Penguin Populations and Projected Dynamics and Oceanites' climate challenge analyses and penguin conservation efforts; and the inaugural *State Of Antarctic Penguins* report.
- (242) The United Kingdom recalled that it had worked with Oceanities for many years and that it continued to support its activities.
- (243) IAATO reported that its vessels had supported the work of Oceanities since its inception, providing logistical assistance and data collection, and that its operators looked forward to continuing this support.

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

- IP 8 *Field Project Reviews: Fulfilling Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA) Monitoring Obligations* (United States).
- IP 34 *Workshop on Environmental Assessment of the McMurdo Dry Valleys: Witness to the Past and Guide to the Future* (United States).
- IP 79 *Environmental monitoring of the reconstruction work of the Brazilian Antarctic Station (2015/16 and 2016/17)* (Brazil).
- SP 9 *Update on the current state of recommendations of the 2012 CEP Tourism Study* (ATS).
- BP 8 *Using virtual reality technology for low-impact monitoring and communication of protected and historic sites in Antarctica* (New Zealand).

## **Item 12: Inspection Reports**

- (245) Chile introduced WP 43 *General Recommendations from the Joint Inspections Undertaken by Argentina and Chile under Article VII of the Antarctic Treaty and Article 14 of the Environmental Protocol*, and referred to IP 126 *Report of the Joint Inspections' Program undertaken by Argentina and Chile under Article VII of the Antarctic Treaty and Article 14 of the Environmental Protocol*, both jointly prepared with Argentina. The co-authors noted general comments and recommendations related to joint inspections undertaken under Article VII of the Antarctic Treaty and Article 14 of the Environment Protocol. These were based on experiences during the Argentine-Chilean joint inspections undertaken between 20 January and 24 February 2017, which involved Johann Gregor Mendel Station of the Czech Republic and Rothera Station of the United Kingdom. Argentina and Chile noted that both stations were compliant with the Environment Protocol, and highlighted the advances in energy efficiency, the number of useful guidelines and training at the stations, and the importance of waste management processes, including for historic waste. Argentina and Chile also warmly thanked the Czech Republic and the United Kingdom for their cooperation and hospitality during the inspections, and noted how inspections represented a valuable learning tool for both the inspecting and inspected Parties.
- (246) The Czech Republic thanked Argentina and Chile for their joint inspection of Johann Gregor Mendel Station, and welcomed their constructive recommendations, which provided useful input to improve the operation of the station. It further thanked Argentina and Chile for acknowledging the high percentage of renewable energy used at the station.
- (247) The United Kingdom thanked Argentina and Chile for their joint inspection of Rothera Station. It acknowledged the benefits of reducing reliance on fossil fuels. It also outlined the parameters being monitored within the nearby ASPA 129 Rothera Point, Adelaide Island, noting that these had included: monitoring skua numbers and breeding success; monitoring soil pollution; looking for non-native species; and examining the metal content of lichens. The United Kingdom noted that future initial environmental evaluations (IEEs) for modernisation of the wharf and the station would be made available on the British Antarctic Survey (BAS) website and on the EIA database.
- (248) The Committee thanked Chile and Argentina for the report on inspections undertaken during 2017. It welcomed the positive findings of the inspection team regarding the high degree of compliance with the Environment Protocol, and also regarding renewable energy use, waste management, and the availability of up-to-date environmental protocols at the inspected stations. Noting that the ATCM would also be considering the inspection report, the Committee expressed its support for the general recommendations presented in WP 43.
- (249) A number of general points were raised during the discussion including: the value of having up-to-date information in the EIES; the value of previous inspection reports as a resource for planning inspections; the benefits associated with the cooperative conduct of inspections; and the value of receiving reports back from inspected Parties regarding actions taken in response to recommendations arising from inspections. In that light, the Committee welcomed the reports submitted by Poland (BP 7) and the Czech Republic (BP 14).
- (250) Australia presented IP 30 *Australian Antarctic Treaty and Environmental Protocol inspections: December 2016*. It reported on an inspection of the Amundsen-Scott South Pole Station, operated by the United States, and Antarctic Specially Managed Area (ASMA) No. 5 Amundsen-Scott South Pole Station, conducted by Australian

PRELIMINARY VERSION

observers in December 2016. It drew the attention of the CEP to the inspection team's conclusion that ASMA No. 5 was operating effectively and achieving the management objectives for which it was designated, and that Amundsen-Scott South Pole Station was operating in compliance with the provisions and objectives of the Protocol on Environmental Protection. The United States thanked Australia for its inspection.

- (251) The Committee welcomed the inspection team's positive findings that ASMA 5 was effective in achieving the management objectives for which it was designated, and that Amundsen-Scott South Pole Station was operating in compliance the Environment Protocol.
- (252) The following papers were also submitted under this agenda item:
- BP 7 *Measures taken on the recommendations by Inspection team at Arctowski Polish Antarctic Station in 2016/2017* (Poland)
  - BP 14 *Follow-up to the Recommendations of the Inspection Teams at the Eco-Nelson Facility* (Czech Republic)

**Item 13: General Matters**

- (253) China introduced WP 36 *Green Expedition in the Antarctic*, jointly prepared with Australia, Chile, France, Germany, India, Republic of Korea, New Zealand, Norway, United Kingdom, and the United States. The paper introduced the "Green Expedition" concept, which referred to the promotion of environmentally friendly activities in the Antarctic by those planning and undertaking activities, and explained that this would involve minimising impacts on the environment by every means. This would include implementing the methods and guidance detailed in current Resolutions and CEP/ATCM discussions, and any new methods developed as a result of recent advances in modern management and technology. The paper contained a proposed Resolution, encouraging Parties to plan and conduct their activities in Antarctica in an efficient and sustainable way.
- (254) The Committee thanked China and the co-authors of this paper. The co-authors highlighted China's leadership on this initiative. The Committee supported the "Green Expedition" concept, as outlined in WP 36, to promote the environmentally friendly planning and conduct of all activities in Antarctica. Some Members provided additional examples of initiatives they had taken consistent with the "Green Expedition" concept.
- (255) Argentina noted that procedures and conduct guidelines also contributed to the environmentally friendly conduct of activities.

**CEP advice to the ATCM on Green Expeditions**

- (256) The CEP agreed to forward a draft Resolution to the ATCM for adoption, encouraging and promoting the concept of "Green Expeditions".
- (257) Portugal presented IP 24 *Future Challenges in Southern Ocean Ecology Research: another outcome of the 1st SCAR Horizon Scan*, jointly prepared with Belgium, Brazil, France, Germany, the Netherlands, SCAR, the United Kingdom, and the United States. The paper reported on an output of the SCAR Antarctic and Southern Ocean Science Horizon Scan. It noted that the work presented reflected contributions from many Antarctic scientists and policy makers. It focused on high-interest research areas related specifically to Southern Ocean life and ecology that, although not all retained as the top priorities among the addressed scientific domains, were of considerable relevance to the biology and ecology of the Southern Ocean. It highlighted that Southern Ocean ecological research would require long-term commitment by Parties to conduct international and interdisciplinary research, aided by the development of technology (in cooperation with organisations such as COMNAP and SCAR). It further noted that education and outreach (in cooperation with organisations such as the Association for Polar Early Career Scientists and Polar Educators International) and coordinated funding strategies for the various stakeholders would be essential to successfully address the challenges in Antarctic research.
- (258) The Committee thanked the co-authors for presenting this work. It noted the consistency between science needs identified by the Committee in documents such as the CCRWP, as outlined in WP 34, and the research areas identified in this paper.
- (259) Ecuador presented IP 110 *Plan de contingencias y riesgos durante la XXI Campaña Antártica Ecuatoriana*

PRELIMINARY VERSION

(2016-2017), which described contingency and emergency plans for the Ecuadorian station Campaña Antártica Ecuatoriana. It noted that the plans address issues related to human safety, security of infrastructure, and environmental protection.

**Item 14: Election Officers**

- (260) The Committee elected Dr Kevin Hughes from the United Kingdom as Vice-Chair for a two-year term and congratulated him on his appointment to the role.
- (261) The Committee warmly thanked and congratulated Dr Polly Penhale from the United States for her excellent work and significant contributions throughout her four-year term as Vice-Chair.

**Item 15: Preparation for the Next Meeting**

- (262) The Committee adopted the Preliminary Agenda for CEP XXI (Appendix 5).

**Item 16: Adoption of the Report**

- (263) The Committee adopted its Report.

**Item 17: Closing of the Meeting**

- (264) The Chair closed the Meeting on Friday, 26 May 2017.



---

Ewan McIvor  
Chair of the Committee for Environmental Protection

**Appendix 1. CEP Five-Year Work Plan 2017**

<b>Issue / Environmental Pressure: Introduction of non-native species</b>	
<b>Priority: 1</b>	
<b>Actions:</b>	
<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Continue developing practical guidelines &amp; resources for all Antarctic operators.</li> <li>2. Implement related actions identified in the Climate Change Response Work Programme.</li> <li>3. Consider the spatially explicit, activity-differentiated risk assessments to mitigate the risks posed by terrestrial non-native species.</li> <li>4. Develop a surveillance strategy for areas at high risk of non-native species establishment.</li> <li>5. Give additional attention to the risks posed by intra-Antarctic transfer of propagules.</li> </ol>	
Intersessional period 2017/18	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Initiate work to develop a non-native species response strategy, including appropriate responses to diseases of wildlife</li> <li>• To help the Committee in assessing the effectiveness of the Manual, request a report from COMNAP on the implementation of quarantine and biosecurity measures by its members</li> <li>• United Kingdom to lead discussion with interested Members and Observers, on the further development of a non-mandatory non-native species response protocol</li> </ul>
CEP XXI 2018	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Discuss the intersessional work concerning the development of a response strategy for inclusion in the Non-native Species Manual, and the implementation of quarantine and biosecurity measures by COMNAP members. Review IMO report on biofouling guidelines</li> <li>• Consider report on intersessional discussion on non-native species response protocol and its inclusion in the non-native species manual.</li> <li>• SCAR to present information on existing mechanism to assist with the identification of non-native species</li> </ul>
Intersessional period 2018/19	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Ask SCAR to compile a list of available biodiversity information sources and databases to help Parties establish which native species are present at Antarctic sites and thereby assist with identifying the scale and scope of current and future introductions</li> <li>• Develop generally applicable monitoring guidelines. More detailed or site-specific monitoring may be required for particular locations</li> <li>• Request a report from Parties and Observers on the application of biosecurity guidelines by their members</li> </ul>
CEP XXII 2019	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Discuss the intersessional work concerning the development of monitoring guidelines for inclusion in the NNS Manual. Consider the reports from Parties and Observers on the application of biosecurity guidelines by their members</li> </ul>
Intersessional period 2019/20	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Initiate work to assess the risk of marine non-native species introductions.</li> </ul>
CEP XXIII 2020	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Discuss the intersessional work concerning the risks of marine non-native species</li> </ul>
Intersessional period 2020/2021	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Develop specific guidelines to reduce non-native species release with wastewater discharge</li> <li>• Review the progress and contents of the CEP Non-native Species Manual</li> </ul>
CEP XXIV 2021	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• CEP to consider if intersessional work is required to review/update the non-native species manual</li> </ul>

PRELIMINARY VERSION

Intersessional period 2021/2022	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>As appropriate, intersessional work to review the non-native species manual.</li> </ul>
CEP XXV 2022	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>CEP to consider report of ICG, if established, and consider adoption of revised non-native species by the ATCM through a resolution</li> </ul>

<b>Issue / Environmental Pressure: Tourism and NGO activities</b>	
<b>Priority: 1</b>	
<b>Actions:</b>	
<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Provide advice to ATCM as requested.</li> <li>Advance recommendations from ship-borne tourism ATME.</li> </ol>	
Intersessional period 2017/18	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Further develop methodology for site sensitivity assessment and to consider trigger levels (recommendations 3 and 7 of the tourism study)</li> </ul>
CEP XXI 2018	
Intersessional period 2018/19	
CEP XXII 2019	
Intersessional period 2019/20	
CEP XXIII 2020	
Intersessional period 2020/2021	
CEP XXIV 2021	

<b>Issue / Environmental Pressure: Climate Change Implications for the Environment</b>	
<b>Priority: 1</b>	
<b>Actions:</b>	
<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Consider implications of climate change for management of Antarctic environment.</li> <li>Advance recommendations from climate change ATME.</li> <li>Implement the Climate Change response work programme.</li> </ol>	
Intersessional period 2017/18	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Pending ATCM approval, subsidiary group conducts work in accordance with agreed work plan</li> </ul>
CEP XXI 2018	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Standing agenda item</li> <li>Consider advice on how WMO activities map to CCRWP</li> <li>Pending ATCM approval, consider subsidiary group report</li> <li>SCAR provides update to ACCE report, with input as appropriate from WMO and ICED, SOOS</li> </ul>
Intersessional period 2018/19	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Pending ATCM approval, subsidiary group conducts work in accordance with agreed work plan</li> </ul>
CEP XXII 2019	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Standing agenda item</li> <li>Pending ATCM approval, consider subsidiary group report</li> <li>SCAR provides update to ACCE report, with input as appropriate from WMO and ICED, SOOS</li> </ul>
Intersessional period 2019/20	
CEP XXIII 2020	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Standing agenda item</li> <li>SCAR provides update to ACCE report, with input as appropriate from WMO and ICED, SOOS</li> </ul>

PRELIMINARY VERSION

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Consider review of subsidiary group</li> <li>• Review implementation of actions arising from 2016 joint CEP/SC-CAMLR workshop</li> <li>• Plan for 5-yearly joint SC-CAMLR/CEP workshop during 2021/22 intersessional period</li> </ul>
Intersessional period 2020/2021	
CEP XXIV 2021	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• As Finalise plans for joint SC-CAMLR/CEP workshop during 2021/22 intersessional period</li> </ul>
Intersessional period 2021/22	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Regular 5-yearly joint SC-CAMLR CEP workshop</li> </ul>

<b>Issue / Environmental Pressure: Processing new and revised protected / managed area management plans</b>	
<b>Priority: 1</b>	
<b>Actions:</b>	
<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Refine the process for reviewing new and revised management plans.</li> <li>2. Update existing guidelines.</li> <li>3. Advance recommendations from climate change ATME.</li> <li>4. Develop guidelines to ASMA's preparation.</li> </ol>	
Intersessional period 2017/18	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• SGMP conducts work as per agreed work plan</li> <li>• Norway and interested Members prepare paper on guidance for delisting ASPAs</li> </ul>
CEP XXI 2018	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Consider SGMP report</li> <li>• Consider paper by Norway and interested Members</li> </ul>
Intersessional period 2018/19	
CEP XXII 2019	
Intersessional period 2019/20	
CEP XXIII 2020	
Intersessional period 2020/2021	
CEP XXIV 2021	

<b>Issue / Environmental Pressure: Operation of the CEP and Strategic Planning</b>	
<b>Priority: 1</b>	
<b>Actions:</b>	
<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Keep the 5 year plan up to date based on changing circumstances and ATCM requirements.</li> <li>2. Identify opportunities for improving the effectiveness of the CEP.</li> <li>3. Consider long-term objectives for Antarctica (50-100 years time).</li> <li>4. Consider opportunities for enhancing the working relationship between the CEP and the ATCM.</li> </ol>	
Intersessional period 2017/18	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• CEP chair to consult with Secretariat and interested Members to develop options for obtaining and managing funding to assist the work of the CEP</li> </ul>

PRELIMINARY VERSION

CEP XXI 2018	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• CEP to consider report by CEP Chair</li> <li>• CEP to review list of science needs presented in ATCM XL/WP 34</li> </ul>
Intersessional period 2018/19	
CEP XXII 2019	
Intersessional period 2019/20	
CEP XXIII 2020	
Intersessional period 2020/2021	
CEP XXIV 2021	

<b>Issue / Environmental Pressure: Repair or Remediation of Environmental Damage</b>	
<b>Priority: 2</b>	
<b>Actions:</b>	
<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Respond to further request from the ATCM related to repair and remediation, as appropriate</li> <li>2. Monitor progress on the establishment of Antarctic-wide inventory of sites of past activity.</li> <li>3. Consider guidelines for repair and remediation.</li> <li>4. Members develop practical guidelines and supporting resources for inclusion in the Clean-up Manual</li> <li>5. Continue developing bioremediation and repair practices for inclusion in the Clean-up Manual.</li> </ol>	
Intersessional period 2017/18	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• ICG to review the Clean-Up Manual</li> </ul>
CEP XXI 2018	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Consider ICG report on review of the Clean-Up Manual</li> </ul>
Intersessional period 2018/19	
CEP XXII 2019	
Intersessional period 2019/20	
CEP XXIII 2020	
Intersessional period 2020/2021	
CEP XXIV 2021	

<b>Issue / Environmental Pressure: Monitoring and state of the environment reporting</b>	
<b>Priority: 2</b>	
<b>Actions:</b>	
<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Identify key environmental indicators and tools.</li> <li>2. Establish a process for reporting to the ATCM.</li> <li>3. SCAR to support information to COMNAP and CEP.</li> </ol>	
Intersessional period 2017/18	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• SCAR to consult with COMNAP and interested Members on review of <i>SCAR's Environmental Code of Conduct for Terrestrial Scientific Field Research in Antarctica</i></li> </ul>

PRELIMINARY VERSION

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• ICG to consider guidance for environmental aspects of UAV/RPAS</li> </ul>
CEP XXI 2018	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• CEP to consider report from SCAR on intersessional review of Code of Conduct</li> <li>• Consider report of ICG on UAV/RPAS</li> </ul>
Intersessional period 2018/19	
CEP XXII 2019	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Consider <i>SCAR's Code of Conduct for the Use of Animals for Scientific Purposes in Antarctica</i></li> </ul>
Intersessional period 2019/20	
CEP XXIII 2020	
Intersessional period 2020/21	
CEP XXIV 2021	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Consider monitoring report by UK on ASPA 107</li> </ul>

<b>Issue / Environmental Pressure: Marine spatial protection and management</b>	
<b>Priority: 2</b>	
<b>Actions:</b>	
<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Cooperation between the CEP and SC-CAMLR on common interest issues.</li> <li>2. Cooperate with CCAMLR on Southern Ocean bioregionalisation and other common interests and agreed principles.</li> <li>3. Identify and apply processes for spatial marine protection.</li> <li>4. Advance recommendations from climate change ATME.</li> <li>5. Consider connectivity between land and ocean, and complementary actions that could be taken by Parties with respect to MPAs.</li> </ol>	
Intersessional period 2017/18	
CEP XXI 2018	
Intersessional period 2018/19	
CEP XXII 2019	
Intersessional period 2019/20	
CEP XXIII 2020	
Intersessional period 2020/2021	
CEP XXIV 2021	

<b>Issue / Environmental Pressure: Site specific guidelines for tourist-visited sites</b>	
<b>Priority: 2</b>	
<b>Actions:</b>	
<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Periodically review the list of sites subject to site guidelines and consider whether development</li> </ol>	

of guidelines should be needed for additional sites.	
2. Provide advice to ATCM as required.	
3. Review the format of the site guidelines	
Intersessional period 2017/18	
CEP XXI 2018	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Standing agenda item; Parties to report on their reviews of site guidelines</li> </ul>
Intersessional period 2018/19	
CEP XXII 2019	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Standing agenda item; Parties to report on their reviews of site guidelines</li> </ul>
Intersessional period 2019/20	
CEP XXIII 2020	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Standing agenda item; Parties to report on their reviews of site guidelines</li> </ul>
Intersessional period 2020/2021	
CEP XXIV 2021	

<b>Issue / Environmental Pressure: Overview of the protected areas system</b>	
<b>Priority: 2</b>	
<b>Actions:</b>	
<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Apply the Environmental Domains Analysis (EDA) and Antarctic Conservation Biogeographic Regions (ACBR) to enhance the protected areas system.</li> <li>2. Advance recommendations from climate change ATME.</li> <li>3. Maintain and develop Protected Area database.</li> <li>4. Assess the extent to which Antarctic IBAs are or should be represented within the series of ASPAs.</li> </ol>	
Intersessional period 2017/18	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• United Kingdom to lead discussion with interested Members and Observers, on Antarctic Specially Protected Areas and Important Bird Areas</li> </ul>
CEP XXI 2018	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Plan for a joint SCAR/CEP workshop on Antarctic biogeography, including to: identify practical management applications of biogeographic tools and future research needs</li> <li>• Provide a status report to the ATCM on the status of the Antarctic Protected Areas network</li> <li>• Consider report of intersessional work on Antarctic Specially Protected Areas and Important Bird Areas</li> </ul>
Intersessional period 2018/19	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Joint SCAR/CEP workshop on Antarctic biogeography</li> </ul>
CEP XXII 2019	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Consider report from joint SCAR/CEP workshop on Antarctic biogeography</li> </ul>
Intersessional period 2019/20	
CEP XXIII 2020	
Intersessional period 2020/2021	
CEP XXIV 2021	

<b>Issue / Environmental Pressure: Outreach and education</b>	
<b>Priority: 2</b>	
<b>Actions:</b>	
<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Review current examples and identify opportunities for greater education and outreach.</li> <li>2. Encourage Members to exchange information regarding their experiences in this area.</li> <li>3. Establish a strategy and guidelines for exchanging information between Members on Education and Outreach for long term perspective.</li> </ol>	
Intersessional period 2017/18	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Celebrate the 20th Anniversary of the CEP</li> </ul>
CEP XXI 2018	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Bulgaria to draw to the Committee's attention any outcomes from the ICG on Education and Outreach of direct relevance to the work of the CEP</li> </ul>
Intersessional period 2018/19	
CEP XXII 2019	
Intersessional period 2019/20	
CEP XXIII 2020	
Intersessional period 2020/2021	
CEP XXIV 2021	

<b>Issue / Environmental Pressure: Implementing and Improving the EIA provisions of Annex I</b>	
<b>Priority: 2</b>	
<b>Actions:</b>	
<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Refine the process for considering CEEs and advising the ATCM accordingly.</li> <li>2. Develop guidelines for assessing cumulative impacts.</li> <li>3. Review EIA guidelines and consider wider policy and other issues.</li> <li>4. Consider application of strategic environmental assessment in Antarctica.</li> <li>5. Advance recommendations from climate change ATME</li> </ol>	
Intersessional period 2017/18	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Establish ICG to review draft CEEs as required</li> <li>• Parties, Experts and Observers work to progress and coordinate information that will assist development of guidance on identifying and assessing cumulative impacts</li> <li>• Consider potential changes required to EIA database to improve its utility</li> </ul>
CEP XXI 2018	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Discuss changes to the EIA database with a view to giving proposals to the Secretariat</li> <li>• Consideration of ICG reports on draft CEE, as required</li> </ul>
Intersessional period 2018/19	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Establish ICG to review draft CEEs as required</li> <li>• Parties, Experts and Observers work to progress and coordinate information that will assist development of guidance on identifying and assessing cumulative impacts</li> </ul>
CEP XXII 2019	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Consideration of ICG reports on draft CEE, as required</li> </ul>
Intersessional period 2019/20	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Establish ICG to review draft CEEs as required</li> <li>• Parties, Experts and Observers work to progress and coordinate information that will assist development of guidance on identifying and assessing cumulative impacts</li> </ul>

PRELIMINARY VERSION

CEP XXIII 2020	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Ask SCAR to provide guidance on how to do an environmental baseline condition survey, and consider their advice in due course</li> <li>• Consideration of ICG reports on draft CEE, as required</li> </ul>
Intersessional period 2020/2021	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Establish ICG to review draft CEEs as required</li> <li>• Parties, Experts and Observers work to progress and coordinate information that will assist development of guidance on identifying and assessing cumulative impacts</li> </ul>
CEP XXIV 2021	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Encourage parties to provide feedback on the utility of the revised set of <i>Guidelines for Environmental Impact Assessment in Antarctica</i> in the preparation of EIAs</li> <li>• Consideration of the options for preparing guidance on identifying and assessing cumulative impacts</li> <li>• Consideration of ICG reports on draft CEE, as required</li> </ul>

<b>Issue / Environmental Pressure: Designation and management of Historic Sites and Monuments</b>	
<b>Priority: 2</b>	
<b>Actions:</b>	
<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Maintain the list and consider new proposals as they arise.</li> <li>2. Consider strategic issues as necessary, including issues relating to designation of HSM versus clean-up provisions of the Protocol.</li> <li>3. Review the presentation of the HSM list with the aim to improve information availability.</li> </ol>	
Intersessional period 2017/18	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• ICG on development of guidance relating to designation of HSM</li> </ul>
CEP XXI 2018	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Consider ICG report</li> </ul>
Intersessional period 2018/19	
CEP XXII 2019	
Intersessional period 2019/20	
CEP XXIII 2020	
Intersessional period 2020/2021	
CEP XXIV 2021	

<b>Issue / Environmental Pressure: Biodiversity knowledge</b>	
<b>Priority: 3</b>	
<b>Actions:</b>	
<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Maintain awareness of threats to existing biodiversity.</li> <li>2. Advance recommendations from climate change ATME</li> <li>3. CEP to consider further scientific advice on wildlife disturbance.</li> </ol>	
Intersessional period 2017/18	
CEP XXI 2018	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Discussion of SCAR update on underwater noise</li> </ul>
Intersessional period 2018/19	

CEP XXII 2019	
Intersessional period 2019/20	
CEP XXIII 2020	
Intersessional period 2020/2021	
CEP XXIV 2021	

<b>Issue / Environmental Pressure: Protection of outstanding geological values</b>	
<b>Priority: 3</b>	
<b>Actions:</b>	
1. Consider further mechanisms for protection of outstanding geological values.	
Intersessional period 2017/18	
CEP XXI 2018	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Consider advice from SCAR.</li> </ul>
Intersessional period 2018/19	
CEP XXII 2019	
Intersessional period 2019/20	
CEP XXIII 2020	
Intersessional period 2020/2021	
CEP XXIV 2021	



## **Appendix 2. Subsidiary Group on Climate Change Response – Framework**

### **Background**

In 2008 the CEP included the issue of climate change on its agenda, and in 2009 SCAR published its Antarctic Climate Change and the Environment Report. In 2010 the ATCM held an Antarctic Treaty Meeting of Experts (ATME) on climate change and implications for Antarctic management and governance, which made 30 recommendations for the ATCM and CEP to consider, including that the

CEP consider developing a climate change response work programme, and that such a work programme should attempt to incorporate, *inter alia*:

- The need to continue to afford a high priority to the management of non-native species;
- A classification of existing protected areas according to climate change vulnerability;
- The need for more sophisticated and coordinated ecosystem monitoring, including the need for increased collaboration between CEP and SC-CAMLR;
- A review of existing management tools to assess their continuing suitability in a climate change context (e.g. EIA guidelines (particularly with regard to planned long-term activities), Specially Protected Species guidelines, the guide to the preparation of management plans).

The CEP established an ICG to develop a climate change response work programme (CCRWP), and in Resolution 4, 2015, the ATCM welcomed the CCRWP, encouraged the CEP implement it as a matter of priority, provide annual progress reports to the ATCM, and keep the CCRWP under regular review. Implementing the CCRWP is a priority 1 item on the CEP Five-Year Work Plan.

### **Subsidiary Body of the CEP**

The Committee may establish, with the approval of the ATCM, subsidiary bodies, as appropriate. Such subsidiary bodies shall operate on the basis of the Rules of Procedure of the Committee as applicable (Rule 10). CEP XX agreed to recommend to the ATCM the establishment of a Subsidiary Group on Climate Change Response (SGCCR) to support the implementation of the CCRWP.

### **SGCCR Terms of Reference**

CEP XX adopted the following terms of reference to guide the Subsidiary Group's work:

Facilitate the efficient and timely implementation of the CCRWP by:

- Facilitating the coordination and communication of the CCRWP between Members, Observers and Experts, highlighting actions identified for the coming year(s) and requesting relevant updates on planned activities;
- Drafting proposed annual updates of the CCRWP, including management, research or monitoring actions;
- Drafting annual progress reports on the implementation of the CCRWP for the CEP to draw on in their updates to the ATCM.

The CEP may amend the ToR of the SGCCR at any time.

### **Translation**

The CEP have agreed that key texts, for example, texts for discussion and or draft annual updates of the CCRWP be translated, on a case by case basis. Noting that the SGCCR will generally conduct its business remotely, the CEP considers that translation of key texts will meet the requirements of Rule 21.

### **Membership**

Membership of the SGCCR is open to all Members, Observers and Experts. It is desirable that SCAR and WMO representatives are members of the group. Members are encouraged to participate in the SGCCR for more than a year, to support continuity in membership and to maintain knowledge.

The Committee has agreed that broad participation in the group is important, and the SGCCR should maintain a minimum of four CEP Member participants. The convenor will have oversight of maintaining the membership of the SGCCR.

### **Convenor**

PRELIMINARY VERSION

Convenors of the SGCCR may be a CEP Vice Chair or CEP Member, elected under the same conditions as set out for Vice Chairs in Rule 15 of the Rules of Procedure, as applicable. Convenors may, but are not required to, provide technical contribution to the SGCCR's activities.

**Review**

CEP XX noted its intention to review the effectiveness of the SGCCR after 3 years.

### **Appendix 3. Procedures for intersessional CEP consideration of draft CEEs**

1. The agenda of each CEP meeting shall include an item relating to the consideration of draft CEEs forwarded to the CEP in accordance with Paragraph 4 of Article 3 of Annex I to the Protocol.\*
2. The CEP shall, under this agenda item, consider any draft CEE and provide advice to the ATCM on such drafts in accordance with Article 12 and Annex I of the Protocol.\*
3. Proponents are encouraged to circulate draft CEEs to the Committee as soon as practicable and, in accordance with Paragraph 4 of Article 3 of Annex I to the Protocol, shall do so at least 120 days before the next Antarctic Treaty Consultative Meeting.
4. At the same time a draft CEE is circulated to Members via diplomatic channels, the proponent shall notify the CEP Chair, preferably by e-mail, that a draft CEE has been circulated.#
5. The proponent should post the draft CEE on a web site in the original language(s). A link to that web site will also be established on the CEP web site. If the proponent does not have a web site on which it is able to post the draft CEE, an electronic version should be forwarded to the CEP Chair who will post it on the CEP web site.#

[The Secretariat shall also translate each draft CEE into all other official languages and post these versions to the CEP web site as soon as practicable.]

6. The CEP Chair shall immediately notify the CEP contact points of the availability of each draft CEE, and provide details of the web site at which such documents can be accessed.#
7. The Chair shall suggest a convenor for an open-ended intersessional contact group to consider the draft CEE. The convenor should preferably not be from the proponent Party.#
8. The Chair shall allow a period of 15 days for Members to object or offer comments, suggestions or proposals concerning:
  - i. the proposed convenor.
  - ii. additional terms of reference beyond the following generic issues:
    - the extent to which the CEE conforms to the requirements of Article 3 of Annex I of the Environment Protocol.
    - whether the CEE: i) has identified all the environmental impacts of the proposed activity; and ii) suggests appropriate methods of mitigating (reducing or avoiding) those impacts.
    - whether the conclusions of the draft CEE are adequately supported by the information contained within the document.
    - the clarity, format and presentation of the draft CEE.#
9. If the Chair does not receive a reply within 15 days it will be considered that the Members agree with the proposed convenor and the generic terms of reference. If the Chair receives comments on i) or ii) listed above within the 15 day limit the Chair shall, as appropriate, circulate a revised suggestion for one or both items. A further 15 day limit applies for Members to respond.#
10. All correspondence shall be available to all representatives via the CEP Discussion Forum.\*
11. The right of a Party to raise an issue on a draft CEE at the CEP or ATCM is not affected by its action in relation to the establishment – or non-establishment – of an open-ended intersessional contact group.#
12. The outcome of the contact group’s deliberations, indicating areas of agreement and areas where differing views are expressed, shall be reported in a Working Paper submitted by the convenor to the next CEP meeting.\*

\* Copied or modified from “Guidelines for CEP Consideration of Draft CEEs” (Annex 4 to CEP II Final Report, 1999).

# Copied or modified from “Operational procedures for establishing intersessional contact groups for consideration of draft CEEs” (Annex 3 to CEP III Final Report, 2000).



#### **Appendix 4. Guidelines: A prior assessment process for the designation of ASPA and ASMAs**

The CEP noted the benefits of a prior assessment process for potential new ASMAs and ASPAs, including: (i) engaging all Parties in the process of designating new sites; (ii) recognising that all ASPAs and ASMAs are internationally designated; (iii) aiding Members in preparing management plans by allowing for feedback and comments from other Members earlier in the process; and (iv) facilitating consideration of the further systematic development of the protected areas system in accordance with Article 3 of Annex V to the Protocol, and with consideration of climate change implications. Proponent(s) of potential new ASPAs or ASMAs are therefore encouraged to engage the Committee in a prior assessment discussion.

Consequently, the following Guidelines were adopted at CEP XVIII Final Report (Appendix 3).

1. The proponent should submit information about planned ASMAs and ASPAs at the first possible CEP meeting after they have identified an area as a potential new ASPA or ASMA irrespective of whether a decision to start working on a management plan has been taken or not. It would be useful if the proponent submitted this information at the latest one year before intending to submit a management plan to the CEP for consideration.
2. The information submitted to the CEP should include:
  - The proposed location of the ASMA/ASPA.
  - The initial rationale behind the plans for proposing the designation<sup>1</sup>, including specifying the legal basis for the designation found in Annex V; how it improves the representativeness of the protected areas network, and how it fits within the ACBR planning tool.
  - Other relevant information relating to the development of a management plan that the proponent country has available at the time of submission to the CEP meeting.
3. The proponent country is encouraged to facilitate further discussions and questions on the preliminary plans through e.g. informal discussions/exchanges on the CEP forum or directly with Member countries.

#### **ASPA prior assessment template**

To assist proponents provide the information detailed in the Guidelines (above) for potential ASPAs, a non-mandatory template has been developed for voluntary use and is available at Appendix A: *Antarctic Specially Protected Area prior assessment template*.

**Appendix A: Antarctic Specially Protected Area prior assessment template<sup>1</sup>**

Proponents should only complete those sections of the template that they consider relevant to the assessment they have completed.

1	Name of potential Antarctic Specially Protected Area (ASPAs):			
2	Proponent(s) of potential ASPAs:			
3	Location and approximate co-ordinates of potential ASPAs:			
4	Is the potential ASPA within an existing Antarctic Specially Managed Area (ASMA)?			
5	Approximate size of potential ASPAs:			
6	Main physical components contained within the potential ASPA (e.g. ice-free ground, lakes, ocean, ice shelf, permanent ice):			
7	Description of the initial rationale for area protection for the potential ASPA:			
8	Indication of the values to be protected within the potential ASPA, in accordance with Annex V Article 3(1):			
	<i>Value</i>	<i>Primary value</i>	<i>Secondary value</i>	<i>Not applicable</i>
	Environmental values			
	Scientific values			
	Historic values			
	Aesthetic values			
	Wilderness values			
	Combination of values			
9	Further description of values to be protected			
10	The following characteristics are contained within the potential ASPA:			(Yes/No)
(a)	areas kept inviolate from human interference so that future comparisons may be possible with localities that have been affected by human activities			
(b)	representative examples of major terrestrial, including glacial and aquatic, ecosystems and marine ecosystems			
(c)	areas with important or unusual assemblages of species, including major colonies of breeding native birds or mammals			
(d)	the type locality or only known habitat of any species			
(e)	areas of particular interest to ongoing or planned scientific research			
(f)	examples of outstanding geological, glaciological or geomorphological features			
(g)	areas of outstanding aesthetic and wilderness value			
(h)	sites or monuments of recognised historic value			
(i)	such other areas as may be appropriate to protect environmental, scientific, historic, aesthetic or wilderness values, any combination of those values, or ongoing or planned scientific research			
11	Consideration as to whether the ASPA be protected primarily for conservation or scientific			

PRELIMINARY VERSION

	research purposes:
12	Description of how the quality of the areas merits ASPA designation (e.g. representativeness, diversity, distinctiveness, ecological importance, degree of interference, science and monitoring uses):
13	Assessment of the risk posed to the area due to human activities and impacts, natural processes, natural variability and viability, non-Antarctic threats, urgency and scientific uncertainty:
<i>Designation of the protected area within a systematic environmental-geographical framework:</i>	
14	The area lies within the following Environmental Domains Analysis region(s) (Resolution 3 (2008)):
15	The area lies within the following Antarctic Conservation Biogeographic Region (Resolution 6 (2012)):
16	The area contains the following Antarctic Important Bird Areas (Resolution 5 (2015)):
17	Short description of how the potential ASPA has been considered to improve the representativeness of the protected areas network:
18	Other relevant information from the assessment process:
19	Any relevant supporting documentation

<sup>1</sup> In this context it is relevant to point to the ‘*Guidelines for implementation of the Framework for Protected Areas set forth in Article 3 of Annex V of the Environmental Protocol*’ (held under Resolution 1 (2000)), which includes guidance for such assessment processes.

N.B. For ASPAs with a substantial marine component, prior approval must be obtained from CCAMLR (Annex V, Article 6(2)).



## ***Appendix 5. Preliminary Agenda for CEP XXI (2018)***

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
  - a. Strategic Approach
  - b. Implementation and Review of the Climate Change Response Work Programme
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