

# Table of contents

<b>Item 1: Opening of the Meeting</b>	115
<b>Item 2: Adoption of the Agenda</b>	116
<b>Item 3: Strategic Discussions on the Future Work of the CEP</b>	117
CEP advice to the ATCM on the Antarctic Environments Portal	118
CEP advice to the ATCM on a symposium on the 25th anniversary of the Environment Protocol	120
<b>Item 4: Operation of the CEP</b>	123
CEP advice to the ATCM on opportunities to strengthen cooperation between the CEP and the ATCM	124
<b>Item 5: Cooperation with other Organisations</b>	125
<b>Item 6: Repair and Remediation of Environment Damage</b>	128
<b>Item 7: Climate Change Implications for the Environment: Strategic approach</b>	130
CEP advice to the ATCM on a CEP Climate Change Response Work Programme	132
CEP advice to the ATCM on Southern Ocean observations and modelling	135
<b>Item 8: Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA)</b>	136
8a) <i>Draft Comprehensive Environmental Evaluations</i>	136
8b) <i>Other EIA Matters</i>	138
CEP advice to the ATCM on the review of the Guidelines for Environmental Impact Assessment in Antarctica	139
CEP advice to the ATCM on unmanned aerial vehicles (UAVs)	144
<b>Item 9: Area Protection and Management Plans</b>	145
9a) <i>Management Plans</i>	145
CEP advice to the ATCM on revised management plans for ASPA and ASMAs:	149
9b) <i>Historic Sites and Monuments</i>	152
CEP advice to the ATCM on additions to the List of Historic Sites and Monuments	153
CEP advice to the ATCM on guidance for the designation of new Historic Sites and Monuments	154
9c) <i>Site Guidelines</i>	155
9d) <i>Marine Spatial Protection and Management</i>	157
9e) <i>Other Annex V Matters</i>	158
CEP advice to ATCM on a prior assessment process for the designation of ASPAs and ASMAs	159
<b>Item 10: Conservation of Antarctic Flora and Fauna</b>	162
10a) <i>Quarantine and Non-native Species</i>	162
10b) <i>Specially Protected Species</i>	166

<i>10c) Other Annex II Matters</i>	166
CEP advice to the ATCM on wildlife disturbance	167
CEP advice to the ATCM on Important Bird Areas in Antarctica	168
<b>Item 11: Environmental Monitoring and Reporting</b>	168
<b>Item 12: Inspection Reports</b>	170
<b>Item 13: General Matters</b>	174
<b>Item 14: Election of Officers</b>	174
<b>Item 15: Preparation for Next Meeting</b>	175
<b>Item 16: Adoption of the Report</b>	175
<b>Item 17: Closing of the Meeting</b>	175
<b>Appendix 1. CEP Five-Year Work Plan</b>	177
<b>Appendix 2. Climate Change Response Work Programme</b>	186
<b>Appendix 3. Guidelines: A prior assessment process for the designation of ASPA and ASMAs</b>	193
<b>Appendix 4. Preliminary Agenda for CEP XIX</b>	194

# **Report of the Committee for Environmental Protection (CEP XVIII)**

**Sofia, Bulgaria, June 1 – 5, 2015**

- (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, India, Italy, Japan, 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 Sofia, Bulgaria, from 1 to 5 June 2015, 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: Malaysia, Mongolia, Switzerland and Turkey;
  - 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), International Union for Conservation of Nature (IUCN), the United Nations Environment Programme (UNEP) and the World Meteorological Organization (WMO).

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

- (3) The CEP Chair, Ewan McIvor (Australia), opened the meeting on Monday 1 June 2015 and thanked Bulgaria for arranging and hosting the meeting in Sofia.
- (4) The Committee expressed sincere condolences to Belgium for the sad loss of Frédéric Chemay, the late Belgian CEP Representative, who passed away in September 2014.

- (5) On behalf of the Committee, the Chair welcomed Venezuela and Portugal as new Members, following their accession to the Protocol on 31 August 2014 and 10 October 2014, respectively. The Chair noted that the CEP now comprised 37 Members.
- (6) The Chair summarised the work undertaken during the intersessional period, noting that all the actions arising from CEP XVII with outcomes anticipated for CEP XVIII had been addressed (IP 121).

## **Item 2: Adoption of the Agenda**

- (7) The Committee adopted the following agenda and confirmed the allocation of 41 Working Papers (WP), 45 Information Papers (IP), 4 Secretariat Papers (SP) and 9 Background Papers (BP) to the agenda items:
  1. Opening of the Meeting
  2. Adoption of the Agenda
  3. Strategic Discussions on the Future Work of the CEP
  4. Operation of the CEP
  5. Cooperation with other Organisations
  6. Repair and Remediation of Environment Damage
  7. Climate Change Implications for the Environment: Strategic approach
  8. Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA)
    - a. Draft Comprehensive Environmental Evaluations
    - b. Other EIA Matters
  9. Area Protection and Management Plans
    - a. Management Plans
    - b. Historic Sites and Monuments
    - c. Site Guidelines
    - d. 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**

- (8) New Zealand introduced WP 21 *Antarctic Environments Portal: Project completion and next steps*, and referred to IP 11 *Antarctic Environmental Portal content development and editorial process*, jointly prepared with Australia, Belgium, Norway, and SCAR. The papers reported on the progress made in completing the development of the Antarctic Environments Portal project since ATCM XXXVII. Intersessional work had included: promotion of the Portal during the 2014 SCAR Open Science Conference, which included the holding of an Association of Polar Early Career Scientists (APECS) workshop on the Portal; the establishment of two advisory groups to provide feedback on aspects of the Portal, and a separate workshop to test and refine the editorial process. New Zealand also noted that an Editor had been contracted and the Portal Editorial Group had been established which was charged with developing, reviewing and keeping up-to-date the Portal content. The Editorial Group was currently overseeing the preparation of 15 articles of direct relevance to the Committee. These articles involve contributions from 50 authors across 15 countries. New Zealand noted that the Portal was in the process of being transferred to Gateway Antarctica, at the University of Canterbury, and that an interim Management Board would be established to oversee the operation of the Portal. New Zealand further noted that a funding proposal had been submitted to an international foundation to support the operation of the Portal for the next three years.
- (9) The co-sponsors of the Working Paper recommended that the Committee: welcome completion of the Antarctic Environments Portal project, and indicate its support for the final product; consider ways in which the Portal could be used to support its discussions, its advice to the ATCM, and its planning of future priority work; consider whether and how it might engage with the Portal

by providing Editorial Group members in the future; and, provide thoughts with regard to the potential future management of the Portal.

- (10) The Committee commended New Zealand, Australia, Belgium, Norway and SCAR for the considerable work undertaken since CEP XVII to further develop and complete the Antarctic Environments Portal. Members remarked on the co-proponents' responsiveness to issues raised in discussions at previous CEP meetings, particularly the development of a rigorous editorial process to ensure the Portal contained the highest quality scientific information, and noted that all content was balanced and politically neutral.
- (11) Regarding opportunities for using the Portal to support the Committee's discussions, it was agreed that Members could draw on the information contained in the Portal to support their work, including: for policy development; as a resource to support environmental impact assessment processes; and as a resource to inform their preparations for meetings and discussions during meetings. The Committee noted that it could suggest issues for future inclusion in the Portal relevant to issues it was addressing.
- (12) A query was raised on how the election of the editorial group would occur in the future, and it was noted that the future governance and management of the Portal were matters the Committee should return to at future meetings. In this regard, caution was noted regarding future funding of the Portal, and the need to ensure that the politically neutral nature of the content and the Portal's management was not compromised. It was suggested that the Secretariat could be the eventual host of the Portal.
- (13) The Committee welcomed the advice that hosting of the Portal was being transferred to the University of Canterbury, and noted that an application for external funding was in progress.
- (14) France offered to contribute to the translation in French providing specific resources.

---

**CEP advice to the ATCM on the Antarctic Environments Portal**

- (15) The Committee agreed to advise the ATCM that it: welcomed the completion of the Antarctic Environments Portal project; expressed its support for the final product; and acknowledged the utility of the Antarctic Environments Portal as a voluntary tool to help ensure the Committee was as informed as possible on the state of Antarctic environments.

- (16) The Committee endorsed a draft Resolution on the future use and management of the Antarctic Environments Portal and agreed to forward it to the ATCM for approval.
- 

*25<sup>th</sup> Anniversary of the Environmental Protocol*

- (17) Norway introduced WP 44 *A symposium celebrating the 25th anniversary of the Environmental Protocol to the Antarctic Treaty*, jointly prepared with Australia, Chile, France, New Zealand and the United Kingdom. Following a suggestion by Norway at CEP XVII, WP 44 suggested that a commemorative symposium to celebrate and discuss achievements in relation to the Protocol's role as the framework for environmental protection in Antarctica be held in conjunction with the 39<sup>th</sup> ATCM and the 19<sup>th</sup> meeting of the CEP.
- (18) The paper recommended that the ATCM/CEP: decide to hold a 25<sup>th</sup> anniversary symposium in conjunction with ATCM XXXIX and CEP XIX in Chile, on the Saturday immediately following the conclusion of the CEP meeting; agree to the framework described in WP 44 as a starting point for further symposium programme development; accept the offer of Norway (along with others) to coordinate the planning of and taking responsibility for the practical implementation of the symposium; and agree to use the ATS Discussion Forum as a platform for Members to provide input to the organisers with regard to the agenda of the symposium.
- (19) The Committee considered and agreed that the 25th anniversary of the Protocol was a milestone that provided a timely and relevant opportunity to focus on the Environment Protocol as the environmental management framework for Antarctica, and that a symposium would be a useful and appropriate vehicle to achieve this.
- (20) The Committee agreed that such a commemorative symposium should be held in conjunction with CEP XIX/ATCM XXXIX in Chile, potentially on the Saturday immediately following the meeting of the CEP.
- (21) With respect to scope, many Members expressed the desire that such a commemorative symposium should not be limited only to internal celebrations, but used as an opportunity to reach out and create an external focus. Suggestions ranged from providing a platform for politicians to meet on the issues, to opening the symposium to the general public. A number of Members suggested developing some form of "product" from the symposium as an outreach component, although details as to what this might entail were not explored further. Furthermore, Members expressed desire to use

the opportunity to look at the Protocol from many perspectives, including its historical background, as well as its legal and social context.

- (22) ASOC expressed support for the proposed symposium, which it considered was an excellent opportunity to assess the implementation and effectiveness of the Protocol to date and also an opportunity to think strategically about how the Protocol can address current and future challenges. ASOC suggested that discussions include an examination of inspections conducted under Article 14 of the Protocol, which provided the “ground truth” of how the Protocol was implemented in practice.
- (23) The Committee noted that there also were a number of other initiatives that catered to the external, outreach component of the 25 year celebrations. The 25 year commemorative brochure suggested by Argentina was one such proposal and product. Over the weekend prior to ATCM XXXVIII / CEP XVIII, the Workshop on Education and Outreach had proposed to establish an electronic forum on Education and Outreach that would use the 25<sup>th</sup> anniversary to provide opportunities for joint outreach and education efforts.
- (24) The Committee also noted that the symposium should provide an opportunity to focus both on achievements of the past as well challenges in the future, and that it should include a clear procedure to ensure an appropriate balance in the presentations and presenters invited to talk at the symposium. It was also noted that the symposium should be arranged within the existing budgetary framework of the Secretariat.

---

**CEP advice to the ATCM on a symposium on the 25<sup>th</sup> anniversary of the Environment Protocol**

- (25) The CEP agreed to advise the ATCM that the 25<sup>th</sup> anniversary of the Protocol was a milestone that provided a timely, relevant and desired opportunity to focus on the Environment Protocol as the environmental management framework for Antarctica, and that a symposium would be a useful and appropriate vehicle to achieve this.
- (26) The CEP furthermore agreed to advise the ATCM that such a commemorative symposium should be held in conjunction with CEP XIX/ATCM XXXIX in Chile, potentially on the Saturday immediately following the meeting of the CEP.
- (27) The CEP agreed to recommend that a steering committee, consisting of representatives of the proponent countries, other interested Members and potentially including former CEP Chairs be established. This steering

committee should further develop the symposium programme, taking into account, as appropriate, the ideas raised by CEP Members with regard to potential scope, balanced procedures for presentations and presenters and budgetary frameworks. The steering committee should consider mechanisms to ensure an opportunity for Parties to provide advice to the steering committee in the development of the symposium programme during the intersessional period.

- 
- (28) Argentina introduced WP 47 *Workshop on Education and Outreach - Report of the Informal Discussions on the Development of a Publication on the Occasion of the 25<sup>th</sup> Anniversary of the Madrid Protocol*. The paper presented the outcomes of the informal discussion led by Argentina, including a draft index of subjects for a publication, and possible ways to move forward. Argentina emphasised the importance of informing the general public on the many achievements over the past 25 years. It noted that several positions were expressed during the informal discussion regarding the scope of the publication. Argentina noted that some participants considered the scope should be limited to the work and accomplishments of the Committee to the present, while others suggested the publication should outline future key challenges and objectives. It suggested that the format and design of the publication should be user friendly and interactive. Argentina recommended that the CEP: recognise the progress made during the informal discussions; consider the various options suggested by participants; and analyse the convenience of formalising the publication process for the next intersessional period.
- (29) The Committee thanked Argentina for leading the informal intersessional discussion, and supported the establishment of a formal process with balanced authorship to prepare a publication to reflect the achievements of the Protocol and CEP, as well as future challenges. The Committee agreed that such a publication should be concise, politically neutral and prepared in language accessible to a wide audience.
- (30) The Committee noted that the Workshop on Education and Outreach held prior to ATCM XXXVIII had discussed the idea of a forum to coordinate outreach activities associated with the 25<sup>th</sup> anniversary of the Protocol, and that such a forum could be a useful means of disseminating information on this publication to a wide audience.
- (31) ASOC noted that the 25th anniversary was an important benchmark in the history of Antarctic governance and that it was appropriate to leave a record to reflect on the successes and challenges of the past 25 years and also

evaluate those of coming years. ASOC expressed its willingness to provide input in the process of publication.

- (32) SCAR also expressed its willingness to provide input in the process of publication.
- (33) The Committee decided to establish an intersessional contact group (ICG) on the development of a publication on the 25th anniversary of the Madrid Protocol with the following ToRs:
  - 1. Establish a small Author Group to develop the writing process of the publication, taking into account the geographical balance and diversity of CEP Parties in terms of experience, including former Chairs of the Committee. Also, to establish an Editing Group for the compilation and editing of the text, once the contributions are received;
  - 2. Develop a neutral, brief, concise and web-based publication including visual and dynamic tools, considering the objectives already defined for the publication by the CEP;
  - 3. Identify the different means of outreach for the publication; and
  - 4. Submit to the XIX CEP the draft publication for Parties consideration and approval, prior to its launch on the occasion of the anniversary date by October 2016.
- (34) The Committee gratefully accepted Argentina's offer to convene the ICG and encouraged broad engagement in this work during the upcoming intersessional period. The Committee welcomed the offer from Patricia Ortúzar (Argentina) to act as convener for the ICG.

#### *CEP Five-Year Work Plan*

- (35) The Committee considered the Five-Year Work Plan adopted at CEP XVII (WP 5) and, in keeping with its agreement at CEP XV (2012), briefly considered the work plan at the end of each agenda item.
- (36) The Committee revised and updated its Five-Year Work Plan (Appendix 1). The major changes included updates to reflect actions agreed during the Meeting, including to add a new issue on the protection of outstanding geological values. The Committee also decided to remove a number of issues for which no specific tasks had been identified (specially protected species; emergency response and contingency planning; updating the Protocol and reviewing Annexes; inspections; waste; and energy management), noting that some of these issues were standing items on its agenda and that these

issues, or any new issues, could be readily added to the work plan in the future.

- (37) The Committee agreed that, for future meetings, the Five-Year Work Plan should be submitted in a Secretariat Paper alongside the work plan of the ATCM.

#### **Item 4: Operation of the CEP**

- (38) The Chair referred to SP 2 *Secretariat Report 2014/15*, which summarised the Secretariat's activities over the past year. The Chair thanked the Secretariat for its work in support of the Committee.
- (39) Australia introduced WP 14 *Report of the intersessional contact group established to review information exchange requirements*. The Committee noted at CEP XVII its interest in contributing to discussions on environmental information exchange requirements. ATCM XVII subsequently requested the CEP to provide advice on these matters. Australia summarised the work of the intersessional contact group, which had identified two broad categories of information exchange suggestions. The first were items or categories where relatively simple changes or clarifications were suggested by one or more participants without debate, and which might gain general support by Parties. The second were items or categories where no clear agreement emerged, and where further discussion of suggested changes was likely to be required.
- (40) The paper recommended that the Committee should: consider the report with reference to the exchange of information relating to environmental matters; discuss those categories and items of information where minor changes might obtain general support to conclude changes where possible; and, for those categories where further discussion was likely to be required, determine if work on these categories and items was necessary and propose how to progress the work.
- (41) The Committee thanked Australia for convening the ICG and for the comprehensive report of discussions. The Committee expressed interest in further considering changes to the requirements for exchange of information relating to environmental matters. It noted that the ATCM's discussions on this paper would take into consideration contributions made by CEP representatives during the course of the meeting, and stood ready to provide

further advice to the ATCM, as appropriate, on the exchange of information relating to environmental matters.

- (42) The Chair recalled that ATCM XXXVII had updated the ATCM Multi-Year Strategic Work Plan to include a priority on ‘strengthening cooperation between the CEP and the ATCM’. The Chair noted that the Committee had a good working relationship with the ATCM, but highlighted the value of the Committee identifying opportunities to further enhance the relationship, and sought Members’ views in this regard.
- (43) The Committee welcomed the ATCM’s decision to prioritise consideration of its relationship with the CEP, and expressed support for steps taken by the Chair, including: providing an early briefing to ATCM delegations on matters to be considered by the Committee that might also be of interest and relevance for the ATCM’s own deliberations; using opportunities during the meeting to coordinate with ATCM Working Group Chairs and informally convey the results of relevant CEP discussions; and seeking to focus the presentation of the CEP report on the matters for which Committee had developed specific advice to the ATCM.
- (44) The Committee recalled its role as an advisory body to the ATCM, as outlined in Article 12 of the Protocol, and noted the necessity of an effective dialogue between the ATCM and CEP. The Committee further noted the importance of being responsive to requests for advice from the ATCM, and of being proactive in bringing important issues to its attention.
- (45) The Committee agreed that it would be useful to request the ATCM to provide feedback on how the Committee provides its advice, and on whether the advice is directed to matters of priority to the ATCM. In this regard, the Committee noted that it could be valuable for the ATCM to consider the priorities in the CEP Five-Year Work Plan.

---

**CEP advice to the ATCM on opportunities to strengthen cooperation between the CEP and the ATCM**

- (46) The Committee welcomed the priority assigned by the ATCM to considering its relationship with the CEP, and encouraged the ATCM to provide feedback regarding opportunities to enhance its approach to providing advice, including to more closely align with ATCM priorities.
-

## Item 5: Cooperation with other Organisations

- (47) COMNAP presented IP 8 *The Annual Report for 2014/15 of the Council of Managers of National Antarctic Programs* (COMNAP), which had also been presented to the ATCM. COMNAP advised the Committee that Anoop Tiwari was the new leader of the COMNAP Environment Expert Group and expressed its thanks to the former leader of the Group, Sandra Potter, for her years of service in that role.
- (48) The SC-CAMLR Observer presented IP 12 *Report by the SC-CAMLR Observer*. As in previous years, the paper focused on the five issues of common interest to the CEP and SC-CAMLR as identified in 2009 at the first joint workshop: a) Climate change and the Antarctic marine environment; b) Biodiversity and non-native species in the Antarctic marine environment; c) Antarctic species requiring special protection; d) Spatial marine management and protected areas; and e) Ecosystem and environmental monitoring.
- (49) IP 12 included progress on these five topics and highlighted some important initiatives of SC-CAMLR including: the Commission for the Conservation of Antarctic Marine Living Resources (CCAMLR) Scientific Scholarship Scheme and the work of SC-CAMLR in the fields of Marine Protected Areas (MPAs) and Vulnerable Marine Ecosystems, and the need for further development of the current set of CCAMLR Ecosystem Monitoring Program (CEMP) parameters as part of the development of feedback management approaches for the krill fishery. The full report on the 33rd SC-CAMLR meeting was available on the CCAMLR website: <http://www.ccamlr.org/en/meetings/27>.
- (50) In response to two questions from Turkey, the SC-CAMLR Observer noted that the most recent assessment of the krill population in the Convention Area was calculated from the CCAMLR 2000 synoptic survey. This survey produced a population estimate of 60 million tons of krill and SC-CAMLR acknowledged that this estimate was dated, but there is no evidence from smaller scale annual krill surveys to suggest any trend in krill biomass since that survey. The SC-CAMLR Observer also reported that no non-native marine species had been reported to CCAMLR but noted the agreement that the CEP would take the lead on the issue of non-native species in the Antarctic marine environment.
- (51) SCAR presented IP 19 *The Scientific Committee on Antarctic Research (SCAR) Annual Report 2014/15* and referred to BP 4 *The Scientific Committee on Antarctic Research (SCAR) Selected Science Highlights for 2014/15*. It

highlighted several examples of its activities including the publication of the Biogeographic Atlas of the Southern Ocean, the completion of the SCAR Science Horizon Scan (IP 20) and resulting publications in the journals Antarctic Science and Nature, and the participation in the development of the Antarctic Environments Portal. SCAR noted the advances in the preparation of a report on Southern Ocean acidification and reminded delegates that this will be the topic of the SCAR Lecture in the XXXVIII ATCM (BP 1). SCAR also informed delegates that the XII International Symposium on Antarctic Earth Sciences (ISAES) 2015 will be held on 13 – 17 July in Goa, India, and the XXXIV SCAR Meetings and Open Science Conference will be held in Kuala Lumpur, Malaysia on 19 to 31 August 2016. SCAR further noted that in 2018, the SCAR Meetings and Open Science Conference would be held 15 – 27 June in Davos, Switzerland. It further noted that it was continuing to develop fellowship programmes for young researchers and to support capacity building.

- (52) SCAR noted that Aleks Terauds had been appointed as the new Chief Officer of the Standing Committee on the Antarctic Treaty System (SCATS) and that several new members had joined SCATS.
- (53) Chile presented IP 106 *Report by the CEP Observer to the XXXIII SCAR Delegates' Meeting*, which presented the most important aspects of the meeting relevant to the Committee. Chile took the opportunity to thank SCATS and Steven Chown for the support given to the Committee in the past, and wished Aleks Terauds the greatest success with his tasks. It also recalled that, during the Open Science Conference of SCAR, SCATS had organised a “flipped symposium” with presentations on the current view of Antarctic researchers about conservation, biodiversity, monitoring, protected sites, local impacts, invasive species and the role of National Antarctic Programmes, as well as with the challenges they presented to the Antarctic Treaty System and the international scientific community. It noted that this information could be helpful for the work of the CEP.
- (54) Malaysia informed the Committee that the next SCAR Open Science Conference would be held 19-31 August, 2016 in Kuala Lumpur and referred the members to the conference webpage (<http://scar2016.com/>) for further details.

*Nomination of CEP Representatives to other organisations*

- (55) The Committee nominated Yves Frenot (France) to represent the CEP at the 27<sup>th</sup> COMNAP Annual General Meeting to be held in Tromsø, Norway,

26 – 28 August 2015, and Polly Penhale (United States) to represent the CEP at the 34<sup>th</sup> SC-CAMLR meeting to be held in Hobart, Australia, 19 – 23 October 2015. The CEP Chair also accepted an invitation from the SC-CAMLR Chair to attend the 2015 meeting of SC-CAMLR.

*CEP SC-CAMLR Workshop*

- (56) The United States introduced WP 6 *Proposed joint CEP/SC-CAMLR workshop (2016) on climate change and monitoring*, jointly prepared with the United Kingdom. The 2014 meetings of the CEP and SC-CAMLR had supported the concept of holding a second joint CEP/SC-CAMLR workshop in 2016. Both committees had agreed that the general scope for the workshop could be to identify effects of climate change that were most likely to impact the conservation of the Antarctic, and to identify existing and potential sources of research and monitoring data relevant to the CEP and SC-CAMLR. Following discussions at SC-CAMLR XVII, a joint steering committee had been established, co-convened by Polly Penhale (CEP Vice-Chair, United States) and Susie Grant (SC-CAMLR Vice-Chair, United Kingdom) and including the Chairs of the CEP (Ewan McIvor, Australia) and SC-CAMLR (Christopher Jones, United States). Additionally, it was noted that So Kawaguchi (Australia) and Anton Van De Putte (Belgium) had been nominated to join the steering committee. The steering committee now sought input from CEP Members regarding the proposed workshop terms of reference, specific items for the agenda, and nominations for additional members of the steering committee.
- (57) The Committee expressed strong support for holding a second joint CEP and SC-CAMLR workshop in 2016.
- (58) The Committee agreed that the proposed ToRs included in WP 6 provide a solid foundation for the workshop, and agreed to prioritise ToR (ii) which focused on a review of current monitoring programmes and the potential development of new approaches and (iii) the development of mechanisms for practical cooperation between the CEP and SC-CAMLR on climate change and monitoring. Furthermore the Committee recognised the need for caution in broadening the ToRs of the workshop and recommended a focus on monitoring of the effects of climate change rather than discussion of climate change mitigation measures.
- (59) The composition of the proposed steering committee was considered appropriate and of an ideal size to work efficiently. It was agreed that the

workshop would be open to all Members of the CEP and all Members of SC-CAMLR, and that all Observers to the CEP and to SC-CAMLR would also be invited to attend. Both SCAR and ASOC indicated their interest in attending the workshop.

- (60) In addition, the Committee agreed that consideration should be given to inviting experts who could share experiences in observational systems and monitoring of climate change, such as those working in the Arctic.
- (61) The Committee agreed that the most convenient timing for CEP Members would be to hold the joint workshop just prior to the 2016 ATCM/CEP meeting in Chile. It was recognised that this venue and timing might be less convenient for SC-CAMLR participants and, therefore, it was recommended that mechanisms for those who could not attend in person to participate remotely should be explored. While there are potential cost and technical issues associated with remote participation, this approach was viewed as worthy of investigation.
- (62) Chile expressed interest in hosting the joint workshop prior in 2016, but noted that a firm commitment could not be made at this time. It expected that a decision could be made in the latter part of 2015 after the review of the overall scope and budget of required support for the ATCM/CEP meeting was completed.
- (63) ASOC stated that the Antarctic environment did not recognise institutional boundaries, particularly with respect to the effects of climate change. Cooperation between various ATS bodies was required and ASOC strongly supported a second joint CEP and SC-CAMLR workshop.
- (64) The following papers were also submitted under this agenda item:
  - BP 4 *The Scientific Committee on Antarctic Research (SCAR) Selected Science Highlights for 2014/15* (SCAR).
  - BP 6 *Submission to the CCAMLR CEMP database of Adélie penguin data from the Ross Sea region* (New Zealand).

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

- (65) The Chair recalled that the CEP had provided advice to ATCM XXXVI (2013) on repair and remediation of environmental damage, as requested in Decision 4 (2010). The ATCM had considered the advice at its meeting in 2014, thanked the Committee for its valuable work, and decided that no

further advice was required at that time. Noting that ATCM XXXVIII would discuss matters relating to liability for environmental damage, in accordance with Decision 4 (2010), the Committee agreed that it would stand ready to provide advice on this topic as required.

- (66) Brazil introduced WP 49 *Environmental Remediation in Antarctica*, jointly prepared with Argentina, and referred to IP 16 *Bioremediation on the Brazilian Antarctic Station area*. WP 49 presented the results of a bilateral discussion between Brazil and Argentina to share experiences regarding environmental risk and remediation, including bioremediation of Antarctic sites contaminated by hydrocarbons. It outlined the difficulties found in establishing adequate parameters to measure levels of contamination in Antarctica, since some established international parameters were not applicable to the Antarctic environment. On this issue, both Members proposed using previous experience in cooperating on pollution monitoring. The paper also raised the importance of contributing to the Clean-up Manual in order to share information on best practice. Brazil and Argentina recommended that the Committee: note and acknowledge the usefulness of the results and outcomes of bilateral and multilateral workshops that allow for a more thorough exchange of views and experiences; encourage National Antarctic Programmes to cooperate on issues related to remediation experiences; and encourage Members and Observers to include their experiences in the Clean-up Manual in the future.
- (67) Many Members and ASOC noted the high quality work presented by Brazil and Argentina, which could be added to the case studies contained in the Clean-up Manual and improve best practice for repair and remediation. Members also acknowledged the excellent work presented by Australia in BP 12 and BP 13, noting that these papers added further value to an existing body of case studies. New Zealand informed the Committee that the Antarctic Environments Portal would soon release a synthesis report on the current state of knowledge on repair and remediation.
- (68) Several Members noted that non-native species should be considered during repair and remediation efforts. India praised the *in situ* bioremediation efforts made by Brazil, Argentina and Australia as cost-effective, but cautioned that the use of fertiliser without dose optimisation could allow non-native species to establish in the vicinity of the remediated site, hence further research on this issue may be persuaded. Ecuador reminded the Committee that it was important to preferentially work with native communities of microbes and bacteria when undertaking bioremediation.

- (69) ASOC noted that repair and remediation of environmental damage is a requirement of the Protocol relevant to annexes I, III, and VI, and should be carried out to the maximum extent possible, while taking into consideration the adverse environmental effects that repair and remediation could have. There were still instances of no action taken in the face of environmental damage. In this context, ASOC thanked Brazil and Argentina for an interesting paper and supported the suggestions to increase both cooperation as well as knowledge on environmental remediation.
- (70) The Committee endorsed the recommendations contained in WP 49.
- (71) The United States presented IP 41 *Remediation and Closure of Dry Valley Drilling Project Boreholes in Response to Rising lake Levels*. The paper discussed the remediation and closure of two boreholes installed as part of the Dry Valley Drilling Project, to mitigate the risk of contamination of Dry Valley lakes or the environment as a result of rising lake levels. The United States highlighted that environmental change must be considered when reviewing the status of sites of past activity.
- (72) The following papers were also submitted under this agenda item:
- BP 12 *Remediation of fuel-contaminated soil using biopile technology at Casey Station* (Australia).
  - BP 13 *Remediation and reuse of soil from a fuel spill near Lake Dingle, Vestfold Hills* (Australia).

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

- (73) The United Kingdom and Norway introduced WP 37 *Report from ICG on Climate Change*. They reminded the Committee that the ICG on climate change was established at CEP XVI to develop a Climate Change Response Work Programme (CCRWP) for the CEP. The paper noted that, during two years of consultation, a CCRWP had been devised. The CCRWP described the issues facing the CEP as a result of the changing Antarctic climate, the actions/tasks required to address these issues, their prioritisation, and suggestions as to how, when, and by whom the actions would best be delivered. It further noted that an objective statement to accompany the CCRWP had also been agreed and the future governance of the CCRWP considered. The United Kingdom and Norway emphasized that the CCRWP should be viewed as a dynamic document that would need regular review

and revision to keep it relevant. They further noted that such efforts would require broad participation and engagement from Members. They encouraged Members to adopt the CCRWP and focus on the implementation of the identified tasks and actions.

- (74) The Committee thanked the United Kingdom and Norway for convening the ICG, and thanked all ICG participants for their contributions. The Committee welcomed the comprehensive report on discussions contained in WP 37.
- (75) Following minor modifications to accommodate suggestions on references to application of the IUCN red list criteria, and to International Maritime Organization (IMO) biofouling guidelines, the Committee adopted the CCRWP (Appendix 2). In doing so, the Committee noted that the CCRWP identified actions consistent with its roles and functions, specifically focusing on addressing impacts of climate change in Antarctica and not duplicating the climate change mitigation activities which were appropriately the responsibility of other bodies. The Committee agreed to retain the CCRWP as a separate document, to be flexible and dynamic, and to be updated annually as required.
- (76) Concerning the remaining issues identified in WP 37 which had not been incorporated into the CCRWP (black carbon, ozone, short lived climate forcers, energy efficiency, renewable energy), France, supported by the Netherlands, stressed the importance of considering their inclusion in the CCRWP at a later stage.
- (77) Concerning the prioritisation of tasks in the work plan, Argentina noted that implementation would be a challenge but that it would be possible to address this issue over time. It also reemphasised that the focus should be on considering the consequences of climate change, and highlighted the inclusion in the document of a reference to practices on Antarctic stations that have no impact on climate change, and which Argentina had already requested to remove. Referring to governance of the CCRWP, Argentina emphasised the need to find a mechanism to increase Members' participation, including translation into the four official languages, and noted that a subsidiary group might not be the best option to achieve this.
- (78) ASOC suggested that the ATCM/CEP could learn from the experience of addressing climate change in the Arctic where relevant, for instance the work carried out by expert groups such as the Arctic Climate Impact Assessment.
- (79) The Committee also recognised the importance of maximum engagement and participation in this topic, and in the implementation of the CCRWP. In this

regard, the Committee agreed to add an item on the CCRWP to its agenda for future meetings, and encouraged Members to give further consideration in advance of CEP XIX to the best mechanisms for managing and supporting implementation of the CCRWP.

---

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

- (80) The Committee endorsed a draft Resolution expressing the intention to implement the Climate Change Response Work Programme as a matter of priority, and agreed to forward the draft Resolution to the ATCM for approval.
- 
- (81) The United Kingdom introduced WP 38 *Application of the RACER (Rapid Assessment of Circum-Arctic Ecosystem Resilience) Conservation Planning Tool to James Ross Island*, and referred to IP 34 *Results of RACER Workshop Focused on James Ross Island*, prepared jointly with the Czech Republic. At CEP XVII the Committee recognised that: resilience should be a key factor in the designation, management and review of protected areas, and further recognised RACER as one possible tool to determine key features important for conferring resilience; and encouraged further collaboration to investigate the applicability of RACER in Antarctica. WP 38 outlined further intersessional activity related to RACER. This included the identification of key features on James Ross Island that were likely to persist under different climate scenarios. The proponents emphasised that this methodology did not intend to replace, change, or conflict with Annex V of the Protocol.
- (82) The Committee was asked to: take note of the RACER analysis of James Ross Island undertaken during the intersessional period, and endorse the outcomes as providing the basis for a new protected area based on resilience criteria; and endorse further work led by the Czech Republic, with support from the United Kingdom and other interested Parties, to bring forward a proposal to CEP to designate initially Torrent Valley and a nearby area, Johnson Mesa and Monolith Lake catchment within a single multi-site Antarctic Specially Protected Area (ASPA) based on resilience criteria.
- (83) The Committee thanked the United Kingdom and Czech Republic for their report on this work in which they had tested the application of the RACER methodology to James Ross Island. The Committee supported the recommendations in WP 38, noting the advice from the United Kingdom and Czech Republic that this work to identify areas for protection on the

basis of resilience was being undertaken within the provisions of Annex V to the Protocol and did not seek to add to those provisions.

- (84) Argentina thanked the Czech Republic and the United Kingdom for their work and presentation. Argentina expressed its interest to participate, noting that several Argentinean scientists have been working at James Ross Island for over 30 years, and have great experience and knowledge of the area, and much data to contribute.
- (85) ASOC also thanked the United Kingdom and the Czech Republic, and strongly supported the recommendation to develop a multi-site ASPA for Ulu Peninsula on James Ross Island, which despite being one of the largest ice-free areas in Antarctica, is currently unrepresented in the protected areas system. ASOC particularly appreciated the expertise of the Czech scientists and other Parties operating in the area, and noted that the designation of protected areas to promote climate resilience is a critical task for the ATCM.
- (86) The Committee looked forward to receiving further details of the proposal to designate a multi-site ASPA on James Ross Island, noting also the usefulness of having had the opportunity to consider and provide comments at an early stage. The United States and Argentina noted the importance of conducting a broad survey of scientific disciplines, to complement the results of the RACER analysis, and expressed interest in participating in the future work. The Czech Republic noted the importance of complementing the RACER analysis with available scientific data and including also sites of outstanding paleontological values in the ASPA proposal.
- (87) The United States introduced WP 39 *Shared Science Priorities and Cooperation: Systemic Observations and Modelling in the Southern Ocean*, prepared jointly with Australia. The paper emphasised the Southern Ocean as an important component of the earth's climate system. Limited observations indicate that the Southern Ocean is changing (warming at certain depths, freshening, circulation and ecological changes and acidification) but processes and rates of change remain poorly understood due to sparse observations, short time-series and uneven spatial and temporal sampling. This knowledge gap has important ramifications for governance and management of this region and beyond.
- (88) The United States and Australia recommended that the Parties note the importance of Southern Ocean observations and modelling to understanding climate change and the need for international cooperation in this area.

Especially valuable would be support for the Southern Ocean Observing System (SOOS), which provides an excellent mechanism to enhance scientific progress.

- (89) The United States noted that it had recently inaugurated the Southern Ocean Climate and Carbon Observations and Modelling (SOCCOM) which aimed to fill in observations gaps using profiling floats with new generation sensors. The United States would welcome participation by other national programmes.
- (90) COMNAP informed that, following a successful SOOS workshop, it had initiated a SOOS Think Tank and welcomed the participation of interested Members.
- (91) ASOC reminded the Committee of the work conducted by CCAMLR in relation to the Southern Ocean and noted that observations and modelling, coupled with suitable environmental protection and management under CCAMLR and the ATCM, should aim to differentiate the effects of environmental change from those that may be caused by fisheries.
- (92) Argentina thanked Australia and the United States for their contribution and strongly supported the document, highlighting its consideration of the Southern Ocean as a scientific description and not a political one. Argentina also considered that it was valuable to continue working to understand the environmental state of oceans and further develop oceanographic knowledge of these areas.
- (93) Members emphasised the importance of collaborative scientific research on the Southern Ocean in the current climate change context, which induces deep changes in the sea ice conditions around the continent and has strong impact on logistical activities of the National Antarctic Programmes.
- (94) SCAR welcomed this paper, noting that it had been a key supporter of SOOS since its inception and remained committed to facilitating ongoing multi-national efforts to undertake monitoring in the Southern Ocean. SCAR noted that similar knowledge gaps exist for terrestrial Antarctic systems and that it welcomed similar cooperative efforts to conduct monitoring and modelling in these areas.
- (95) The Committee warmly thanked the United States and Australia for raising this subject for its attention, and supported the recommendations in WP 39. Several Members expressed their willingness to participate in the ongoing process of monitoring the Southern Ocean and the further development of SOOS.

---

**CEP advice to the ATCM on Southern Ocean observations and modelling**

- (96) The Committee noted the relevance of the matters discussed in WP 39 to the proposed CEP/SC-CAMLR workshop, and to the actions identified in the Climate Change Response Work Programme to support and undertake collaborative long-term monitoring of change in the Antarctic environment. The Committee endorsed the recommendations presented in the paper.
- 
- (97) SCAR presented IP 92 *Antarctic Climate Change and the Environment – 2015 Update*. SCAR reported on updates to the Antarctic Climate Change and the Environment (ACCE) Report related to the understanding of climate change across the Antarctic continent and the Southern Ocean, and the impact on terrestrial and marine biota. SCAR highlighted a number of recent scientific studies that have contributed significantly to the understanding of climate change impacts on both the physical and biological environments. Among these, SCAR noted that ocean acidification would become one of the biggest challenges to the Antarctic ecosystem in the future. SCAR noted that it was undertaking continuous updates of the ACCE report through a wiki. The Committee welcomed this update from SCAR.
- (98) The United Kingdom presented IP 94 *Climate Change in Antarctica*. This paper presented a graphic produced by the British Antarctic Survey showing the patterns and magnitudes of change in the climate of Antarctica and the Southern Ocean.
- (99) ASOC presented IP 110 *Climate Change 2015: A Report Card*, which summarised up-to-date scientific findings about current and future climate change in the Antarctic. ASOC emphasised the importance of Members providing support for scientific research.
- (100) ASOC also presented IP 114 *The Antarctic Treaty System, Climate Change and Strengthened Scientific Interface with Relevant Bodies of the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change* (UNFCCC). It noted that the Antarctic Treaty System had an important role to play in promoting the relevance of climate-related Antarctic research to the climate change community, including the UNFCCC. ASOC suggested that Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (IPCC) scientists be invited to future CEP and ATCM events, and welcomed the involvement of SCAR in an upcoming UNFCCC session.
- (101) France supported the recommendations made in IP 114 and suggested that the UNFCCC CoP 21 could be advised of the development of the CCRWP.

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

- *SP 7 Actions Taken by the CEP and the ATCM Recommendations on Climate Change* (Secretariat).
- *BP 1 Abstract of the SCAR Lecture: Southern Ocean Acidification* (SCAR).

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

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

(103) No draft Comprehensive Environmental Evaluations (CEEs) were submitted for consideration by the Committee at the meeting.

(104) Italy introduced WP 30 *Towards the submission of a Draft Comprehensive Environmental Evaluation for the construction and operation of a gravel runway in the area of Mario Zucchelli Station, Victoria Land, Antarctica*. Italy reminded the Committee that this paper followed reports on Italy's intention to build a gravel runway presented at previous CEP meetings (CEP XVII - IP 57, CEP XVI - IP 80 and CEP XV - IP 41). This paper reported on Italy's progress in preparing a draft CEE, and Italy encouraged Members to offer advice on an 'in progress' version of the document. It summarised the rationale for building a gravel runway near Mario Zucchelli Station, specifically to reduce reliance on neighbouring National Antarctic Programmes, to reduce reliance on a biennial ship charter, and to increase flexibility in supporting science in the region. Italy also briefly described the environmental impacts, monitoring efforts, and mitigations considered during the preparation of the informal draft CEE. Italy noted that it intended to formally circulate a draft CEE in accordance with the provisions on Annex I of the Environment Protocol in advance of ATCM XXXIX. Italy invited Parties and Observers to express their views in detailed comments during the upcoming intersessional period.

(105) The Committee thanked Italy for the further update on its plans for a gravel runway at Mario Zucchelli Station as presented in WP 30. Several Members and ASOC noted the benefits of receiving advance notice of the CEE and indicated that they had already conducted a review of the preliminary draft CEE and offered to provide detailed comments directly to Italy. Some Members expressed a desire to receive more details regarding: formal collaboration agreements between the National Antarctic Programmes operating near Mario Zucchelli Station; the relationship of this new gravel

runway to existing runways in Antarctica; the extent to which the operation of a new runway facility may increase air transport in the region; use of the runway by other operators; anticipated types of aircraft to be used; fuel use and handling; meteorological or weather forecasting support; mitigation measures; potential for and mitigation of noise impacts; the potential impacts of the new runway on wilderness values; indirect and cumulative impacts associated with the construction and operation of the runway; additional infrastructure like a gravel road between the new runway and Mario Zucchelli Station; and further consideration of alternatives, including the alternative of not proceeding.

- (106) ASOC thanked Italy for the transparent approach to this proposed activity. While understanding the logistic difficulties Italy was facing, ASOC noted that environmental groups had reservations about the establishment of new airstrips because of the direct, indirect and cumulative impacts. ASOC suggested that the formal draft CEE should consider alternatives including the mandatory alternative of not proceeding, and should consider the reasonable foreseeable use of the runway, including a statement about tourism.
- (107) In response to a question, Italy noted that it could be ready to submit the in progress draft CEE to the CEP forum as early as July 2015. The Committee encouraged any other interested Members to provide further comments to Italy as it continued to prepare a formal draft CEE. The Chair further noted that once the formal draft CEE was circulated by Italy, a formal ICG would be convened to conduct the review, in accordance with the *Procedures for intersessional CEP consideration of draft CEEs*.
- (108) Belarus presented IP 39 *Construction and Operation of Belarussian Antarctic Research Station at Mount Vechernyaya, Enderby Land*. This paper introduced the final CEE, annexed to the paper, which included changes made in response to Members' comments on the draft CEE on the planned construction and operation of the Belarussian Antarctic Research Station, circulated in 2014, in accordance with the provisions of Annex I to the Environment Protocol (ATCM XXXVII - WP 22). Belarus expressed thanks to all the Members who participated in the ICG to review the draft CEE and in the discussion of the draft CEE at CEP XVII, and acknowledged that the CEE was improved by the suggestions received. It highlighted that significant changes were made to the document in the design of the station, monitoring programme, environment protection measures, evaluation of the current status of the environment and other sections of the CEE. It noted that detailed responses to each comment received were provided in the

attachment to the final CEE. Belarus further highlighted its commitment to environmental protection and noted that it had secured funds to conduct environmental monitoring programmes.

- (109) The Committee welcomed the paper from Belarus. It noted that, in circulating the final CEE and presenting this paper, which detailed how it took into account the comments received, Belarus had met its obligation under Annex I of the Environment Protocol. The Committee wished Belarus success in implementing the construction and operation of its station at Mount Vechernyaya, Enderby Land.

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

- (110) Australia introduced WP 13 *Initial report of the intersessional contact group established to review the Guidelines for Environmental Impact Assessment in Antarctica*, jointly prepared with the United Kingdom. The paper provided an initial report from the ICG established at CEP XVII. It noted that the group had reached general agreement on a number of issues that it considered should be addressed in a revision of the EIA Guidelines, and had commenced work on specific suggested modifications. The ICG had also recorded broader policy or other issues that had arisen during discussion, and that might warrant further consideration by the CEP. It noted that the EIA Guidelines had last been revised in 2005 and that it was important for the CEP to review the guidelines to ensure that they adequately and accurately represented the Committee's current views on the important topics to be covered in an EIA document. The Committee was invited to note the initial report, to provide feedback on the ICG's activities to date, and to support the continuation of the ICG for a further intersessional period.
- (111) The Committee thanked Australia and the United Kingdom for convening the group, and congratulated all ICG participants for the excellent work they had produced. It warmly welcomed this first report of the ICG and noted that good progress had been made. The Committee agreed that the ICG's work to consider climate change in the context of the EIA process should focus on addressing the implications of climate change in Antarctica and not mitigation measures.
- (112) ASOC thanked Australia and the United Kingdom for coordinating the ICG on EIA guidelines, which was essential to the CEP's work. ASOC hoped that this work would continue.

- (113) The Committee endorsed the continuation of the ICG on Review of the Guidelines for Environmental Impact Assessment for a second intersessional period, and noted that the ICG's final report to CEP XIX would contain several items of interest to the ATCM. It also agreed to the following Terms of Reference:
1. Continue revising the Guidelines for Environmental Impact Assessment in Antarctica appended to Resolution 1 (2005) to address issues including those identified in ATCM XXXVII - WP 29 and, as appropriate, suggest modifications to the Guidelines.
  2. Record issues raised during discussions under ToR 1, which relate to broader policy or other issues for the development and handling of EIAs, and which may warrant further discussion by the CEP with a view to strengthening the implementation of Annex I to the Protocol.
  3. Provide a final report to CEP XIX.
- (114) Australia and the United Kingdom agreed to convene the ICG. The Committee welcomed the offers from Phil Tracey (Australia) and Henry Burgess (United Kingdom) to jointly convene the ICG.

---

**CEP advice to the ATCM on the review of the Guidelines for Environmental Impact Assessment in Antarctica**

- (115) The Committee agreed to advise the ATCM that its review of the *Guidelines for Environmental Impact Assessment in Antarctica* would: incorporate new or additional guidance to emphasise the importance of key matters; reflect new and revised CEP procedures and resources for environmental impact assessment; and include references to relevant other guidelines and resources. The review process would also identify broader policy issues relating to environmental impact assessment, including cumulative impacts and environmental repair and remediation. The final report of the review would be presented at CEP XIX, and would likely be of interest to the ATCM.
- 
- (116) The Czech Republic presented IP 15 *Proposed routes for all-terrain vehicles based on impact on deglaciated area of James Ross Island*. This paper complemented information provided by the Czech Republic in ATCM XXXIV - IP 133 on tire tracks made by former expeditions in different parts of James Ross Island. It reported on the use of all-terrain vehicles by the 2015 Czech expedition, as well as a suggestion to monitor the impact on the environment, and presented a preliminary proposal for all-terrain vehicles routes on James Ross Island. It noted that both GPS data layers of the routes and hard copies of the maps were available to interested Members.

- (117) The United States expressed interest in efforts to develop all-terrain vehicle routes on James Ross Island, noting that a diverse scientific community conducted field work on the island and that routes should consider both environmental protection and impacts on scientific projects.
- (118) ASOC presented IP 111 *Cumulative Impact Assessment*. This paper briefly reviewed some of the discussions on cumulative impact assessment as represented in papers presented previously to the ATCM and CEP. It took an environmentally focused approach to cumulative impact assessment and recommended that Members: review earlier recommendations on cumulative impact assessment; complete the review of EIA Guidelines so that it adequately considered cumulative impacts; carry out some case studies of cumulative impacts at particular sites; and augment and improve the consideration of cumulative impacts in the implementation of Annex I.
- (119) Several Members thanked ASOC for raising an important issue and noted that although cumulative impacts were a complicated topic, it was one that merited further attention, such as in the revision of EIA Guidelines.

#### *Unmanned Aerial Vehicles*

- (120) The Committee recalled that, following an initial discussion at CEP XVII (2014) on the use of unmanned aerial vehicles (UAVs) in Antarctica, it had agreed to hold in-depth discussions at CEP XVIII. The Committee had requested: reports by SCAR and COMNAP on the utility and risks of UAV operation in Antarctica; a paper from IAATO on its experiences and current practices relating to UAVs; and additional papers referring to Members' experiences on this matter.
- (121) COMNAP introduced WP 22 *UAV Use in Antarctica – Risks and Benefits*. This paper described the practical benefits of UAVs to National Antarctic Programmes in science support, science, operations and logistics, with a focus on close and medium range Remotely Piloted Aircrafts (RPAs). COMNAP advised that there were obvious benefits of UAVs with respect to safety, and reduction of fossil fuel use and transportation in the region. With benefits such as low operation costs and ease of transportation, there were also potential risks as well, including interference with other air operations. COMNAP's recommendations as listed in the paper included: that National Antarctic Programmes develop programme-specific, equipment-specific and site-specific guidelines for UAV use based on the developing COMNAP UAV code of conduct; and also that National Antarctic Programmes and other operators collect and share data and support research on UAV use.

- (122) SCAR introduced WP 27 *Wildlife Approach Distances in Antarctica*, and referred to BP 22 *A Meta-Analysis of Human Disturbance Impacts on Antarctic Wildlife*. This paper considered more than 60 research studies conducted on 21 species. The meta-analysis clearly indicated that human disturbance has a significant negative impact on Antarctic wildlife. In the case of camping and unmanned aerial vehicles, SCAR noted that little scientific evidence currently existed about the nature or extent of their impacts on Antarctic wildlife. SCAR also noted that research was underway globally to inform understanding of UAV impacts on wildlife, and this may also prove useful in informing Antarctic policy in this area. It recommended that the CEP encourage Members to undertake further research in support of setting evidenced-based guidelines to approach distances to wildlife in Antarctica. It also recommended that the CEP encourage Members using UAVs near wildlife concentrations to support research on UAV impacts; and encourage Members to consider avoiding UAV launches closer than 100 metres to wildlife and to consider avoiding vertical approaches by UAVs until Antarctic-specific information became available.
- (123) Poland presented IP 77 *UAV remote sensing of environmental changes on King George Island (South Shetland Islands): preliminary information on the results of the first field season 2014/2015*. This paper presented preliminary information on the first season of a new joint Polish and Norwegian monitoring programme using fixed-wing UAVs to collect geospatial environmental data. It also reported on observations undertaken to assess potential overflight impacts on breeding penguins. The study focused on species inhabiting ASPA No 128 (Western Shore of Admiralty Bay) and ASPA No 151 (Lions Rump, and Chabrier Rock and Shag Islands / Admiralty Bay).
- (124) South Africa presented IP 80 *South Africa's use of Unmanned Aerial Vehicles (UAV) in Antarctica*. It reported on the use of UAVs by the South African Antarctic Programme during the summer 2013/14, the monitoring of the possible environmental impact associated with this activity, and the preparation of guidelines by the South African Civil Aviation Authority for the use of UAVs within South Africa. It noted that the increased use of UAVs in Antarctica necessitated the development of regulations and, subsequently, guidelines.
- (125) The United States presented IP 82 *A risk-based approach to safe operations of unmanned aircraft systems in the United States Antarctic Program (USAP)* and IP 83 *Guidance on unmanned aerial system (UAS) use in Antarctica*

*developed for applications to scientific studies on penguins and seals.* These papers reported on the use of UAS by the United States Antarctic Program, on the use of operational guidelines, and on a risk assessment of UAS operation performed by the National Science Foundation to validate and inform the evolving guidelines. The United States noted that it had issued a programmatic statement on UAVs for the 2014/15 season prohibiting the unauthorised use of UAVs within the United States Antarctic Program, with permission only following an in-depth safety and environmental review process. It also issued guidelines for pre-flight planning, flight operations, and required certifications (see IP 82). IP 83 presented lessons that the United States had learned while operating UAVs in the Antarctic. It described the work conducted by the United States Antarctic Marine Living Resources (AMLR) programme to advance the work of CCAMLR's ecosystem monitoring programme by using UAVs to study seals and penguins. It noted the rigorous training and UAV selection process undertaken before field operations began. Acknowledging that the focus of the study was limited to population studies of land-based birds and mammals, the United States presented this paper as a useful reference for those considering permitting UAV operations in Antarctica

- (126) IAATO presented IP 88 *IAATO Policies on the use of unmanned Aerial Vehicles (UAVs) in Antarctica*. This paper outlined the discussions and policy evolution within the IAATO membership regarding the use of UAVs during IAATO member operations. A recent statement on the use of UAVs in Antarctica highlighted the agreement of IAATO members to: not allow recreational UAV flights in coastal areas for the 2015/16 season; and allow UAV flights for scientific or commercial purposes or at deep field sites, if conducted with the permission/authorisation from a competent authority. IAATO noted that, during the 2014/15 season, its operators had recorded 68 UAV flights, 44 in coastal areas. It further noted that most flights had been conducted without incident, but that one UAV had been lost in a crevasse.
- (127) The Committee thanked all Members and Observers who submitted papers to inform the discussion on environmental impacts of UAV use in Antarctica. It noted the importance of giving consideration to the safety risks associated with UAV use, and that this aspect would be more fully considered by the ATCM and COMNAP. It recognised the benefits of using UAVs for research and monitoring, including the potential reduction of environmental risks as compared to other means of collecting such data.

- (128) Acknowledging that the ATCM would also consider WP 22, the Committee generally supported the recommendations presented by COMNAP in the paper. The Committee welcomed COMNAP's ongoing work to prepare guidance for the use of UAVs in Antarctica, in the form of a code of conduct, and thanked COMNAP for its offer to report on progress at CEP XIX.
- (129) The Committee also thanked SCAR for the advice given in WP 27 and BP 22 and noted that, although no scientific evidence had been published in the peer reviewed literature on negative impacts of UAVs to wildlife in Antarctica, research was underway both in Antarctica and globally on this topic. With regard to the recommendations presented in WP 27, the Committee agreed to: encourage Members to undertake further research in support of setting evidence-based guidelines on approach distances to wildlife in Antarctica; and to support research into UAV impacts, and means to avoid them. The Committee supported taking a precautionary approach in the absence of scientific data and noted the utility of considering cryptic responses to disturbance when evaluating environmental impacts of UAVs. It noted SCAR's suggestion to consider avoiding UAV launches closer than 100 metres to wildlife until Antarctic-specific information had become available, while noting the importance of considering the different types and sizes of UAVs, and the different site specific environmental conditions. The Committee welcomed SCAR's offer to report back to CEP XX in 2017 on advances in research on the impacts of UAVs on wildlife. The Committee also noted that it would be useful if the Antarctic Environments Portal could provide summaries on the scientific understanding of impacts of UAVs on wildlife as it becomes available.
- (130) Members expressed their concern about a potential overpopulation of UAVs in Antarctica due to their low costs, taking also into account the knowledge of accidents that have already occurred with such aircraft in the past. In this regard, they expressed the view that the use of UAVs should be prioritised for scientific and logistic purposes in accordance with EIA guidelines, and raised concerns about the recreational use of UAVs.
- (131) The Committee thanked all Members who had submitted papers on UAV use in Antarctica. It also thanked IAATO for presenting its draft guidelines and policies on UAV use, and noted that these policies and guidelines represented a conservative approach to managing the use of UAVs.
- (132) Germany informed the Committee that it was currently carrying out a research project on the impacts of micro-UAVs on penguin colonies and that it was planning to present the results at the next meeting of the Committee.

- (133) Spain highlighted the importance of UAVs and underwater unmanned vehicles for scientific research, for improving the safety of navigation in ice-covered waters, and for reducing environmental impacts associated with ship and aircraft operations. France also mentioned the potential use of UAVs for detection of crevasses in the coastal areas of the continent, making traverses safer.
- (134) ASOC noted that UAVs were considered aircraft. It encouraged Members to develop guidelines appropriate for the use of the types of aircraft represented by UAVs. It encouraged National Antarctic Programmes, COMNAP, and IAATO to ensure that any developed guidelines were mutually consistent and expressed a desire that common guidelines for UAV operation in Antarctica be developed.
- (135) The Committee expressed support for developing guidelines for the environmental aspects of UAV use in Antarctica, which could provide guidance on avoiding or minimising wildlife disturbance, and could also consider other environmental values such as wilderness and aesthetic values. It further noted that it may be desirable, in the future, to establish an ICG to advance discussions on this issue, which could take into consideration any further advice from SCAR and COMNAP, as well as valuable information contained in the papers submitted by Members and Observers to the meeting.
- (136) The Committee also noted that it may be useful, at some point, to give consideration to unmanned marine vehicles. It encouraged interested Members to give further consideration to that issue and to bring forward papers for consideration.

---

**CEP advice to the ATCM on unmanned aerial vehicles (UAVs)**

- (137) The Committee discussed the use of unmanned aerial vehicles (UAVs) in Antarctica, recognised the benefits of developing guidance on the environmental aspects of UAV use in Antarctica, and agreed that it would consider at CEP XIX initiating work to develop such guidance.
- 
- (138) The following paper was also submitted under this agenda item:
- *SP 5 Annual list of Initial Environmental Evaluations (IEE) and Comprehensive Environmental Evaluations (CEE) prepared between April 1st 2014 and March 31st 2015 (Secretariat).*

## 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*
- (139) The convener of the Subsidiary Group on Management Plans (SGMP), Birgit Njåstad (Norway) introduced WP 15 *Subsidiary Group on Management Plans – Report on 2014/15 Intersessional Work*, 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 Group had reviewed five draft Antarctic Specially Protected Area (ASPAs) management plans referred by CEP XVI and CEP XVII for intersessional review.
- (140) The SGMP advised the CEP that since the proponent had not been able to progress the review of these management plans during the intersessional period, the SGMP was not able to give further advice and complete the review process. The SGMP anticipated that it would be able to complete its work in the upcoming intersessional period. Accordingly, the SGMP suggested that further intersessional work be conducted with regard to the following management plans:
- ASPA No. 125: Fildes Peninsula, King George Island (Chile)
  - ASPA No. 144: ‘Chile Bay’ (Discovery Bay), Greenwich Island, South Shetland Islands (Chile)
  - ASPA No. 145: Port Foster, Deception Island, South Shetland Islands (Chile)
  - ASPA No. 146: South Bay, Doumer Island, Palmer Archipelago (Chile)
  - ASPA No. 150: Ardley Island (Ardley Peninsula), Maxwell Bay, King George Island (Chile)
- (141) Chile informed the Committee that it anticipated submitting revised versions of the five management plans to the SGMP for review in October 2015.
- (142) The SGMP convener further recalled the long-term goal of having all management plans undergo review in the SGMP or a similar review to ensure that they contain adequate content, and are clear and effective. The SGMP convener drew Members’ attention to the table provided at the end

of WP 15 which detailed progress towards this goal, and noted that only two of the revised management plans presented to the CEP this year had previously been considered by the SGMP.

- (143) The Committee thanked the SGMP and Birgit Njåstad for their work and the report provided. It noted the advice from Chile and looked forward to further consideration of the SGMP's advice on these management plans next year.

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

- (144) The Committee considered revised management plans for 17 ASPAs and one Antarctic Specially Managed Area (ASMA) that had not been reviewed by the SGMP. In each case, the proponent(s): summarised the suggested changes to the existing management plan; noted that (for the ASPA management plans) it had been reviewed and revised with reference to the *Guide to the Preparation of Management Plans for Antarctic Specially Protected Areas* (the Guide); and recommended its approval by the Committee and referral to the ATCM for adoption:

- a. WP 1 *Revised Management Plan for Antarctic Specially Protected Area No. 106 Cape Hallett, Northern Victoria Land, Ross Sea* (United States)
- b. WP 2 *Revised Management Plan for Antarctic Specially Protected Area No. 119 Davis Valley and Forlidas Pond Dufek Massif, Pensacola Mountains* (United States)
- c. WP 3 *Revised Management Plan for Antarctic Specially Protected Area No. 152* (United States)
- d. WP 4 *Revised Management Plan for Antarctic Specially Protected Area No. 153 Eastern Dallmann Bay* (United States)
- e. WP 8 *Updated Management Plan and maps for Antarctic Specially Managed Area No. 2 McMurdo Dry Valleys, Southern Victoria Land* (New Zealand and United States)
- f. WP 9 *Revision of the Management Plan for Antarctic Specially Protected Area (ASPAs) No. 103 Ardery Island and Odbert Island, Budd Coast, Wilkes Land, East Antarctica* (Australia)
- g. WP 10 *Revision of the Management Plan for Antarctic Specially Protected Area (ASPAs) No. 101 Taylor Rookery, Mac.Robertson Land* (Australia)

- h. WP 11 *Revision of the Management Plan for Antarctic Specially Protected Area (ASPAs) No. 164 Scullin and Murray Monoliths, Mac. Robertson Land (Australia)*
  - i. WP 12 *Revision of the Management Plan for Antarctic Specially Protected Area (ASPAs) No. 102 Rookery Islands, Holme Bay, Mac. Robertson Land (Australia)*
  - j. WP 25 *Revision of the Management Plan for Antarctic Specially Protected Area (ASPAs) No. 104 Sabrina Island, Balleny Islands (New Zealand)*
  - k. WP 26 *Revision of the Management Plans for Antarctic Specially Protected Areas (ASPAs) No.105, 155, 157, 158 and 159 (New Zealand)*
  - l. WP 34 *Revised Management Plan for Antarctic Specially Protected Area No. 148, Mount Flora, Hope Bay, Antarctic Peninsula (United Kingdom and Argentina)*
  - m. WP 41 *Revision of the Management Plan for Antarctic Specially Protected Area (ASPAs) No. 168 Mount Harding, Grove Mountains, East Antarctica (China)*
  - n. WP 42 *Review of Management Plan for Antarctic Specially Protected Area (ASPAs) No 163: Dakshin Gangotri Glacier, Dronning Maud Land (India)*
- (145) With respect to WP 1 (ASPAs 106), WP 2 (ASPAs 119), WP 3 (ASPAs 152) and WP 4 (ASPAs 153), the United States noted that only minor changes to the existing management plans were proposed. These included map and text updates, and the addition of classifications under the Antarctic Environmental Domains Analysis (EDA) and the Antarctic Conservation Biogeographic Regions (ACBR). The plans were updated to incorporate recent scientific results.
- (146) With respect to WP 8 (ASMA 2), New Zealand and the United States noted minor changes to the plan and maps involving facilities, camps, landing sites, shorelines and other physical features in the area. In responding to IAATO's query regarding potential additional visitor sites in the McMurdo Dry Valleys, the United States welcomed input from IAATO, as well as ASOC and other interested parties into further work on the ASMA 2 management plan during the next intersessional period.

- (147) In relation to WP 9 (ASPAs 103), WP 10 (ASPAs 101), WP 11 (ASPAs 164) and WP 12 (ASPAs 102), Australia noted that it had proposed minor changes to the description of the Areas, maps and management provisions. Where relevant, these changes included: adding the locations of automatic cameras used for bird surveys; enhanced biosecurity measures; clarification of waste disposal requirements; and updated population estimates for bird species. Australia also noted that minor changes to the boundaries of ASPAs 101 and ASPAs 164 were proposed for clarification and improved mapping based on satellite imagery.
- (148) Introducing WP 25 (ASPAs 104) and WP 26 (ASPAs 105, 155, 157, 158 and 159), New Zealand advised that only minor amendments to the management plans and maps were proposed. It pointed out a minor suggested change to the boundary of ASPAs 157, to reflect the change made in 2014 to the shared boundary with ASPAs 121, and noted that there were no changes to the boundaries of the other Areas.
- (149) With respect to WP 34 (ASPAs 148), the United Kingdom and Argentina explained that the proposed changes included: the addition of an introduction; references to the EDA and ACBR; an updated description of the Area; amendments to provisions for access to the Area and sampling of geological specimens; and inclusion of an improved geological map. The United Kingdom and Argentina also recommended that Argentina be recognised as a co-managing Party, with the United Kingdom, for ASPAs 148. Argentina thanked the United Kingdom for its invitation to work on the development and update of the management plan.
- (150) The Committee supported the proposal in WP 48 that the United Kingdom and Argentina be recognised as co-managing Parties for ASPAs 148.
- (151) With respect to WP 41 (ASPAs 168), China explained that the suggested changes to the management plan included: updated details of CHINARE visits to the Area; improvements to the aims and objectives for consistency with provisions regarding the prevention of non-native species introductions; and updated details of support documentation.
- (152) With respect to WP 42 (ASPAs 163), India noted that minor changes to the plan had been proposed, including to: reflect recent observations of the retreat of Dakshin Gangotri Glacier; update the restrictions on materials and organisms to be brought into the Area to reflect the provisions of the CEP Non-Native Species Manual; and provide better resolution maps and updated figures.

(153) The Committee approved all of the revised management plans that had not been reviewed by the SGMP.

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

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

---

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

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

#	Name
ASPAs 101	Taylor Rookery, Mac.Robertson Land
ASPAs 102	Rookery Islands, Holme Bay, Mac.Robertson Land
ASPAs 103	Arderly Island and Odberly Island, Budd Coast, Wilkes Land, East Antarctica
ASPAs 104	Sabrina Island, Balleny Islands
ASPAs 105	Beaufort Island, McMurdo Sound, Ross Sea
ASPAs 106	Cape Hallett, Northern Victoria Land, Ross Sea
ASPAs 119	Davis Valley and Forlidas Pond Dufek Massif, Pensacola Mountains
ASPAs 148	Mount Flora, Hope Bay, Antarctic Peninsula
ASPAs 152	Western Bransfield Strait
ASPAs 153	Eastern Dallmann Bay
ASPAs 155	Cape Evans, Ross Island
ASPAs 157	Backdoor Bay, Cape Royds, Ross Island
ASPAs 158	Hut Point, Ross Island
ASPAs 159	Cape Adare, Borchgrevink Coast
ASPAs 163	Dakshin Gangotri Glacier, Dronning Maud Land
ASPAs 164	Scullin and Murray Monoliths, Mac.Robertson Land
ASPAs 168	Mount Harding, Grove Mountains, East Antarctica
ASMA 2	McMurdo Dry Valleys, Southern Victoria Land

---

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

(156) The SGMP convener, Birgit Njåstad (Norway), introduced the elements of WP 15 *Subsidiary Group on Management Plans – Report on 2014/15 Intersessional Work* that reported on the SGMP’s intersessional work in accordance with terms of reference #4 and #5. The paper reported on discussions led by SGMP member, Polly Penhale (United States), on initiating work to develop guidance for preparing and reviewing ASMA management plans, *inter alia* by developing a work plan for the process. The paper recalled the agreed long-term goal aimed at ensuring all ASPA

and ASMA management plans contained adequate content and were clear, consistent and likely to be effective, as stated in term of reference #5. It therefore suggested that Members consider the updated overview of the status of ASPA and ASMA management plans and any actions that may be needed to ensure an appropriate level of review and consideration.

- (157) The SGMP advised the CEP that: the work plan for 2015/16 should include the development of guidance on determining whether an area should be designated as an ASMA; and that, after completing this work, the SGMP should in the next instance include on its work plan the preparation of a document, with checklists, similar to the ‘Guide to the Preparation of Management Plans for Antarctic Specially Protected Areas’. With regard to early consultation with the CEP on proposed new ASMAs, the SGMP noted the Committee’s separate discussion on Norway’s initiative on a process of pre-assessment of ASPAs and ASMAs (WP 29) would provide input to this topic.
- (158) The Committee thanked the SGMP for its advice, and agreed to adopt the SGMP’s proposed work plan for 2015/16:

Terms of Reference	Suggested tasks
ToR 1 to 3	Review draft management plans referred by CEP for intersessional review and provide advice to proponents (including the five postponed plans from the 2014/15 intersessional period)
ToR 4 and 5	Work with relevant Parties to ensure progress on review of management plans overdue for five-yearly review
	Continue the work to develop guidance for preparing and reviewing ASMA management plan in according with agreed work plan for the process, i.e. initiate work on developing guidance on determining whether an area should be designated as an ASMA.
	Review and update SGMP work plan
Working Papers	Prepare report for CEP XIX against SGMP ToR 1 to 3
	Prepare report for CEP XIX against SGMP ToR 4 and 5

- (159) China introduced WP 48 *Report of the Informal Discussions for Another Intersessional Period on the Proposal for a New Antarctic Specially Managed Area at Chinese Antarctic Kunlun Station, Dome A*. Following the Committee’s consideration at CEP XVI of China’s proposal to designate an ASMA at the Chinese Antarctic Kunlun Station, Dome A, and informal intersessional discussion during the 2013/14 intersessional period, this paper reported on further informal discussions held during the 2014/15 intersessional period. The paper included an attachment summarising China’s responses to various concerns previously expressed by Members.

China gave a brief introduction to the scientific research work carried out in the area including the international cooperation projects. With concerns that the environment in the area is vulnerable to damage and impossible for this to be remedied once damaged, and the environmental capacity is extremely low there, China, in 2013, presented the proposal for a new Antarctic Specially Managed Area in accordance with the Protocol. The proposal had been through three rounds of discussion over two years. With the co-endeavours of the international colleagues, the legal and technical issues raised had been fully discussed. During the third round of discussion, Argentina kindly offered to share its experience. China thanked Argentina for its comments during the intersessional period, and asked the Committee to move the proposal to the SGMP.

- (160) Argentina thanked China for taking into account its contributions during the discussion, noting its openness to discussion and debate regarding the management plan. Argentina noted that, if there was agreement to refer the proposal to the SGMP for review, it would have some further recommendations regarding the management plan.
- (161) Germany expressed doubts as to the necessity of an ASMA in this area, and stated it was not in favour of referring this proposal to the SGMP.
- (162) China responded that the core spirit of an ASMA is not to calculate how many countries are carrying out activities, but to evaluate how much impact is caused by the human activities to the area. What concerns China is to build a kind of standard and effective environmental protection system in the Dome A area, so as to contribute to Antarctic environmental protection with a high standard. Considering the fact that the environmental capacity is extremely low and the international scientific cooperation is becoming more frequent there, under the framework of the Protocol and its annexes, China hopes and would like to communicate and cooperate with Parties as far as the issue of Dome A ASMA establishment and operation is concerned.
- (163) The Chair summarised that the Committee had not reached the consensus to forward the draft ASMA management plan to the SGMP.
- (164) New Zealand expressed its agreement with the Chair's summary.
- (165) The Committee thanked China for conducting further informal intersessional discussions and for providing the report on those discussions. The Committee recognised China's openness to discussion and to considering comments received from CEP Members. It noted that Members had also generally recognised the value of having sound management arrangements in place for

this scientifically important area and had congratulated China for its work to lead discussions in this regard. Noting that it had not reached a consensus on China's proposal, the Committee decided not to refer the ASMA proposal to the SGMP for review at this time.

- (166) The Committee welcomed China's offer to lead a fourth round of informal intersessional discussion on the proposal in 2015/16 and encouraged interested Members to participate.

### **9b) Historic Sites and Monuments**

- (167) Bulgaria introduced WP 17 *Proposal to Add the Lame Dog Hut at the Bulgarian base St. Kliment Ohridski on Livingston Island to the List of Historic Sites and Monuments*. It also gave an informative presentation of the same title that included many photographs of the hut. It noted that the hut was the first permanent building established in Antarctica by Bulgaria, and that it had laid the foundations for Bulgaria's systematic scientific research in the Livingston Island area. It proposed that, if adopted, the new Historic Site and Monument (HSM) be named Lame Dog Hut at the Bulgarian base St. Kliment Ohridski on Livingston Island, South Shetland Islands. It noted that the Lame Dog Hut was erected in April 1988, and had been the main building of St. Kliment Ohridski base until 1998. It was currently the oldest preserved building on Livingston Island. The paper detailed several reasons, in accordance with Resolution 8 (1995) and the Appendix to Resolution 3 (2009), for the site meriting listing as an HSM. These included the hut's importance to the history of science as the first Bulgarian building to support science in Antarctica, the unique materials and methods of construction, and its cultural values as the oldest preserved building on Livingston Island.
- (168) In response to questions from Belgium, Bulgaria expressed a preference for keeping the building *in situ* rather than moving it to a more controlled museum environment outside Antarctica. It noted that there is a replica of the hut in the Bulgarian national history museum. In response to questions regarding the future conservation of the building, Bulgaria further noted that it was currently in very good condition and it saw no difficulties in maintaining it into the future.
- (169) The Committee noted that the reasons outlined in WP 17 were the basis for the proposed designation, in accordance with Resolution 3 (2009), and agreed to forward the proposal to the ATCM for adoption.

- (170) The Russian Federation introduced WP 31 *Proposal on inclusion of the oversnow heavy tractor “Kharkovchanka” that was used in Antarctica from 1959 to 2010 to the List of Historical Sites and Monuments*. It noted that the tractor was the first non-serial transport vehicle of Soviet machine-building produced exclusively for operations in Antarctica and was a unique historical sample of engineering technology developments made for the exploration of Antarctica. The Russian Federation highlighted the historic significance of the “Kharkovchanka” tractor and its commemorative and emotional value to all who would visit it in Antarctica. It further noted that the tractor had been purged of all its liquids and the doors hermitically sealed to keep out snow in preparation for its long-term display in Antarctica.
- (171) In response to questions from Members, the Russian Federation indicated its preference to preserve the tractor *in situ*, noting that the tractor’s historical significance would be best appreciated by expeditioners and other visitors to Antarctica. The Russian Federation also advised that it had taken steps to preserve the tractor, including sealing it to prevent snow ingress, and would report back to the Committee in the future on the effectiveness of these measures. It encouraged other Members to do the same for HSMs for which they are responsible.
- (172) The Committee noted that the reasons outlined in WP 31 were the basis for the proposed designation, in accordance with Resolution 3 (2009), and agreed to forward the proposal to the ATCM for adoption.

---

**CEP advice to the ATCM on additions to the List of Historic Sites and Monuments**

- (173) The Committee agreed to forward two proposals for additions to the List of Historic Sites and Monuments to the ATCM for approval by means of a Measure.

#	Name
HSM #	Lame Dog Hut, St. Kliment Ohridski, Livingston Island
HSM #	Oversnow heavy tractor “Kharkovchanka”

- (174) Norway, following up on a discussion initiated at CEP XVI, suggested that it now could be timely to initiate further discussion on HSM designations in the broader sense. Norway recalled earlier discussions where it had pointed to the challenge arising from the fact that as many buildings or other items in Antarctica might be considered to have historical value, this could lead to the designation of a large number of HSMs in the future, which again

might be seen to contradict the Environment Protocol's provision regarding clean-up of past activities in Antarctica. Norway noted in this context that the current management philosophy and understanding focusing on alternative ways to preserve such values, instead of maintaining such values physically in their original place, could be informative for such a broader discussion.

- (175) Noting the importance of having some guidance on the issue of potential conflicts between Annex V and Annex III provisions, Norway offered to do preparatory work in advance of CEP XIX in order to provide the Committee with a basis for further discussions, initially focusing on inter alia collating information on approaches and methods discussed, used and accepted as alternatives to *in situ* preservation of historic and cultural remains.
- (176) The Committee welcomed Norway's offer, noting also that it would be useful to seek advice from expert organisations such as the International Polar Heritage Committee (IPHC). Norway suggested that future proposals for new designations of HSM be put on hold until some further guidance had been established in this regard.

---

**CEP advice to the ATCM on guidance for the designation of new Historic Sites and Monuments**

- (177) The Committee agreed that future proposals for new designations of HSM should be put on hold until some further guidance has been established in this regard.
- 
- (178) Argentina welcomed both presentations and Members' commitment to patrimony conservation. It also recalled that the debates held during two intersessional periods (2010-2011) referred to the patrimony concept and the different protection mechanisms for these values. Regarding some considerations about their transfer outside the Antarctic Treaty area, Argentina considered that, once the elements are designated as HSMs, they become part of the list, allowing any person interested to visit them, and transfers would impair access.
- (179) ASOC remarked that, in its view, aspects of the relationship between Annex III and Annex V (8) merited further examination.
- (180) New Zealand introduced WP 23 *Ross Sea Heritage Restoration Project: A Model for conserving heritage values in Antarctic Specially Protected Areas*, and referred to IP 13 *Supporting Images for Working Paper: Ross Sea Heritage Restoration Project: A model for conserving heritage values in Antarctic Specially Protected Areas*. These papers reported on the New

Zealand Antarctic Heritage Trust's decade-long programme of heritage conservation of the buildings and artefact collections from ASPAs 155, 157 and 158 on Ross Island. New Zealand noted that the Project had recently reached a significant milestone and was unprecedented in its scale and complexity in respect of heritage conservation in the polar regions. It informed the Committee of intentions to continue the work, noting that funding had already been secured to support the next 25 years of maintenance efforts.

- (181) The Committee thanked New Zealand for these papers and congratulated the New Zealand Antarctic Heritage Trust for its comprehensive work to protect historical sites in the Ross Sea region. Members highlighted the significant education and outreach efforts carried out in the course of this project, and noted that the restored sites would have value to future generations.
- (182) There was strong support for the recommendations presented in WP 23. The Committee recognised the approach followed by the New Zealand Antarctic Heritage Trust as a helpful model for others conducting preservation work in Antarctica, while at the same time recognising the importance of conservation management practices being tailored to the characteristics of the historic sites in question. The Committee further noted that the Antarctic Heritage Trust is meeting the provisions of the relevant ASPA management plans, which place an obligation on National Antarctic Programmes to consult together with a view to ensuring that management activities within the ASPAs, including conservation, are implemented.
- (183) The following paper was also submitted under this agenda item:
- IP 50 *Damage to the Observation Hill Cross (HSM 20)* (New Zealand).

### **9c) Site Guidelines**

- (184) No new or revised Site Guidelines were submitted for the Committee's consideration.
- (185) IAATO presented IP 85 *Report on IAATO Operator Use of Antarctic Peninsula Landing Sites and ATCM Visitor Site Guidelines, 2013-14 and 2014-15 Season*. The paper presented data collected from its members' Post Visit Report Forms, noting that no non-IAATO visits had been included in the analysis. IAATO informed the Committee that: tourism levels were still depressed from the peak season of 2007-08, but were recovering slightly; the increase in air cruise tourism had resulted in a disproportionate increase in

the numbers of voyages and, to a lesser extent, in landings made; and almost all the landing sites in the top twenty landing sites on the Peninsula, apart from the Yalour Islands, were managed by ATCM Visitor Site Guidelines or through National Programme Management guidelines. IAATO invited assistance from interested parties in developing guidelines for this site. It also informed the Committee that it would continue to provide information annually to the CEP and ATCM on its members' activities.

- (186) The Committee noted IAATO's useful contribution and appreciated being updated regularly by IAATO. The CEP welcomed and appreciated the report on visitor site guidelines and acknowledged the utility of the reports in understanding management and monitoring activities at the most frequently visited sites. The United Kingdom offered to engage with IAATO on its suggestion to develop guidelines for Yalour Island.
- (187) New Zealand presented IP 102 *Antarctic Site Inventory: Results from long-term monitoring*, prepared jointly with the United States. The Antarctic Site Inventory (ASI) had collected biological data and site-descriptive information in the Antarctic Peninsula region since 1994. New Zealand noted the ASI would continue to monitor the rapid change in the relative populations of gentoo, chinstrap, and Adélie penguins throughout the western Antarctic Peninsula. It noted that the ASI monitoring results had recorded that gentoo penguin populations were increasing rapidly and expanding their range southward, and the other two species were declining significantly.
- (188) The Committee noted its appreciation of the information and data contained in the paper.
- (189) The United Kingdom presented IP 119 *National Antarctic Programme use of locations with Visitor Site Guidelines in 2014-15* prepared jointly with Argentina, Australia and the United States. This paper provided an overview of information provided by Parties on visits by their National Antarctic Programme personnel of locations with ATCM Site Guidelines in place, during the 2014/15 season.
- (190) The Committee noted its appreciation of the information provided.
- (191) Argentina presented IP 131 *Tourism Management Policy for Brown Scientific Station*. Recalling discussion on its paper ATCM XXXVI - WP 49, Argentina noted that many Parties had supported its proposal that stations should have written regulations related to visitors. IP 131 presented guidelines for Brown Scientific Station. Argentina requested that these guidelines be included in the IAATO "Field Operations Manual".

- (192) The Committee thanked Argentina for the paper and accompanying guidelines for visitation to its Brown Scientific Station. The Committee noted that IAATO intended to include the guidelines in its operations manual, and further noted the intention of nearby stations to inform their visitors about the guidelines if they intended to visit Brown Scientific Station.

**9d) Marine Spatial Protection and Management**

- (193) Belgium introduced WP 20 *The concept of “outstanding values” in the marine environment under Annex V of the Protocol*, and referred to IP 10 *The concept of “outstanding values” in the Antarctic marine environment under Annex V of the Protocol*. This paper presented a summary of the discussions of the ICG established by CEP XVII to consider the concept of outstanding values in the marine environment. ICG participants had reached general agreement that: presently no further work was required on definitions and criteria for protecting ‘outstanding values’ in the marine environment, because Annex V and the *Guidelines for implementation of the Framework for Protected Areas set forth in Article 3, Annex V of the Environmental Protocol* (Resolution 1 (2000)) provided sufficient guidance; and they wished to proceed case by case and step by step, the greatest need for spatial protection being given by the combination, in a given area, of a value (in this case, an outstanding marine value) and a situation or activity that threatens that value. This threat may be an actual threat or a potential one that could affect the value in the future. The CEP should consider outstanding values in the marine environment when proposing new ASPAs or revising existing ASPA management plans; and the CEP’s efforts to advance the provisions of Annex V should complement rather than duplicate the ongoing work by CCAMLR to consider the designation of MPAs. The ICG further recommended that the CEP endorse the continuation of an ICG, which would report to CEP XIX regarding this second round of discussions.
- (194) China raised concerns that the designation of marine ASPAs could potentially limit access to areas by national programme vessels and logistical support.
- (195) In response to these concerns, the United States noted that the management plans for marine ASPAs 152 and 153 specifically allow essential operational activities of vessels that will not jeopardise the values of the Areas, such as transit through, or stationing within, the Areas in order to facilitate science or other activities, including tourism, or for access to sites outside of the Areas.

- (196) ASOC noted that some ASPAs, including those with a marine component, had been established to facilitate research, and that ASPAs established for conservation purposes did not unduly interfere with research.
- (197) The Committee thanked Belgium for convening the ICG and supported the key outcomes of the intersessional discussion. Members gave particular emphasis to the recommendation that Parties and the CEP should consider outstanding values in the marine environment under Annex V of the Protocol when proposing new ASPAs or revising the management plans for existing ASPAs, and should make use of the 2000 Guidelines.
- (198) The Committee agreed to continue discussions on these matters, and established an ICG led by Belgium to work during the 2015/16 intersessional period with the following terms of reference:
- 1) Discussing next steps in the implementation of Annex V, Art. 3 of the Protocol regarding the concept of “outstanding values” applied to the marine environment, including any actual or potential threats to that environment, with respect to activities covered by Art. 3 (4) of the Protocol;
  - 2) Identifying further mechanisms for the CEP, within the existing framework and tools of the Treaty and the Protocol, to consider “outstanding values” of the marine environment, when establishing and/or reviewing ASPAs, and ASMAs as appropriate;
  - 3) Understanding the work of CCAMLR on systematic conservation planning, in order to avoid duplication of efforts, complement it and maintain separate roles, while using the appropriate tools available to the CEP’s work to implement Article 3 (2) of Annex 5 to the Protocol;
  - 4) Providing a final report to CEP XIX.
- (199) The Committee welcomed the offer from François André (Belgium) to act as ICG convener.

***9e) Other Annex V Matters***

- (200) Norway introduced WP 29 *A Suggested ASPA/ASMA Prior Assessment Process*. Norway noted that intersessional discussions had shown that there was a general interest amongst Members to develop preliminary assessment procedures for ASPA and ASMA proposals, noting that such procedures could engage all Parties in the process of designating new Areas, allow Members to receive early feedback on proposals, help achieve greater coherence in areas selected

for ASPA/ASMA designation, and facilitate the process of management plan adoption. The paper presented draft guidelines for ‘A prior assessment process for the designation of ASPAs and ASMAs’. It also suggested that the Committee: emphasise the merit of the CEP having the opportunity to undertake prior assessment of any new ASPA and ASMA designations; encourage proponents of a new ASPA or ASMA to bring plans of such a designation to the attention of the CEP as early as possible to allow for a prior assessment of the area; and agree to the proposed guidelines as a desired, but not mandatory, procedure to be used to enable prior assessment of new designations.

- (201) The Committee thanked Norway for leading the discussions and noted the benefits of a prior assessment process for proposed new ASMAs and ASPAs, including: engaging all Parties in the process of designating new sites, recognising that all ASPAs and ASMAs are internationally designated; aiding Members in preparing management plans by allowing for feedback and comments from other Members earlier in the process; and 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.
- (202) China emphasised that, during the process of discussion, the procedure of an ASPA or ASMA which has already been proposed shall not be interrupted or delayed by any new process.
- (203) Argentina agreed with the adoption of these guidelines. It also supported the comments made by China that this procedure should not apply to ASMA/ASPA proposals already in course.
- (204) ASOC noted that such a prior assessment process may be a useful contribution to a more strategic approach in the development of a representative network of protected areas as long as this does not discourage the submission of draft management plans.
- (205) The Committee supported the idea of establishing a non-mandatory procedure and, following some comments from Members and minor modifications to the wording presented in WP 29, agreed to adopt the *Guidelines: A Prior Assessment process for the designation of ASPAs and ASMAs* (Appendix 3).

---

**CEP advice to ATCM on a prior assessment process for the designation of ASPAs and ASMAs**

- (206) The Committee encouraged Members to utilize the *Guidelines: A Prior Assessment process for the designation of ASPAs and ASMAs* in future ASMA

and ASPA designation processes. The Committee noted that the procedure for prior assessment of ASPAs or ASMAs should not apply to any areas that had already been proposed as an ASPA or an ASMA.

---

- (207) New Zealand introduced WP 35 *Code of Conduct for Activities within Terrestrial Geothermal Environments in Antarctica*, and referred to IP 24 *Code of Conduct for Activities within Terrestrial Geothermal Environments in Antarctica*, both of which were jointly prepared with Spain, the United Kingdom, and the United States. The co-authors of these papers highlighted the high scientific value of terrestrial geothermal environments in Antarctica, and suggested that a code of conduct was needed to help maintain the unique environmental and scientific values of terrestrial geothermal sites. They further noted that such a code would serve as a non-mandatory guide to best practice within geothermal environments. The proponents recommended that the Committee: provide any comments on the draft of the code of conduct; invite SCAR in consultation with COMNAP to review the draft code of conduct with a view to endorsing it as a SCAR code of conduct; and invite SCAR to re-submit a final version of the code of conduct for consideration at CEP XIX.
- (208) The Committee thanked New Zealand and the United States for convening the workshop and expressed strong support for the proposed recommendations, particularly noting the value of having SCAR and COMNAP involved. The Committee welcomed SCAR's offer to review the draft code of conduct and to submit a final version to CEP XIX for consideration by the Committee. The Committee asked Members to encourage their own relevant specialists to participate in the intersessional review process.
- (209) Argentina introduced WP 50 *Findings from ad hoc Surveys Related to the Protection of Fossils in Antarctica: Potential Courses of Action for Further Discussion*. Argentina reminded the Committee that this matter was raised at CEP XVII, where Argentina undertook to lead informal intersessional discussions. Following these discussions and a survey of relevant Parties, Argentina identified possible courses of action that could assist in achieving additional protective measures related to fossils in Antarctica, including: that all Parties take note of the various mechanisms and procedures informed by each survey participant; that various modes of information exchange be considered; and that SCAR, through its Action Group on Geological Heritage and Conservation, could be requested to provide technical advice on identifying appropriate management and protection measures for geological sites, including those containing fossils.

- (210) The Committee thanked Argentina for reporting on the outcomes of the intersessional discussions. It noted the value of fossils to scientific understanding of the history and evolution of the Antarctic continent, and recognised the importance of ensuring protection of fossils and fossil sites through enhanced information exchange and the possible development of best practice management guidance.
- (211) The Committee welcomed SCAR's advice that the SCAR Action Group on Geological Heritage and Conservation would be considering matters related to the scientific understanding of fossils, as part of the group's broader work, and thanked SCAR for its offer to provide advice to a future meeting. The Committee also welcomed IAATO's offer to support the Committee's work on this matter as appropriate. Members expressed support for considering a Resolution similar to Resolution 3 (2001) on Protection of Meteorites, but noted that such a resolution would best be developed at a future meeting following further discussion of these matters.
- (212) The Committee noted with concern the collection of Antarctic fossils and other geological material for commercial sale. The Committee urged all Parties, national programmes and IAATO to take appropriate actions to ensure that the collection of fossils and other geological material was only undertaken for scientific research and that such material was appropriately archived for ongoing research purposes.
- (213) ASOC presented IP 109 *Antarctic Tourism and Protected Areas*, and emphasised the connection between area protection and tourism regulation. It recommended that Members consider examining, from a regional perspective, the intersection of current tourism activities with protected and managed areas, as well as area protection and management needs. It further suggested that Members provide clear statements about tourism policies at their facilities and consider the spatial expansion of tourism in the process of developing a representative network of protected areas.
- (214) ASOC also presented IP 112 *Expanding Antarctica's Protected Areas System*, which highlighted the importance of strengthening the protected areas system, given the exposure of the changing Antarctic environment to threats such as invasive species. It recommended that the Committee critically review the scope of ASPA coverage in Antarctica and initiate an integrated, region-wide planning process that enacted the obligations set out in Article 3 of Annex V to the Protocol.

- (215) Belgium recalled its Working Paper 39 presented to CEP XVI, co-sponsored by the United Kingdom and South Africa, and stressed the importance of Annex V as a tool for the protection of microbial habitats, especially in pristine areas, where anthropogenic impacts could destroy future scientific values.
- (216) The Committee thanked ASOC for the papers, and noted that they contained a range of information and views that may be useful for the Committee's further discussions on the systematic development of the protected areas system, including actions identified in the Climate Change Response Work Programme.

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

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

- (217) The United Kingdom introduced WP 28 *Revision of the CEP Non-native Species Manual (Edition 2011)*, jointly prepared with France and New Zealand. The United Kingdom reminded the Committee that the CEP Non-Native Species Manual was adopted under Resolution 6 (2011), which also encouraged the Committee to continue to develop the Manual. The paper highlighted the growing body of scientific work and developments in practical methods for addressing non-native species issues, as well as the additional work on non-native species by the Committee and recent ICGs, and suggested that consideration be given to the revision of the Manual.
- (218) The Committee thanked the United Kingdom, France and New Zealand for the paper, which addressed an issue identified as the highest priority in both the CEP Five-Year Work Plan and the CCRWP. The Committee also welcomed the detailed summary of relevant developments and results since the adoption of Resolution 6 (2011). It noted that relevant information available from the Antarctic Environments Portal and the other papers submitted under this agenda item would also be useful for the work of the ICG. Many Members expressed interest in participating in the ICG. The Committee also welcomed the offers of assistance from SCAR and IAATO.
- (219) The Committee noted the recommendation within Resolution 6 (2011) that Parties 'encourage the Committee for Environmental Protection to continue to develop the Non-Native Species Manual with the input of the Scientific Committee on Antarctic Research and the Council of Managers of National Antarctic Programmes on scientific and practical matters, respectively', recognised recent scientific and practical environmental management

developments regarding non-native species issues, and noted also that a review of the manual had been identified as a prioritised action in the Climate Change Response Work Programme.

- (220) The Committee welcomed the proposal and agreed to establish an ICG to:
- 1) Review and/or reconfirm the ‘Overall Objectives’ and ‘Key Guiding Principles’ for Parties’ actions to address non-native species, contained within the CEP Non-Native Species Manual;
  - 2) Revise, and supplement with new information, the section of the Manual concerning ‘Guidelines and resources to support prevention of the introduction of non-native species including the transfer of species between sites in the Antarctic’;
  - 3) Review and revise the Annex ‘Guidelines and resources requiring further attention or development’ to identify particular aspects of Antarctic operations for which further work might be required in order to develop specific guidance. Furthermore, give consideration to issues relating to the natural introduction pathways for species;
  - 4) Report to CEP XIX on progress with the above.
- (221) The United Kingdom agreed to convene the ICG. The Committee welcomed the offer from Kevin Hughes (United Kingdom) to act as ICG convener.
- (222) Argentina introduced WP 46 *Study to determine the occurrence of non-native species introduced into Antarctica through natural pathways*. This paper discussed the results of studies conducted on two specimens of the vagrant bird *Netta peposaca* found dead in the South Shetland Islands. An autopsy carried out on both specimens suggested that they may have died of hunger, tiredness and dehydration. Laboratory tests had showed no apparent parasitic disease, no signs of bacterial disease and no presence of influenza virus. The paper highlighted the need to advance studies on the pathways of introduction of new species in the Antarctic. It further noted the need to distinguish between natural and anthropogenic pathways. Argentina encouraged interested Members and SCAR to conduct research on potential pathways for natural introductions to the Antarctic and to collect data on occurrence and distribution of microorganisms in Antarctica.
- (223) France stated that it had been confronted with two cases of albatross’ epizooties in sub-Antarctic islands. In both cases, viruses had been detected and had affected populations in isolated areas. It was very likely that these viruses had been introduced through natural pathways. France noted that it had undertaken bio-security measures to prevent any spread to neighbouring populations.

- (224) SCAR highlighted that introduction of non-native species remains an important issue and that, according to recent studies, human introductions of non-native species were becoming more frequent. SCAR also noted recent works, including one on the detection of distinct avian influenza viruses in Adelie Penguins, and a second which lists several bird dispersal events to Elephant Island, King George Island and Nelson Island. SCAR also drew attention to several recent microbiological reviews, indicating much endemism in elements of the continent's microbiota. These works also indicate that differentiation of incoming species by natural means, such as wind, from those introduced by humans is feasible. SCAR also noted that much of the wind-borne microbial diversity is indigenous to the continent. SCAR further noted that the SCAR groups AntEco and AnT-ERA were undertaking work on these questions. SCAR supported Argentina's encouragement of Members to support terrestrial biodiversity research in the region indicating such work will improve understanding of the risks of introductions from elsewhere, and those from transfers among the continent's Conservation Biogeographic regions.
- (225) Chile thanked Argentina for its document and supported the recommendations presented in it, mentioning that this issue could be relevant mainly in the Antarctic Peninsula region, where Chilean researchers have informed the record of live non-Antarctic birds and also pathogen microorganisms.
- (226) The Committee welcomed the paper from Argentina, noting that it addressed a subject identified as a high priority for the CEP's work. The Committee supported the recommendation that Parties be encouraged to conduct similar studies as those described in WP 48. With regard to the second recommendation, the Committee noted SCAR's advice regarding ongoing research within the Antarctic science community. The Committee noted that the issues raised in the paper could be considered further in the review of the Non-native Species Manual, which could also include the experiences of other Members. It also noted the relevance of the publications mentioned by SCAR, which should serve as a useful reference for the work of the ICG when reviewing the Non-native Species Manual.
- (227) Spain presented IP 29 *The successful eradication of Poa pratensis from Cierva Point, Danco Coast, Antarctic Peninsula*, jointly prepared with the United Kingdom and Argentina. This paper reported on collaborative efforts by the co-authors to protect native biodiversity by eradicating the non-native grass *Poa pratensis*, which had been inadvertently introduced to the Cierva Point area in 1954.

- (228) The Committee thanked the authors of the paper, noting its usefulness as a resource for the intersessional work to include in the Non-native Species Manual during its revision.
- (229) The United Kingdom presented IP 46 *Colonisation status of known non-native species in the Antarctic terrestrial environment: a review*, jointly prepared with Chile and Spain. The paper summarised a recent academic review paper that detailed non-native species distribution and eradications within the Treaty area and discussed pertinent legislative and management issues.
- (230) The Committee welcomed the paper and noted that it would be a useful reference for the ICG's work to review the Non-native Species Manual.
- (231) Poland presented IP 78 *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 reported on a research project undertaken during the 2014/15 season at Arctowski station and ASPA 128, which aimed to eradicate the non-native grass *Poa annua*.
- (232) The Committee thanked the authors of the paper, and welcomed the efforts made by Poland. The Committee encouraged further updates from Poland on the eradication of non-native grass from ASPA 128, and on any lessons learned.
- (233) SCAR presented IP 93 *Monitoring biological invasion across the broader Antarctic: a baseline and indicator framework*. SCAR reported on some recent published research that has developed a framework (the Antarctic Biological Invasion Indicator - ABII), which applies global best practice to the problem of understanding, monitoring and managing biological invasions in Antarctica. The research shows that: invasion drivers are prevalent across the Antarctic and are increasing; plants and insects make up most of the non-native species present in the Antarctic region; and the conservation status of threatened species impacted by non-native species is declining. SCAR suggested that the indicator framework not only provides a comprehensive baseline on the current status of biological invasions in Antarctica, but also provides a mechanism to facilitate information exchange across the broader Antarctic region. SCAR recommended that the CEP consider the potential value of the ABII for helping to address one of its key priorities and drew attention to the relevance of this framework in the review of the Non-native Species Manual.

- (234) The Committee thanked SCAR for bringing to its attention the ABII, and noted that further consideration could be given to this framework during the planned review of the Non-native Species Manual.
- (235) COMNAP presented IP 101 *COMNAP Practical Training Modules: Module 2 – Non-native Species*. This paper presented a training module developed by the COMNAP Training Expert Group entitled “Non-native Species”. The module was created from training presentations developed by the National Antarctic Programmes of Argentina, Australia, China, India, New Zealand and Spain. COMNAP thanked those programmes and also thanked IAATO, who had provided input into the training module. The paper noted that the training module would be made freely available in various file formats from the COMNAP website.
- (236) The Committee commended COMNAP for its work to develop the training materials, noting that the Non-native Species Manual highlighted the importance of raising awareness of non-native species risks.

***10b) Specially Protected Species***

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

***10c) Other Annex II Matters***

- (238) The Committee considered elements of WP 27 *Wildlife Approach Distances in Antarctica* (SCAR) that had not been discussed under Agenda Item 8b.
- (239) SCAR noted that its recommendations in WP 27 were intended to emphasise the importance of taking into account cryptic, negative responses of wildlife. It noted that this element was not reflected in existing guidelines, and therefore warranted consideration.
- (240) The Committee thanked SCAR for presenting the paper and for its comprehensive review of scientific publications and evidence relating to an understating of wildlife disturbance. The Committee agreed that the management of human activities to avoid disturbance of wildlife should be based on the best available science. The Committee strongly encouraged Members to conduct more research in this area, as suggested by SCAR, and agreed that matters related to wildlife disturbance should be reconsidered in the future as new scientific data became available.

---

**CEP advice to the ATCM on wildlife disturbance**

(241) On the basis of information provided by SCAR, the Committee agreed to advise the ATCM that:

- approach distances in existing ATCM guidelines should be regularly reviewed on the basis of emerging scientific research;
- precautionary approaches are urged in all circumstances when operating in the vicinity of wildlife; and
- further research should be undertaken to ensure management decisions are taken on the basis of the best available knowledge.

---

(242) The United States introduced WP 40 *Important Bird Areas (IBAs) in Antarctica and IP 27 Important Bird Areas (IBAs) in Antarctica*, jointly prepared with Australia, New Zealand, Norway and the United Kingdom. It reported on the recently completed analysis of Important Bird Areas based on the consistent application of global criteria for bird population assessment worldwide. It noted that until now there was a significant gap in coverage of the terrestrial environment in continental Antarctica. The effort to compile an IBA inventory for Antarctica was initiated by BirdLife International and SCAR in 1998, and had been aided by support from Members in recent years. It further noted that all IBA sites were identified using a standardised set of thresholds and IBAs now covered five per cent of the world area, with 204 IBAs located in Antarctica. IBA was neither a formal designation, nor had a protected area status associated with it, but designation of an IBA emphasised the area's importance for the preservation of biodiversity. The paper recommended that the Committee consider the IBA analysis as an important tool to be used for assessment and monitoring.

(243) The Committee thanked the co-authors of these papers. It also thanked Birdlife International and the various contributors to the report, including many members of the scientific community. The Committee recognised the value of the IBA report, which represented a substantial product and was of considerable relevance to its deliberations on the protection and management of Antarctica. Members noted further potential applications for the IBA report, including as a resource for preparing and assessing EIAs, reviewing protected area management plans, and preparing for policy and management discussions at the annual ATCM and CEP meetings.

### **CEP advice to the ATCM on Important Bird Areas in Antarctica**

(244) The Committee agreed to forward a draft Resolution on Important Bird Areas in Antarctica to the ATCM for adoption.

---

(245) Spain presented IP 69 *Update of the status of the rare moss formations on Caliente Hill (ASPAs 140 – site C)*. This paper drew attention to damage caused by inadvertent cumulative trampling on the endemic moss *Schistidium deceptionense* in the sensitive area of Deception Island. It provided an update to CEP XVII - IP 58, which had reported on new damage detected on Deception Island. It highlighted some elements of this damage and the related difficult issues. It also mentioned that it was necessary to work from different perspectives in order to assess this damage properly. Damage was sometimes due to recreational activities, but it was not automatically attributable to IAATO vessels, and could come from elsewhere. Spain also noted that the duplication of research was likely to put the environment under pressure. It mentioned that it had developed an internal code of conduct for field activities, which was suggested as a useful example for other Members. It concluded by expressing interest in supporting and managing the ASPA, noting that it operated a research station nearby and that a Geothermal Code of Conduct could potentially be of great use.

(246) The Committee thanked Spain for this paper and noted the steps Spain had taken to improve protection for these important sites on Deception Island. The United Kingdom noted that it was interested in working closely with Spain and the Deception Island Management Group to consider opportunities to improve protection and management of ASPA 140.

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

- BP 22 *A meta-analysis of human disturbance impacts on Antarctic wildlife* (SCAR).

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

(248) The United States introduced IP 42 *EIA Field Reviews of Science, Operations, and Camps*. The paper reported on the monitoring of United States Antarctic Program projects in Antarctica through an EIA field review process. The process was designed to compare each project's planned and actual activities and impacts. The United States informed the Committee that prior to the field season, projects were identified as candidates for an EIA Field Review using one or more of the following attributes as selection criteria: use of large

quantities of hazardous materials or generation of large quantities of waste; use of undisturbed or minimally disturbed areas (operational activities); establishment and use of large field camps or new tent camps; located in or near sensitive areas; located where other projects were on-going or may be initiated; and use of emerging technology.

- (249) The Committee commended the United States for its comprehensive approach to follow-up of EIAs, and noted that the information presented in IP 42 could be a useful resource for the ICG on EIA matters.
- (250) The Republic of Korea introduced IP 71 *Environmental Monitoring at Jang-Bogo Station, Terra Nova Bay*, which reported on a comprehensive environmental monitoring programme aimed to assess the impacts of the operation of Jang-Bogo Station on the Antarctic environment. It noted that the process also aimed to devise effective mitigation measures and that the level of environmental impact of the station was generally in compliance with the levels expressed in the CEE.
- (251) India congratulated the Republic of Korea for conducting comprehensive environmental monitoring, selecting various environmental indicators, and noticed that this experience may be useful for Parties conducting environmental monitoring with reference to indicators suggested by COMNAP and SCAR.
- (252) The Committee welcomed the advice that monitoring at Jang-Bogo Station had shown that the environmental impacts associated with operating the station were generally in compliance with the levels expressed in the CEE.
- (253) SCAR presented IP 98 *Report on the 2014-2015 activities of the Southern Ocean Observing System (SOOS)*. It noted that, in 2014, SOOS clarified its mission and objectives, and developed Implementation Structures to support implementation activities. It highlighted SOOS sponsorship and endorsement as well as activities planned for the 2015/16 season along with its key objectives.
- (254) The Committee welcomed the update and noted the value and relevance of SOOS to CEP interests, as had been recognised in its earlier discussions of WP 39 and the CCRWP.
- (255) New Zealand presented IP 103 *A Methodology to Assess Site Sensitivity at Visitor Sites: Progress Report*, prepared jointly with Australia, Norway, the United Kingdom and the United States. The paper reported on work

conducted in collaboration with Oceanites and Stony Brook University to identify opportunities to use the long-term data set of the Antarctic Site Inventory. It provided a progress report and outcomes of field work undertaken during the 2014/15 season and set out further work to be undertaken ahead of CEP XIX.

- (256) IAATO considered that the methodology employed a good mix of qualitative and quantitative approaches, noting its involvement in the expert survey. France noted the potential bias in the results due to more information on birds and mammals and expressed the wish that other components of the ecosystem will be more covered in the future. ASOC stated that environmental monitoring was essential and encouraged Members to continue developing this kind of work.
- (257) The Committee recalled its discussion at CEP XVII of this work, and noted that it related to recommendations arising from the 2012 CEP Tourism Study. The Committee thanked IAATO and its member operators for the significant support in facilitating the expert survey. It looked forward to a further update during the next meeting, including a discussion of the anticipated site sensitivity methodology.

## **Item 12: Inspection Reports**

- (258) The United Kingdom introduced WP 19 rev. 1 *General Recommendations From the Joint Inspections Undertaken by the United Kingdom and the Czech Republic Under Article VII of the Antarctic Treaty and Article 14 of the Environmental Protocol*, and referred to IP 57 *Report of the Joint Inspections Undertaken by the United Kingdom and the Czech Republic under Article VII of the Antarctic Treaty and Article 14 of the Environmental Protocol*, jointly prepared with the Czech Republic. It reported on the joint Antarctic Treaty inspections undertaken between December 2014 and January 2015, which involved 12 research stations, one non-governmental facility, one refuge, six cruise vessels and five yachts. The United Kingdom thanked all Parties and vessel operators who were inspected for their cooperation during the inspection process. The United Kingdom noted that inspections necessarily reflected the position at a point in time. They welcomed all Parties who indicated that they would consider the individual station or vessel recommendations. No significant breaches of the Treaty or its Environment Protocol were observed.

- (259) The United Kingdom drew the attention of the Committee to the recommendations in WP 19 rev. 1 that in its and the Czech Republic's opinion addressed environmental issues (Recommendations 4, 11, 13, 14, 17, 18, 19, 20, 21, and 26), and asked the meeting to welcome and endorse them.
- (260) The Czech Republic noted that the paper reported on the first inspections carried out by a Czech inspector. It noted the importance of international cooperation during the inspection process, and highlighted the value of multi-national inspection teams.
- (261) The Committee thanked the United Kingdom and the Czech Republic for the detailed report on inspections undertaken during 2014-2015, and generally focused its discussions on the environmental elements of the inspection report and the recommendations arising. The Committee noted the value of inspections, including as a means of verifying compliance with the Protocol and highlighting good practice. The Committee welcomed the inspection team's observations regarding the generally high level of awareness of the provisions of the Environment Protocol, and the significant examples of good practice, as highlighted in the full inspection report.
- (262) Some Members provided comments, clarifications and updates on issues raised in the inspection report as it related to their operations.
- (263) China noted that the Chinese emergency refuge listed in Table 1 of the inspection report was scheduled for removal in two years and that appropriate mitigation measures would be taken to reduce the environmental impact of the removal.
- (264) Bulgaria commented that the Bulgarian Antarctic Institute (BAI) was not "mainly reliant on hosting visiting scientists at the station" for funding the national scientific research. The scientific operations of BAI and its Antarctic base St. Kliment Ohridski were funded through the National Research Fund, which approved scientific projects on a competitive basis, and by other national sources such as the Ministry of Environment. It further noted that Ohridski base did not rely on the Spanish station for medical support. Each of the two stations had its own doctor and basic health care facilities, so there was no essential interdependence as far as medical support was concerned. As for the possible complex medical emergencies that would require evacuation from the island, it would only delay the process and pose additional risks for the patient if transported first to the Spanish station. Such evacuation was carried out by helicopters to the Chilean airport on

King George Island, the flying conditions at the two stations would be most likely similar, and the flight distances were the same, obviating the need for evacuation by way of the Spanish station. Bulgaria highlighted that the station was operated by a mixture of volunteers and non-volunteers. Indeed, paid BAI employees such as its director, programme manager and secretary who regularly participate in the annual Bulgarian Antarctic campaigns and work at the base in various capacities (campaign leadership, logistics or other support) were not volunteers. Bulgarian scientists working at the station also took part in the operation of the station, and they were usually remunerated under their respective scientific projects and thus were not volunteers either. The volunteers included non-scientific personnel such as construction, mechanical or electrical engineers, doctors, cooks, etc. However, “volunteers” should not be interpreted as “amateurs”. These were skilled professionals in their field, usually with several (more than ten in some cases) seasons of previous Antarctic experience.

- (265) Germany reiterated its feedback that the German Antarctic Receiving Station (GARS) O’Higgins did not process data for military purposes.
- (266) Canada informed the Committee that it had noted the concerns raised regarding observations at HSM 61 and that it would be working with its authorised tour operators, particularly those inspected, to improve compliance with the Treaty and the Environment Protocol.
- (267) Ukraine informed the Committee that it had taken note of the recommendations relevant to its station and had already commenced work on improvements.
- (268) Several Members recognised the general character and the interests of the recommendations resulting from inspections but urged the Committee to only consider the recommendations related to environmental issues.
- (269) Argentina welcomed the inspections carried out under Article 7 of the Antarctic Treaty; it further noted that they were very useful for future decision-making and it agreed with the Chair that the Committee should focus strictly on environment-related inspections only. In this regard, Argentina drew attention to the fact that the document contained all recommendations and not just those related to the environment. It also stated that since the recommendations were made by individual Parties, Argentina did not share the view that the Committee include the general recommendations in any final report of the CEP meeting.

- (270) Brazil thanked the work done by the United Kingdom and the Czech Republic, whose findings about the Brazilian station were very positive. Brazil recognised the usefulness of inspections insofar as they aim at reinforcing the objectives of the Antarctic Treaty and Madrid Protocol. Brazil highlighted the recommendatory nature of the inspection reports which reflect the view of its proponents and could be taken into account as appropriate by the inspected Parties.
- (271) Belgium highlighted the importance of addressing the environmental repair and remediation issues associated with Eco Base Nelson. It suggested that the station posed a significant risk to safety and the environment and should be removed as soon as possible.
- (272) With regard to recommendation 13, SCAR informed the Committee that it does not have a research group focused on the impact of climatic or environmental changes on facilities or infrastructure.
- (273) IAATO noted that its members welcomed inspections under the Treaty on its members' activities, highlighting that such inspections were seen as an opportunity for operators to showcase their environmentally-responsible operations and further educate their visitors about the Treaty. IAATO noted that their members remained strongly committed to biosecurity best practice. They requested that, if issues should arise, concerned Parties approach IAATO directly so that issues could be dealt with promptly.
- (274) Norway noted that many of the recommendations provided in the report covered issues important to the Committee. It suggested that, if the recommendations could not be adopted at this stage, then the Committee could consider these, as appropriate, when advancing the work of the CEP. It noted that for example recommendation 13 was particularly relevant in the context of the implementation of the CCRWP.
- (275) The Committee noted the paper introduced by the United Kingdom and the Czech Republic with general recommendations presented in WP 19 rev. 1. Members noted that recommendations arising from inspections were useful for the consideration of the inspected Parties, as appropriate. It was noted that the recommendations presented in the inspection report are the recommendations of the Parties who conducted the inspection, but not recommendations by the Committee. Some Members indicated the usefulness of the recommendations for their own use when appropriate.
- (276) Several Members and ASOC noted the usefulness of reporting back to the Committee on progress made to implement recommendations

contained in inspection reports. They cited India's follow-up report to the recommendations made by an inspection of Maitri Station as a good example of this (BP 14). The Russian Federation noted that such follow-up reports could also allow the inspected National Antarctic Programmes to fully articulate their position regarding recommendations received.

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

- BP 14 *Follow-up to the Recommendations of the Inspection Teams to Maitri Station* (India).

### **Item 13: General Matters**

(278) SCAR presented IP 20 *Outcomes of the 1st SCAR Antarctic and Southern Ocean Science Horizon Scan*. The Horizon Scan had focused on the most compelling and important scientific questions, both in and from Antarctica and the Southern Ocean, to be addressed over the next two decades and beyond. It identified 80 high-priority scientific questions divided into six areas. These included: 1) defining the global reach of the Antarctic atmosphere and Southern Ocean; 2) understanding how, where and why ice sheets lose mass; 3) revealing Antarctica's history; 4) learning how Antarctic life evolved and survived; 5) observing space and the Universe; and 6) recognising and mitigating human influences.

(279) The Committee congratulated SCAR for undertaking the Horizon Scan and for the report on key outcomes. It noted that one of the priorities identified related to the recognition of mitigation of human impacts, and looked forward to drawing on the results of research prioritised in the Horizon Scan for its future work.

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

- IP 74 *Waste Water Management in Antarctica COMNAP Workshop* (COMNAP).
- BP 17 *Manejo de residuos sólidos en la XIX Expedición Ecuatoriana* (Ecuador).

### **Item 14: Election Officers**

(281) The Committee elected Polly Penhale from the United States as Vice-Chair for a second two-year term and congratulated her on her appointment to the role.

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

(282) The Committee adopted the Preliminary Agenda for CEP XIX (Appendix 4).

**Item 16: Adoption of the Report**

(283) The Committee adopted its Report.

**Item 17: Closing of the Meeting**

(284) The Chair closed the Meeting on Friday 5<sup>th</sup> June 2015.



## Appendix 1

## CEP Five-Year Work Plan

<b>Issue / Environmental Pressure: Introduction of non-native species</b>	
<b>Priority: 1</b>	
<b>Actions:</b>	
1. Continue developing practical guidelines & resources for all Antarctic operators.	
2. Implement related actions identified in the Climate Change Response Work Programme.	
3. Consider the spatially explicit, activity-differentiated risk assessments to mitigate the risks posed by terrestrial non-native species.	
4. Develop a surveillance strategy for areas at high risk of non-native species establishment.	
5. Give additional attention to the risks posed by intra-Antarctic transfer of propagules.	
Intersessional period 2015/16	ICG to review Non-Native Species Manual
CEP XIX 2016	Consider ICG report
Intersessional period 2016/17	
CEP XX 2017	
Intersessional period 2017/18	
CEP XXI 2018	
Intersessional period 2018/19	
CEP XXII 2019	
Intersessional period 2019/20	
CEP XXIII 2020	

<b>Issue / Environmental Pressure: Tourism and NGO activities</b>	
<b>Priority: 1</b>	
<b>Actions:</b>	
1. Provide advice to ATCM as requested.	
2. Advance recommendations from ship-borne tourism ATME.	
Intersessional period 2015/16	
CEP XIX 2016	Consider the outcomes of the development of the site sensitivity methodology [recommendation 3 of the tourism study].
Intersessional period 2016/17	
CEP XX 2017	
Intersessional period 2017/18	
CEP XXI 2018	
Intersessional period 2018/19	
CEP XXII 2019	
Intersessional period 2019/20	
CEP XXIII 2020	

<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>1. Consider implications of climate change for management of Antarctic environment.</li> <li>2. Advance recommendations from climate change ATME.</li> <li>3. Implement the Climate Change response work programme.</li> </ol>	
Intersessional period 2015/16	Discuss mechanisms for reviewing and updating the CCRWP.
CEP XIX 2016	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Standing agenda item</li> <li>• SCAR provides update</li> </ul>
Intersessional period 2016/17	
CEP XX 2017	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Standing agenda item</li> <li>• SCAR provides update</li> </ul>
Intersessional period 2017/18	
CEP XXI 2018	
Intersessional period 2018/19	
CEP XXII 2019	
Intersessional period 2019/20	
CEP XXIII 2020	

<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 ASMAs preparation.</li> </ol>	
Intersessional period 2015/16	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• SGMP / conducts work as per agreed work plan</li> <li>• Continue the work on developing guidelines to ASMAs preparation.</li> </ul>
CEP XIX 2016	Consideration of SGMP / report
Intersessional period 2016/17	
CEP XX 2017	
Intersessional period 2017/18	
CEP XXI 2018	
Intersessional period 2018/19	
CEP XXII 2019	
Intersessional period 2019/20	
CEP XXIII 2020	

<b>Issue / Environmental Pressure: Marine spatial protection and management</b>	
<b>Priority: 1</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> </ol>	
Intersessional period 2015/16	ICG on outstanding marine values
CEP XIX 2016	Consider ICG report
Intersessional period 2016/17	
CEP XX 2017	
Intersessional period 2017/18	
CEP XXI 2018	
Intersessional period 2018/19	
CEP XXII 2019	
Intersessional period 2019/20	
CEP XXIII 2020	

<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 2015/16	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Prepare publication for 25<sup>th</sup> anniversary of the Protocol.</li> <li>• As required, plan for 25<sup>th</sup> anniversary symposium.</li> </ul>
CEP XIX 2016	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 25<sup>th</sup> anniversary of Protocol. Review and revise work plan as appropriate.</li> <li>• Consider draft publication prepared by ICG.</li> </ul>
Intersessional period 2016/17	
CEP XX 2017	
Intersessional period 2017/18	
CEP XXI 2018	
Intersessional period 2018/19	
CEP XXII 2019	
Intersessional period 2019/20	
CEP XXIII 2020	

<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 2015/16	
CEP XIX 2016	
Intersessional period 2016/17	
CEP XX 2017	Consider review of the Clean-up Manual.
Intersessional period 2017/18	
CEP XXI 2018	
Intersessional period 2018/19	
CEP XXII 2019	
Intersessional period 2019/20	
CEP XXIII 2020	

<b>Issue / Environmental Pressure: Human footprint / wilderness management</b>	
<b>Priority: 2</b>	
<b>Actions:</b>	
<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Develop methods for improved protection of wilderness under Annexes I and V.</li> </ol>	
Intersessional period 2015/16	Consider how wilderness aspects could be taken into account in the EIA guidelines
CEP XIX 2016	
Intersessional period 2016/17	
CEP XX 2017	
Intersessional period 2017/18	
CEP XXI 2018	
Intersessional period 2018/19	
CEP XXII 2019	
Intersessional period 2019/20	
CEP XXIII 2020	

<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 2015/16	
CEP XIX 2016	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Report from COMNAP and SCAR on the use of unmanned aerial vehicles (UAVs).</li> <li>• Consider establishing an ICG to develop UAV guidance.</li> </ul>
Intersessional period 2016/17	
CEP XX 2017	
Intersessional period 2017/18	
CEP XXI 2018	
Intersessional period 2018/19	
CEP XXII 2019	
Intersessional period 2019/20	
CEP XXIII 2020	

<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 2015/16	
CEP XIX 2016	
Intersessional period 2016/17	
CEP XX 2017	Discussion of SCAR update on underwater noise.
Intersessional period 2017/18	
CEP XXI 2018	
Intersessional period 2018/19	
CEP XXII 2019	
Intersessional period 2019/20	
CEP XXIII 2020	

<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 of guidelines should be needed for additional sites.</li> <li>2. Provide advice to ATCM as required.</li> <li>3. Review the format of the site guidelines</li> </ol>	
Intersessional period 2015/16	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• UK to coordinate an informal process to seek and collate information on National Operators' recreational use of site guidelines</li> <li>• Develop visitor site guideline for the Yalour Island.</li> </ul>
CEP XIX 2016	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Standing agenda item; Parties to report on their reviews of site guidelines</li> <li>• Report to the CEP with Barrientos Island, Aitcho Islands, monitoring results.</li> </ul>
Intersessional period 2016/17	
CEP XX 2017	Standing agenda item; Parties to report on their reviews of site guidelines
Intersessional period 2017/18	
CEP XXI 2018	
Intersessional period 2018/19	
CEP XXII 2019	
Intersessional period 2019/20	
CEP XXIII 2020	

<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 2015/16	
CEP XIX 2016	
Intersessional period 2016/17	
CEP XX 2017	
Intersessional period 2017/18	
CEP XXI 2018	
Intersessional period 2018/19	
CEP XXII 2019	
Intersessional period 2019/20	
CEP XXIII 2020	

<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 2015/16	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Prepare publication on 25<sup>th</sup> anniversary</li> <li>• As appropriate, contribute to ATCM ICG on Education and Outreach.</li> </ul>
CEP XIX 2016	Consider and adopt publication
Intersessional period 2016/17	
CEP XX 2017	
Intersessional period 2017/18	
CEP XXI 2018	
Intersessional period 2018/19	
CEP XXII 2019	
Intersessional period 2019/20	
CEP XXIII 2020	

<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 2015/16	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Establish ICG to review draft CEEs as required</li> <li>• Continue ICG on EIA guidelines review, as required</li> </ul>
CEP XIX 2016	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Consideration of ICG reports on draft CEE, as required</li> <li>• Consideration of ICG review of the EIA guidelines</li> </ul>
Intersessional period 2016/17	Establish ICG to review draft CEEs as required
CEP XX 2017	Consideration of ICG reports on draft CEE, as required
Intersessional period 2017/18	
CEP XXI 2018	
Intersessional period 2018/19	
CEP XXII 2019	
Intersessional period 2019/20	
CEP XXIII 2020	

<b>Issue / Environmental Pressure: Designation and management of Historic Sites and Monuments</b>	
<b>Priority: 3</b>	
<b>Actions:</b>	
1. Maintain the list and consider new proposals as they arise.	
2. Consider strategic issues as necessary, including issues relating to designation of HSM versus clean-up provisions of the Protocol.	
3. Review the presentation of the HSM list with the aim to improve information availability.	
Intersessional period 2015/16	Secretariat update list of HSMs
CEP XIX 2016	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Standing item</li> <li>• Start discussions on issues relating to designation of HSM versus clean-up provisions of the Protocol.</li> </ul>
Intersessional period 2016/17	Secretariat update list of HSMs
CEP XX 2017	Standing item
Intersessional period 2017/18	
CEP XXI 2018	
Intersessional period 2018/19	
CEP XXII 2019	
Intersessional period 2019/20	
CEP XXIII 2020	

<b>Issue / Environmental Pressure: Exchange of Information</b>	
<b>Priority: 3</b>	
<b>Actions:</b>	
1. Assign to the Secretariat.	
2. Monitor and facilitate easy use of the EIES.	
3. Review environmental reporting requirements	
Intersessional period 2015/16	Contribute to further work as necessary on environmental aspects of information exchange.
CEP XIX 2016	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Secretariat Report</li> <li>• Consider ICG report, as appropriate</li> </ul>
Intersessional period 2016/17	
CEP XX 2017	Secretariat Report
Intersessional period 2017/18	
CEP XXI 2018	
Intersessional period 2018/19	
CEP XXII 2019	
Intersessional period 2019/20	
CEP XXIII 2020	

<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 2015/16	Assess possible environmental protection mechanisms for the geological values.
CEP XIX 2016	
Intersessional period 2016/17	
CEP XX 2017	
Intersessional period 2017/18	
CEP XXI 2018	Consider advice from SCAR.
Intersessional period 2018/19	
CEP XXII 2019	
Intersessional period 2019/20	
CEP XXIII 2020	

## **Climate Change Response Work Programme**

**CCRWP Vision:** Taking into account the conclusions and recommendations from the ATME on Climate Change in 2010, the CCRWP provides a mechanism for identifying and revising goals and specific actions by the CEP to support efforts within the Antarctic Treaty System to prepare for, and build resilience to, the environmental impacts of a changing climate and the associated implications for the governance and management of Antarctica.

Climate related issue	Gaps/needs	Response area	Action/Task	Priority	Who	IP	CEP 2016	IP	CEP 2017	IP	CEP 2018	IP	CEP 2019	IP	CEP 2020	
1) Enhanced potential for non-native species establishment	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Framework for surveillance for non-native species establishments (NNS) in terrestrial and freshwater environment</li> <li>Response strategy for supported NNS</li> <li>Assessment of whether existing regimes for preventing NNS introductions and management tools applied in other areas.</li> </ul>	Management	<p>a. Continue to develop the NNS manual consistent with Resolution 6 (2011), ensuring that the manual includes, specifically in the approaches (p. 21)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Response strategy (p. 22)</li> <li>Assessment of whether NNS (p. 18)</li> </ul>	1.3	CEP		Ensure climate change implications are sufficiently considered and appropriately developed as listed in CEP 5-year work plan		Initiate ISW to develop a NNS surveillance and response strategy, including the highest risk habitats/bioregion		Receive report of ISW and take action accordingly					
			<p>b. Review of IMO biofouling guidelines to check adequacy for Southern Ocean and vessels moving from region to region</p>	2.6	Interested Parties, Experts and Observers						Receive IMO report on biofouling guidelines.		Receive report from IAATO on the application of the biofouling guidelines by their members.			
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Improved understanding of risks associated with relocation of native terrestrial species</li> <li>Mapping of aquatic habitats at risk of invasion</li> </ul>	Management/ Research	<p>c. Undertake a risk assessment: identification of native species at risk of relocation, and pathways for intra-continental transfer, including developing a map of the risk of invasion</p>	1.2	CEP Interested Parties, Experts and Observers	ISW	Initiate ISW to undertake an assessment of risks of relocation of native Antarctic species and identify relevant management actions		Receive report of ISW and take action accordingly							
			<p>d. Undertake risk assessment: identification of size habitats at risk of invasion and pathways for introduction</p> <p>e. Progress actions identified under "Response" in NNS manual (p. 22-23)</p>	1.8	CEP Interested Parties, Experts and Observers											
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Ongoing surveillance programme to identify status of NNS in light of climate change</li> </ul>	Monitoring	<p>f. Implement marine and terrestrial monitoring in accordance with established surveillance framework (p. 4) once developed</p>	1.6	NAPs, SCAR											
			<p>g. Progress actions identified under "Response" in NNS manual (p. 22-23)</p>	1.9	NAPs, SCAR			CEP to encourage national programmes and SCAR to support and facilitate new and on-going research activities, especially with respect to highly visited sites with high risk potential.								
			<p>h. Request for summary of regional and funded research projects</p>													

Climate related issue	Gaps/needs	Respon- se area	Action/Task	Pri- ority	Who	IP	CEP 2016	IP	CEP 2017	IP	CEP 2018	IP	CEP 2019	IP	CEP 2020			
2) Changes in the quantity and quality of aquatic biotic and abiotic environment due to climate change	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Understand how biota will respond to a changing climate and the impacts of these changes</li> <li>Understand as to how the abiotic terrestrial environment will change and the impacts of these changes</li> </ul>	Research	a. Support and undertake research on current and future change and to inform response	1.9	NAPs, SCAR		CEP to encourage national research to support and facilitate new and on-going research activities CEP to equate SCAR to provide a list of knowledge updates on climate impacts on terrestrial biota.		Ongoing. Update reports to be provided, including through the Portal.		Ongoing. Update reports to be provided, including through the Portal.		Ongoing. Update reports to be provided, including through the Portal.		Ongoing. Update reports to be provided, including through the Portal.			
			b. Support and undertake long term monitoring of changes, including collaborative efforts (eg. ANTOS).	1.8	NAPs, SCAR		CEP to encourage national programmes and SCAR to support and facilitate new and on-going research activities CEP to request regular updates from relevant long term monitoring programmes			Ongoing. Consider questions relating to access of data for the CEP		Ongoing. Update reports to be provided, including through the Portal.		Ongoing. Update reports to be provided, including through the Portal.				
			c. Continue develop biogeographic tools (EDA and ACBR) to provide a sound basis for informing Antarctic area management at regional and continental scales in light of climate change, including identifying the need to set aside reference areas for monitoring of climate change areas resilient to climate change	2.1	Initiated by interested Parties and CEP					Plan for a joint SCAR/ CEP workshop on Antarctic biogeography, including to identify practical applications of management tools and future research needs								
			d. Identify and prioritize Antarctic biogeographic areas vulnerable to climate change	1.6	Initiated by interested Parties and CEP													
		e. Review and revise where necessary existing management tools to consider if they afford the best practical adaptation measure to areas at risk from climate change	1.9	CEP	EIA ICC?		EIA ICC?		Ensure EIA ICC (if 5-year work plan) considers and incorporates implications of climate change									
		f. Evaluate review of existing Protected Areas and the process for designation of such areas to ensure they take into account climate change impacts and consider how we might respond.	1.8	CEP	SGMP?		SGMP work on ASMA (if workshop plan) considers and incorporates appropriately the implication of climate change		Plan for intersectoral workshop on the status of the protected areas system	WS?								
		g. Initiate action with the aim to protect representative areas of biota and ecosystems that are likely to provide refuges to species and ecosystems at risk	2.3	CEP														
				Management														

Climate related issue	Gaps/needs	Respon- se area	Action/Task	Pri- ority	Who	IP	CEP 2016	IP	CEP 2017	IP	CEP 2018	IP	CEP 2019	IP	CEP 2020		
3) Change to marine near-shore abiotic and biotic systems (including OA) <sup>1</sup>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Understanding and have the ability to predict near-shore marine abiotic and biotic changes</li> <li>Have a broader understanding of what monitoring data can tell us about changes to the marine environment</li> <li>Assess climate driven changes to the marine environment</li> </ul>	Research	a. Encourage research by national programmes and SCAR and seek state of knowledge updates on marine biota	2.0	NAPs, SCAR		CEP to encourage national programmes and SCAR to support and facilitate new and on-going research activities incl. through the Portal.		Update reports to be provided, incl. through the Portal.		Ongoing. Update reports to be provided, incl. through the Portal.		Ongoing. Update reports to be provided, incl. through the Portal.		Ongoing. Update reports to be provided, incl. through the Portal.		
			b. Support and undertake collaborative, long term monitoring of change (eg. SOOS and ANTOCS) and seek regular state of knowledge reports from such programmes	2.0	NAPs, SCAR		CEP to encourage national programmes and SCAR to support and facilitate new and on-going monitoring activities incl. through the Portal.		Update reports to be provided, incl. through the Portal.		Ongoing. Update reports to be provided, incl. through the Portal.		Ongoing. Update reports to be provided, incl. through the Portal.		Ongoing. Update reports to be provided, incl. through the Portal.		Ongoing. Update reports to be provided, incl. through the Portal.
			c. Review and revise where necessary existing management tools to consider if they afford the best practical adaptation measure to species or geographic areas at risk from climate change in SO	2.0	CEP												
4) Ecosystems change due to ocean acidification	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Understanding of the impact of OA to marine biota and ecosystems</li> </ul>	Management	d. Continue to work with CCAMLR to identify the best practical adaptation measure for reference areas for future research	2.5	CEP, SCAR, SC-CAMLR												
			e. Maintain regular dialogue (or sharing of information) with SC-CAMLR, CCAMLR and the Southern Ocean in particular on actions being taken	1.5	CEP, CCAMLR						Hold workshop as noted in CEP 5- year work plan						
			a. As required, encourage further research and assessment on impact of OA, informed by the SCAR report	1.9	NAPs, SCAR		CEP to encourage national programmes and SCAR to support and facilitate new and on-going research activities Preliminary consideration of SCAR report		Update reports to be provided, incl. through the Portal.		Ongoing. Update reports to be provided, incl. through the Portal.		Ongoing. Update reports to be provided, incl. through the Portal.		Ongoing. Update reports to be provided, incl. through the Portal.		Ongoing. Update reports to be provided, incl. through the Portal.
		Management	b. Consider forthcoming SCAR report and set accordingly (unbinding) some actions may be best advanced by ATCM)	1.6	CEP, CCAMLR <sup>2</sup>												
			c. Review and revise where necessary existing relevant management tools to consider if they afford the best practical adaptation measure to species or geographic areas at risk from ocean acidification	2.4	CEP, CCAMLR <sup>2</sup>												

Climate related issue	Gaps/needs	Respon- se area	Action/Task	Pri- ority	Who	CEP 2016	IP	CEP 2017	IP	CEP 2018	IP	CEP 2019	IP	CEP 2020		
5) Climate change impact to the abiotic terrestrial environment resulting in impacts on environmental or heritage values	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Understanding how the abiotic terrestrial environment will be impacted and how this might impact result in impacts on environmental or heritage values</li> <li>Understanding what the effects of climate change on contaminated sites and implications for species/ecosystems will be and how these changes will increase mobilization and exposure of species/ecosystems to contaminants</li> <li>Understanding how species/ecosystems will respond to exposure to such contaminants</li> <li>Understanding what interventions might be applicable to counteract these impacts</li> </ul>	Research	a. National operators to assess risk of change in climate infrastructure and environmental consequences	3.0	NAPs, COMNAP					Encourage COMNAP to consider implications of climate change to NAP infrastructure				Receive report from COMNAP on climate change assessment accordingly		
			b. Assess risk of changes in climate change to HSM/heritage ASPA	2.9	Proponents and interested Parties											Initiate risk assessment for HSMs
			c. Identify and specify research needs and communicate them to the research community	3.3	CEP											
			Management	d. Update the EIA guidelines to take into account the impacts of cc, eg ensuring proposed activities are climate resilient to cc and will not have an impact on species or habitats at risk.	1.9	CEP	Ensure EIA ICG (cf. 5-year works plan) considers appropriately the implications of climate change	EIA ICG	Ensure EIA ICG (cf. 5-year works plan) considers and incorporates implications of climate change							
				e. Further development of the Clean Up Manual (ref. Resolution 2,(2013))	2.0	CEP			Ensure clean up manual revisions (referred to in 5 year plan) consider implications of climate change							
				f. Encourage national programmes to assess which sites of their past activities (not yet cleaned up or remediated) are most likely to be affected by climate change in order to prioritize their work.	2.3	NAPs			Members to provide a status report to CEP on which sites of their past activities (not yet cleaned up or remediated) are more likely to be affected by climate change and plans to clean up or remediate those sites		Ongoing			Ongoing	Ongoing	

Climate related issue	Gaps/needs	Respon- se area	Action/Task	Pri- ority	Who	IP	CEP 2016	IP	CEP 2017	IP	CEP 2018	IP	CEP 2019	IP	CEP 2020			
6) Marine and ter- restrial species at risk due to climate change	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Understand population status, trends, vulner- ability and distribution of key Antarctic species</li> <li>Understand the impact and cascading effect on climate on species at risk, including critical thresholds that would be exceeded</li> <li>Develop a framework for monitoring to ensure the effects on key species are understood</li> <li>Understand relationship between species and climate change impacts in important locations/ areas</li> </ul>	Research	<p>a. Encourage research by national programmes and SCAR, sp. through programmes such as AntEco and AntERA</p>	1.6	NAPs, SCAR-		CEP to encourage national programmes and SCAR to support and facilitate new and on-going research activities through programmes such as AntEco and AntERA. Identify trends reports on Antarctic terrestrial and marine species from SCAR, ACAP and others											
		Management	<p>b. Consider if and how the IUCN red list criteria can be applied on a regional basis for the Antarctic in the context of climate change</p>	2.4	SCAR		Facilitate a programme of work with SCAR, SC-CAMLR, ACAP and IUCN to: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Progress assessments on Antarctic species not yet assessed</li> <li>Initiate a programme to provide information on the status of Antarctic species</li> <li>Develop an approach to applying the IUCN Red List criteria on a regional basis in Antarctica</li> </ol>											
			<p>c. Begin a rolling programme of assessments of Antarctic species focusing particularly on those species not currently assessed in the IUCN Red List</p>	1.7	CEP, SCAR, ACAP					See 6 a above								Provide update reports to IUCN on trends and vulnerability of Antarctic species
			<p>d. Review and revise where necessary existing management plans to ensure they are the best technical advice measure to species at risk of climate change</p>	1.6	CEP CCAMLR comisd.						See 6 a above							
			<p>e. Where necessary develop management actions to maintain or improve the conservation status of species threatened by climate change, eg. through SPS action plans</p>	2.0	CEP, SCAR CCAMLR comisd.				Ongoing		Ongoing				Ongoing			

Climate related issue	Gap/needs	Respon- se area	Action/Task	Pri- ority	Who	CEP 2016	IP	CEP 2017	IP	CEP2018	IP	CEP 2019	IP	CEP 2020
7) Marine, terrestrial and freshwater habitats at risk due to climate change	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Understand habitat status, trends, vulnerability and distribution</li> <li>Improve understanding of the extent of climate change on habitat e.g. sea ice extent and duration, snow cover, ground water, etc.</li> <li>Understand changing melt flows and consequences to lake systems</li> <li>Improve understanding of the potential expansion of human presence in Antarctica as a result of changes resulting from climate change and e.g. changes to sea ice distribution; collapse of ice shelves; expansion of ice free area).</li> </ul>	<p>Research</p> <p>Management</p>	<p>a. Encourage research by national programmes and SCAR</p> <p>b. Review and revise where necessary existing management plans to consider if they afford the best possible measure to habitats at risk of climate change.</p>	2.4	NAFs, SCAR	CEP to encourage national programmes and SCAR to support and facilitate new and on-going research activities		Ongoing. Update reports to be provided, incl. through the Portal		Ongoing. Update reports to be provided, incl. through the Portal		Ongoing. Update reports to be provided, incl. through the Portal		Ongoing. Update reports to be provided, incl. through the Portal

- 1 ISW = Interseasonal work (could be ICG, workshop, interested members, etc).
- 2 Ensure EIA ICG (cf. CEP Five-Year Work Plan) considers and incorporates appropriately the implications of climate change
- 3 Ensure SGMP work on ASMA guidelines (cf. SGMP work plan) considers and incorporates appropriately the implication of climate change
- 4 Workshop
- 5 Noting the importance of CCAMLR consideration of climate change issues in the Southern Ocean
- 6 Including in context of proposed joint workshop (pt. 3e)
- 7 Note that the IUCN criteria cover many aspects besides climate change, and does not necessarily identify the effects solely due to climate change. The benefit of using IUCN criteria in our response to climate change will be assessed prior to its use.

## Appendix 3

### **Guidelines: A prior assessment process for the designation of ASPAs and ASMAs**

- 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; and how the area would complement the Antarctic protected area system as a whole;
  - consistency with relevant CEP guidelines and resources, including the ACBR planning tool; and results of consultations with other relevant parties; and
  - 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.

<sup>1</sup> In this context it is relevant to point to “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.

## Preliminary Agenda for CEP XIX

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