

REPORT OF THE COMMITTEE FOR ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION

(CEP VI)

MADRID, SPAIN, 9 – 13 JUNE 2003

Item 1: Opening of the Meeting

(1) The CEP Chair, Dr Tony Press (Australia) opened the meeting on Monday 9 June 2003.

Item 2: Adoption of the Agenda

(2) The provisional agenda, as agreed at CEP V and circulated by the Chair in CEP Circulars 11/2002 and 7/2003 was adopted. 27 Working Papers and 74 Information Papers were considered under the various agenda items (Annex 1 of this report).

Item 3: Operation of the CEP

(3) The United States introduced ATCM XXVI/IP013, noting Romania's ratification of the Protocol on Environmental Protection to the Antarctic Treaty, effective on 5 March 2003.

(4) Romania introduced ATCM XXVI/IP060 on their ratification of the Protocol. The Committee congratulated Romania on its accession to the Protocol and welcomed it to full membership of the CEP.

(5) The Committee welcomed the information from the Czech Republic contained in ATCM XXVI/IP114 and from Canada that acts to ratify the Protocol are before their respective parliaments, and that both Members hoped to complete their notification processes before the end of 2003.

(6) Estonia informed the Committee that it is preparing the legislation necessary for it to accede to the Protocol on Environmental Protection to the Antarctic Treaty.

(7) The Committee noted and welcomed this information and encouraged the Czech Republic, Canada and Estonia towards completing this work.

(8) The list of CEP contact points was updated (Annex 2).

Item 4: Compliance with the Protocol on Environmental Protection

4a) General matters

(9) The Russian Federation introduced ATCM XXVI/IP022 describing the opening of a snow-ice runway at Novolazarevskaya, and its certification by the Russian government for use by heavy aircraft. The Committee noted the importance of air transport to the conduct of national programs. Russia informed the Committee that it had submitted the paper for discussion by the ATCM working group on operational matters under ATCM Agenda Item 13.

(10) Some members raised concerns about the possible use of the runway by tourists. Russia emphasised that this runway was not a new one but a restoration of an existing one intended to better support activities of the Russian Antarctic program. The Chairman noted that, in general, issues of tourism would be discussed under Agenda Item 10 of the ATCM.

(11) Argentina noted that the issue of tourism includes aspects of significance to the CEP, and that including tourism on the agenda of the operational issues working group of the ATCM should not preclude consideration by the CEP of issues within the Committee's competence.

(12) As suggested by the CEP V final report, the USA presented Information Paper XXVI ATCM/IP010 and Japan presented Information Paper ATCM XXVI/IP111 describing their approaches to managing the collection and curation of Antarctic meteorites. Norway informed the Committee that the collection of meteorites other than for scientific research is prohibited in accordance with Norwegian legislation. The Committee agreed that the issue of collecting meteorites and making them available for scientific research is an important issue, and agreed that Article 7 of the Protocol extends to the collection of meteorites. The Committee's advice to the ATCM on the matter is attached as Appendix 1.

(13) Chile presented ATCM XXVI/IP029 describing measures implemented by the Chilean program to maximise energy efficiency at their stations.

(14) Australia presented ATCM XXVI/IP034 on the installation of wind-turbines at Mawson station, noting that an Initial Environmental Evaluation (IEE) had been prepared for the project, and that up to 80% of the average station power load may be supplied from wind generation, with commensurate savings in fuel. The Committee welcomed further information from Australia on the results of this project.

(15) Poland reported (ATCM XXVI/IP083) on the favourable results of a preliminary study of the greenhouse cultivation of vegetables in Antarctic mineral soil enriched with penguin guano, carried out at Arctowski station.

(16) Spain introduced Information Paper ATCM XXVI/IP041 describing measures adopted to implement the Resolutions of XXIV and XXV ATCM.

(17) The following Information Papers giving annual reports were submitted to the Committee, in accordance with Article 17 of the Protocol: ATCM XXVI/IP002-Italy; ATCM XXVI/IP005-Uruguay; ATCM XXVI/IP008-Spain; ATCM XXVI/IP011-New Zealand; ATCM XXVI/IP016-France; ATCM XXVI/IP021-Russia; ATCM XXVI/IP024-Brazil; ATCM XXVI/IP062-UK; ATCM XXVI/IP079-Japan; ATCM XXVI/IP82-NL; ATCM XXVI/IP084-Sweden; ATCM XXVI/IP086-China; ATCM XXVI/IP89-South Africa; ATCM XXVI/IP090-Finland; ATCM XXVI/IP093-Germany; ATCM XXVI/IP097-Belgium; ATCM XXVI/IP104-Republic of Korea.

(18) Annex 3 provides a list of addresses of websites where members provide annual reporting information electronically.

4b) Consideration of Draft CEEs forwarded to the CEP in accordance with paragraph 4 of Article 3 of Annex I of the Protocol.

i) Lake Vostok.

(19) The Russian Federation introduced its revised draft Comprehensive Environmental Evaluation (CEE) for Water Sampling of the subglacial Lake Vostok ATCM XXVI/WP01, circulated by the Russian Federation on 6 February 2003.

(20) In response to a query from New Zealand on the sterility of the drilling fluid, the Russian Federation explained that there are micro-organisms in the fluid but not in the ice; that it is impossible to produce sterile drilling fluid; and that it is not expected that the drilling technique will allow micro-organisms to penetrate the ice-water interface.

(21) The Russian Federation noted that the penetration theory and technique have been tested under similar but not identical conditions, because the Lake Vostok conditions are unique.

(22) France introduced the report of the Intersessional Contact Group ATCM XXVI/WP36 convened to consider the Lake Vostok draft CEE, noting the ICG's conclusion that the document does not adequately address the description of the activity, the drilling technique, contingency plans for environmental accidents, or alternative solutions including testing the technology in similar but less critical situations.

(23) The Netherlands noted that its review of the draft CEE ATCM XXVI IP092 concluded that the document generally complies with the Annex I requirements but does not analyse worst-case scenarios, including spillage of drilling fluids or the possibility that the lake water is pressurised.

(24) SCAR presented its paper on the Lake Vostok proposal ATCM XXVI/IP94, which advises that the Lake Vostok project is at the current limits of both technology and glaciology, and urging caution on this basis. SCAR suggested that a more rigorous evaluation is required of the potential for chemical and biological contamination, as well as the risk that the lake water is pressurised and could cause hydro-fracturing leading to accidental penetration by drilling fluid.

(25) Norway noted that there are many uncertainties regarding the physical properties of the ice-water system. If sampling was to be limited to frozen lake water rather than free liquid water, this could be undertaken more safely from a new drill hole through ice over rock at the lake margin.

(26) New Zealand noted that a major issue affecting the risk associated with the proposed drilling into Lake Vostok proposed in the draft Russian CEE was the view that abnormally high pressures might exist beneath the ice. NZ drew attention to an alternative view, that hydrostatic pressures could not build up in this setting because the ice over the lake was floating. New Zealand suggested that a body with appropriate expertise, such as SCAR, might review this issue and develop advice to improve the quality of risk assessment. New Zealand also noted the concern from several quarters with regard to the Vostok proposal about the current practice of leaving drilling fluid in deep-ice holes after completion, and suggested that it might be timely for this issue to be addressed also.

(27) Russia noted that comments in Appendix 2 of this Final Report (CEP Advice to ATCM XXVI on the draft CEE contained in ATCM XXVI/WP01) are of a generic nature and do not contain any specific proposals on the use of alternative technologies and methods to take water samples from Lake Vostok. Russia has an established procedure to consider applications for Antarctic activities, which allows it to meet all the requirements of the Protocol. The Russian Interministerial Commission will

review the responses of Russian experts to the comments received, and this will occur within the context of deciding about the Permit required for the Lake Vostok water sampling project.

(28) Consistent with the above, the CEP's advice to ATCM XXVI on the draft CEE is attached as Appendix 2.

ii) ANDRILL

(29) New Zealand introduced Working Paper ATCM XXVI/WP002, a draft CEE for the ANDRILL scientific stratigraphic drilling program. New Zealand thanked those members that had provided comments on the draft CEE in accordance with Article 3(3) of Annex I of the Protocol.

(30) New Zealand noted that several other Members are partners to the ANDRILL program including Germany, Italy and the USA, and that the program is essentially an extension of the substantial work that has already been done by previous drilling programs in the area, including the Cape Roberts Project, and is aimed at exploring the climate and tectonic history of the McMurdo Sound Region.

(31) Australia introduced Working Paper ATCM XXVI/WP035 containing the report of the open-ended intersessional contact group set up to consider the draft CEE.

(32) The report noted that while there were some issues that could be further clarified and information that would be useful to include in the final draft, the draft CEE had provided a comprehensive analysis and evaluation of the environmental impacts for Members to consider. The main issues raised concerned the pre-disposal treatment of sewage, establishing contingency plans in case of sea-ice break-up near the drilling operations, and the use of an air gun for the vertical seismic profiling process.

(33) Several members congratulated NZ on producing a high quality draft CEE and provided comments and questions about the draft document. These related to *inter alia*:

- how the impact evaluation criteria at page 111 were weighted and combined to achieve the estimations of impacts described at Table 24 on pages 122 to 125 of the draft CEE;
- clarification of the purpose of the project with reference to Article 7 of the Protocol;
- greater consideration of noise in relation to the activity, in particular the drill rig and the use of explosives and air guns, including mitigation and monitoring of impacts;
- the need for further elaboration of contingency plans in the final document; and
- further consideration of disposal of sewage and whether treatment is practical at the project locations.

(34) Russia stated that, despite the lack of a Russian translation of the draft CEE, it was ready to discuss this document. As a general point, Argentina stressed the importance of having translations of CEEs available in time, due to the complexity these documents usually involve. As a general point on all draft CEEs, Argentina also noted that Annex I requires that CEEs shall be forwarded 120 days before the next ATCM, and the CEP rules of procedure set a deadline of 45 days for submission of

WPs. These matters therefore deserve further discussion during the next CEP meeting.

(35) New Zealand thanked the CEP for its comments and acknowledged that the issue of weighting of the criteria for impact assessment is a difficult one, and will endeavour to provide clarification in the final CEE. New Zealand assured the CEP that the purpose and motivation for the proposal is purely scientific: to uncover information about the earth's climatic and tectonic history. New Zealand further noted that the final CEE will provide additional information on contingency plans, the practicality of treatment of human waste at the proposed locations, and noise impacts (recognising that this needs to be tied to the environmental values that might be impacted).

(36) In advising the ATCM on its consideration of the draft CEE, the CEP:

- noted that it had fully considered the draft CEE circulated by New Zealand and had provided comments on specific elements to New Zealand at the meeting;
- considered that, in general, the draft CEE is well structured and provides an appropriate assessment of the impacts of the proposed activity; and
- considered that the draft CEE is consistent with the requirements of Annex I of the Protocol.

(37) The Committee's advice to ATCM XXVI on the draft CEE is attached at Appendix 3.

iii) Czech Scientific Station in Antarctica

(38) The Czech Republic introduced Information Paper ATCM XXVI/IP068 containing a draft CEE for the construction and operation of a scientific station in Antarctica.

(39) The Czech Republic explained the process they had undertaken to locate a satisfactory site for the station and to meet the requirements of the Protocol both in relation to the EIA process and to environmental protection in general.

(40) Australia introduced Information Paper ATCM XXVI/IP106, presenting the report of the ICG convened to consider the draft CEE, noting that the comments were provided on a version of the draft CEE that has since been superseded. The report had concluded that this earlier draft did not meet the requirements of Annex I of the Protocol. Australia suggested that those Members that had assisted the Czech Republic with logistic and scientific support might continue to assist with the development of the CEE.

(41) The Committee welcomed the draft CEE and discussed the concerns raised by some Members that the submission by the Czech Republic in April 2003 of a substantially different second draft CEE meant that the process had not adhered to the requirements of Article 3 of Annex I to the Protocol, in particular the 120 day submission deadline.

(42) It was noted that the Czech Republic is a non-Consultative Party and has not yet ratified the Protocol on Environmental Protection to the Antarctic Treaty, and is therefore not bound by it or by the agreed processes of the CEP. However the

Committee commended the Czech Republic on its clear commitment to act “as if” it had ratified the Protocol, and suggested that the draft CEE be revised and resubmitted for consideration by CEP VII.

(43) The Czech Republic thanked Members for their comments on the draft CEE and suggestions on how to move forward. It informed the Committee that there are domestic time and budget constraints on its proposal, and that it would seek approval to extend its project timeline in order to accommodate the work necessary to complete the draft CEE to a satisfactory standard and to meet the process requirements of Annex I of the Protocol. The Czech Republic declared their intent to carry out a baseline environmental monitoring of the selected building site in the season 2003/2004 and will also consider the possibility of transporting a part of the construction material to James Ross Island in this season.

iv) Other matters under Agenda item 4b.

(44) Estonia presented Information Paper ATCM XXVI/IP081 reporting progress towards the establishment of an Estonian station in the Ross Sea region. Estonia drew particular attention to the fact that the proposed station would be able to be removed virtually without trace, and assured the Committee that it would follow appropriate procedures for EIA and other matters required by the Protocol.

(45) Italy expressed a concern about the potential interference of the planned activities with migration routes of the penguins breeding at Edmonson Point, and considered that this impact could be minimised by selecting appropriate transport routes across the fast

(46) ASOC requested Estonia to clarify the location of their proposed scientific station as described in ATCM XXVI/IP081, with respect to the Antarctic Specially Protected Area (ASP) proposed by Italy in ATCM XXVI/WP19. Estonia stated that the site of their proposed station is approximately four kilometres from the proposed ASP boundary, and this was confirmed by Italy.

(47) Estonia also indicated that they are conducting an EIA of the proposed project in line with the procedures of the Protocol. Estonia thanked Italy and New Zealand for their logistic support in relation to this project.

(48) In advising Estonia about the appropriate level of environmental impact assessment for their new research station, some Members advised that they considered a CEE to be the appropriate level of assessment given the permanency of the new station in a new location. Others felt that the level of activity proposed could be adequately addressed by an IEE.

(49) Estonia thanked the CEP for its assistance, advised the CEP that it will continue to work with Members intersessionally, and undertook to keep Members and Observers informed about the progress of its EIA.

4c) Other matters covered by Annex I: Environmental Impact Assessment.

(50) The United States introduced Working Paper XXVI ATCM/WP06 presenting results of an intersessional contact group (ICG) that considered a coordinated approach to monitoring cumulative impacts. The paper included an annotated bibliography of past and continuing studies examining cumulative impacts and

recommendations to further the understanding of cumulative impacts of human activity.

(51) The Committee thanked the US for coordinating this work and welcomed the comprehensive assessment of ongoing monitoring programs. The Committee noted the recommendations contained within the paper, and in particular that:

- * there is a need for more information from all visits to areas of interest, noting that tour operators currently provide such information in the post-visit site reports, but visits by scientists and national program personnel are not being tracked in the same way by all Parties;

- * Parties should maintain information on visits to areas similar to that maintained in site visit reports for tourist activities to provide a complete data set of all visits and activities to areas of concern;

- * development and maintenance of a database or databases with information on site visitation and other relevant data should be encouraged and the information in the databases should be readily accessible; and

- * Parties should continue to conduct research relevant to cumulative impacts, and in particular to study disturbed versus undisturbed areas.

(52) New Zealand noted that a fundamental element in assessing cumulative impacts was the collation of quality information about what activities are being carried out, where and over what timescale, but that it was equally important to make such data available. New Zealand suggested that the results of the intersessional work should be further considered in connection with advising on the state of the Antarctic environment.

(53) IAATO noted the organisation's progress on the development of a database in order to further address cumulative impacts.

(54) ASOC welcomed the work on cumulative impacts but noted that only six members had participated, and encouraged those which had not to contribute to the database.

(55) COMNAP advised the meeting that its Antarctic Environmental Officers Network (AEON) prepared a report which was published in 1998, summarising environmental monitoring activities and studies in Antarctica. The report may be downloaded from the COMNAP website <http://www.comnap.aq> via the 'environment' link. The site also has an 'active' copy of the report which can be updated by COMNAP members as further environmental monitoring activities or studies take place.

(56) Spain introduced Working Paper XXVI ATCM/WP34 on noise and anthropogenic acoustic discharges, and their effect on marine mammals. ASOC introduced Information Paper XXVI ATCM/IP073 on marine acoustic technology and the Antarctic environment. SCAR introduced Information Paper XXVI ATCM/IP077 on acoustic technology and the marine ecosystem.

(57) Germany welcomed the growing focus on the environmental effects of marine noise, and expressed its hope that the results of the 2002 Berlin workshop on this matter can be presented to CEP VII.

(58) SCAR noted that it provides a database of existing marine seismic data which may be used by researchers in order to avoid repeating seismic work. SCAR announced it was forming a new acoustics expert working group, and that the Spanish and ASOC papers would be forwarded to the new group. It undertook to present further commentary on marine noise to CEP VII. Dr Press, in his capacity as CEP representative to the Scientific Committee of CCAMLR, agreed also to inform SC-CCAMLR of the Committee's consideration of this matter.

(59) Italy welcomed the ASOC paper and made a comment on the growing interest in the effects on the marine environment of acoustic techniques, expressing the hope that more investigations on this matter would be performed.

(60) The Russian Federation presented an information paper ATCM XXVI/IP023 on its IEE for the additional 50m drilling of a deep ice borehole at Vostok station.

(61) The Chairman tabled Information Paper ATCM XXVI IP063 which collates information on Initial Environmental Evaluations and Comprehensive Environmental Evaluations prepared by Members in the preceding calendar year as per Resolution 6 2001.

(62) COMNAP advised the meeting that it would provide a commentary to CEP VII on the survey undertaken by the Antarctic Environmental Officers' Network in 2002 examining the consistency and completeness of a range of IEEs.

4d) Matters covered by Annex II (Conservation of Antarctic Fauna and Flora)

(63) Argentina introduced Working Paper XXVI ATCM/WP25, Progress Report of the CEP Intersessional Contact Group on Annex II Review. It noted that this was an initial report with further work planned over the next year, and that it was a technical review.

(64) Many members expressed their support of the work of the ICG, and particularly congratulated the convenor, Jose Maria Acero, for his excellent work in coordinating the activities of the ICG.

(65) Several members emphasised that the ongoing review should stay focused on scientific and technical issues only and should make no attempt to revise the Annex such that changes to the main body of the Protocol would be required.

(66) The CEP agreed to consider the ICG report point by point.

(67) The title of the Annex

The ICG recommended the adoption of a new title 'The Conservation of Antarctic Living Organisms'. While most of the Members supported adoption of the new title, one Party expressed the view that the current title, 'Conservation of Antarctic Fauna and Flora' should remain. Other Members suggested other versions of the title including use of the words 'protection' and 'protection and conservation' instead of 'conservation'.

(68) A number of Members stated that from a technical point of view, the new title proposed by the ICG should be adopted. The CEP concluded that the matter of a title change should be brought before the ATCM for its consideration.

(69) Preamble

There was no consensus within the ICG on the matter of a preamble to the Annex.

(70) The CEP concluded that no preamble was required.

(71) Reorganisation of Articles

The CEP concluded that the ICG should work on more substantive technical matters and that consideration of the reorganisation of articles could be taken up in the future.

(72) Scope of Annex II

The CEP noted that the ICG made a link between this issue and the issue of the title of Annex II.

(73) The CEP agreed that the ICG should continue to work on this issue after receiving any advice the ATCM may wish to offer on the issue of the title of Annex II.

(74) Geographic Area of Application of Annex II

The CEP agreed that this matter lies beyond the scope of this review of Annex II.

(75) Taxonomic Definitions

The CEP asked the ICG to continue its work on this matter.

(76) Invertebrates

The CEP recognised that terrestrial and freshwater invertebrates are already protected by Annex II and that their protection needs to be applied in a practical way.

(77) The CEP asked the ICG to continue its work on this issue.

(78) 'Taking' and 'Harmful Interference'

The CEP agreed that these terms applied only to living organisms. The ICG noted the ambiguity of the terms 'taking' and 'harmful interference' in determining the application of permit regulations.

(79) Members agreed to report to CEP VII on the way these terms are interpreted in national legislation. Consequently ICG need not address this issue further in its current work.

(80) Collecting Live Specimens for Educational or Cultural Purposes

The CEP agreed with the ICG proposal to establish specific criteria to guide Members in their assessment of applications to collect Antarctic wildlife for educational or cultural purposes and asked the ICG to discuss the matter further.

(81) SCAR noted that captive facilities were generally developing guidelines for obtaining wildlife and that these guidelines could be helpful to the CEP. SCAR agreed to assist the work of the ICG by obtaining more information on this matter.

(82) The CEP agreed that the ICG should continue with work on both these areas.

(83) Specially Protected Species

Some Members noted that the issue of specially protected species was becoming urgent.

(84) The CEP agreed with the ICG proposals to introduce into the text of Annex II language covering: i) the inclusion of terrestrial and freshwater invertebrates as defined in Annex II as possible candidates for SPS status; ii) the use of lethal techniques on SPS only for compelling scientific reasons relating to conservation; and iii) the ability of the CEP to decide on appropriate protection and management measures for any species designated as a SPS.

(85) The CEP recalled paragraphs 64 to 66 of the Final report of ATCM XXV in which the ATCM agreed to “take early steps to seek the agreement of CCAMLR, CCAS and, where appropriate, other organisations, to establish co-operative working relationships (with those organisations) to seek a common approach as to how special protection for species in the marine environment could be achieved and how proposals under the Protocol for designating Specially Protected Species in the Antarctic marine environment could be addressed”.

(86) The CEP recognised that further consideration was required to determine the means by which marine species, not already covered by Annex II of the Protocol, may be given special protection under Article 3 of Annex II to the Protocol. To this end the CEP noted that Annex V requires liaison with CCAMLR, and its approval in respect of protected areas with a marine component, and that this approach might be a useful model when dealing with marine species.

(87) In this regard, the CEP also recalled the derogation to CCAMLR, CCAS and IWC in the Final Act of the XI SATCM.

(88) The CEP therefore agreed to refer back to the ICG the following draft text as part of the proposed technical revisions of Annex II of the Protocol:

“Having regard to the provisions of Articles 4 and 5 of the Protocol, and Article 7 of this Annex, no native marine species shall be designated as a Specially Protected Species without [the prior approval of] [consultation and cooperation with] [, and if required, the prior approval of] the Commission for the Conservation of Antarctic Marine Living Resources, or the Convention for the Conservation of Antarctic Seals in the case of seals, or other organisations where appropriate”.

(89) Some Members of the CEP felt that a definition of “native marine species” would need to be included in Article 1 of Annex II and offered the following for consideration:

““Native marine species” means any species of flora and fauna occurring in the maritime waters south of 60° South, or occurring there seasonally through natural migrations”.

(90) Other Members proposed a second definition for the CEP’s consideration:

““Native marine species” means any species of flora and fauna, other than native mammals, or native birds, occurring in the maritime waters south of 60° South, or occurring there seasonally through natural migrations”.

(91) However, on this matter, some Members felt that no definitional term was required, preferring instead to develop criteria, using the model of Decision 4 (1998), to determine the relevant species covered and when liaison with other organisations was required. The CEP was therefore unable to reach agreement on either the need for a definition or what that definition might be.

(92) The CEP agreed that in reporting to the ATCM, the ATCM should be asked to take particular note of these proposed changes to Annex II of the Protocol on Environmental Protection to the Antarctic Treaty, and that the CEP was unable to reach agreement on the issue of a definitional term for native marine species.

(93) The CEP also recognised that further consideration will need to be given to the process of iteration with other organisations that would need to be followed when marine species are proposed for special protection, and agreed that the established practice for dealing with marine protected areas would again provide a useful basis.

(94) Introduction of Non-Native Species

The CEP noted the view of SCAR that as it would be impossible to determine which micro-organisms are native or not, and agreed with the recommendation of the ICG that the words in Article 4.6 ‘not present in the native flora and fauna’ should be deleted.

(95) The CEP agreed that the term ‘parasites’ should be deleted from Article 4.6 since Members agreed that the term defines a function rather than a taxonomic category and is inconsistent with the remainder of Article 4.6.

(96) The CEP agreed that as dogs are no longer present in the Antarctic, Article 4.2 be deleted.

(97) The CEP agreed that, as it would be impossible to determine the risk from non-native species to native flora and fauna, the clause ‘unless it is determined that they pose no risk to native flora and fauna’ should be deleted from Article 4.4. However, consideration of the concept of risk assessment should be included in the deliberations of the ICG.

(98) The CEP agreed that the ICG should continue its work to clarify whether or not the present text of Article 4 covers both the need to control deliberate introduction and to minimise inadvertent, unavoidable and unintentional introductions. Several members expressed the view that reasonableness and intent need to be taken into consideration by the ICG.

(99) Inspections of Poultry Products

The CEP agreed that the issue of the utility of inspection of poultry products should be returned to the ICG for further elaboration. Alternative language, consistent with Annex III and elsewhere, such as: ‘All reasonable efforts shall be made to ensure that poultry contaminated with disease such as Newcastle’s disease, tuberculosis or yeast

infection is not imported into Antarctica' should be considered for insertion into Paragraph 1 of Appendix C.

(100) ASOC suggested that the ICG consider the issue of consistency in terms between Annex II (where Appendix C refers to 'poultry') and Annex III (where Article 2 refers to 'introduced avian products').

(101) Parasite Checks

The CEP agreed that advice on parasites should be sought from SCAR, although SCAR acknowledged that listings may be incomplete. The CEP asked the ICG to continue its work on this matter.

(102) Importation of non-sterile Soil

The CEP noted an apparent inconsistency between the terms 'non-sterile soil' in Annexes II and III. The ICG was asked to examine this matter further.

(103) Conditions for Issuing Permits

The CEP agreed that, in some English language versions Article 3.3(c) currently makes reference to the 'Antarctic Treaty' instead of the 'Antarctic Treaty area'. All Members agreed that the text of Article 3.3 (c) in the English language version should refer to 'Antarctic Treaty area'.

(104) The CEP decided to continue the work of the Intersessional Contact Group (ICG) in order to advance the review of Annex II by the CEP in accordance with Article 12(1)(b) of the Protocol. The CEP thanked its Vice Chair, Mr José Maria Acero (Argentina), for agreeing to continue his excellent work coordinating the activities of the ICG. Contact jmacero@dna.gov.ar.

(105) The agreed Terms of Reference for the ICG were taken fully into account in the discussion and decisions made by CEP VI on Annex II and reported in its report to the XXVI ATCM (paragraphs 63 to 104). The ICG should present a Final Report to CEP VII to which should be attached an amended draft text of Annex II with annotations.

(106) Chile introduced Information Paper ATCM XXVI/IP031, Synthesis on Antarctic pinnipeds pathologies at Cape Shirreff, Livingston Island, Antarctica.

(107) Spain presented Information Paper ATCM XXVI/IP056 on Illegal Fishing: International Cooperation to Reinforce Implementation Mechanisms. Spain was congratulated for its leadership role in this matter and the excellent conference, to which this paper referred.

(108) The CEP acknowledged the role of the late Esteban de Salas, former Executive Secretary of CCAMLR, for his work in preparing the conference in Santiago de Compostella, in Spain, and for his significant contribution to combating IUU fishing.

(109) SCAR introduced Information Paper ATCM XXVI/IP100 on Antarctic Specially Protected Species. New Zealand and the United Kingdom reiterated that consideration of the issue of specially protected species is urgent.

(110) The CEP thanked SCAR for this work and noted that procedures and guidelines for designating Specially Protected Species need to be completed by 2005 in time for the first expected detailed proposals for SPS status.

(111) COMNAP noted that the review of the guidelines proposed in ATCM XXV/WP26 (UK) for the operation of aircraft near concentration of birds will be addressed at the next COMNAP meeting and a paper will be presented at CEP VII.

4e) Matters covered by Annex III (Waste Disposal and Waste Management)

(112) The CEP noted Australia's Information Papers XXVI ATCM/IP035 on Prince Charles Mountains Expedition of Germany and Australia (PCMEGA), and Information Paper (XXVI ATCM/IP 36) on clean-up of Thala Valley waste disposal site near Casey.

(113) Argentina introduced Information Paper XXVI ATCM/IP043 Progress on environmental restoration of Marambio station.

(114) The United Kingdom presented Information Paper XXVI ATCM/IP050 on the removal and clean up of abandoned British bases and waste dumps in Antarctica.

(115) China introduced Information Paper XXVI ATCM/IP087 reporting on the cleanup and removal of the old power building at Great Wall station. The Meeting noted that it was pleasing to see that several Parties are cleaning up old abandoned stations and waste dumps as required by Annex III of the Protocol.

4f) Matters covered by Annex IV (Prevention of Marine Pollution)

(116) The United Kingdom introduced Working Paper ATCM XXVI/WP37 on Advice to Mariners and Vessel Operators on the Protocol's obligations.

(117) The United Kingdom made minor amendments following a COMNAP intervention and provided a corrected version ATCM XXVI/WP37 Rev.1. The UK advised that it would take this paper forward to the ATCM XXVI for further consideration.

(118) ASOC introduced Information Paper ATCM XXVI/IP064 on Preventing Marine Pollution in Antarctic Waters and Information Paper ATCM XXVI/IP117 on Coastal Sediment Pollution at Sites Frequently Visited by Tourism Operations. Information Paper ATCM XXVI/IP117 was regarded as a useful demonstration of how Members and Observers can work together. SCAR noted there needed to be a distinction between historical and current hydrocarbons to support any firm conclusions.

(119) IAATO expressed concern over the title referencing tourism and noted that consideration be given to over 100 years of human activity in Port Foster.

4g) Matters covered by Annex V (Area Protection and Management)

(120) The following papers on Antarctic protected areas presented the results from intersessional working groups.

(121) The United States introduced Working Paper XXVI ATCM/WP07 Rev 1 on the review of draft Protected Area Management Plans for Management Plans for ASPA No. 152 Western Bransfield Strait, Antarctic Peninsula and ASPA No. 153 Eastern Dallmann Bay, Antarctic Peninsula.

(122) The Committee noted that ASPA No.152 and ASPA No.153 would be the first solely marine ASPAs designated since Annex V entered into force, and that this was a significant and welcome development in the Antarctic protected area system.

(123) The United Kingdom introduced Working Paper XXVI ATCM/WP10 on the review of the draft Protected Area Management Plan for ASPA No. 114 Northern Coronation Island.

(124) Australia introduced Working Paper XXVI ATCM/WP16 on the review of three draft Protected Area Management Plans for Management Plans for ASPA No.135 North-East Bailey Peninsula, Budd Coast, Wilkes Land; ASPA No.143) Marine Plain, Mule Peninsula, Vestfold Hills, Princess Elizabeth Land; and a proposal for a new ASPA for Frazier Islands, Wilkes Land, East Antarctica.

(125) The United Kingdom, Argentina and CCAMLR expressed concern at the use of an administrative buffer zone outside of the new ASPA for Frazier Islands to control air and ship movements towards the ASPA. Australia made a minor revision to the proposed management plan by removing this administrative proposal XXVI ATCM/WP 16 rev.1.

(126) Italy introduced Working Paper (XXVI ATCM/WP19 Rev 1.), regarding a proposal for a new Antarctic Specially Protected Area in Terra Nova Bay, Ross Sea.

(127) New Zealand presented Working Paper XXVI ATCM/WP32 on the review of the management plan for ASPA 118, Summit of Mt Melbourne, North Victoria Land.

(128) New Zealand introduced Working Paper XXVI ATCM/WP31 containing a five-year review of the management plans for ASPA No. 105 Beaufort Island, Ross Sea; ASPA No. 154 Botany Bay Cape Geology, Victoria Land; and ASPA No. 156 Lewis Bay, Mount Erebus, Ross Island, Ross Sea. Given the minor technical nature of the revisions to these three ASPA management plans, the CEP considered that the plans for ASPAs No. 105, 154, and 156 did not need to go to intersessional review.

(129) The Committee thanked the United States, the United Kingdom, Australia, Italy, and New Zealand for preparing these management plans and other Members for assisting with intersessional reviews and agreed to recommend to the ATCM formal adoption of these management plans by means of the draft Measure at Appendix 4.

(130) The United States introduced Working Paper XXVI ATCM/WP08 draft Protected Area Management Plans for ASPA No. 113 Litchfield Island, Arthur Harbor, Anvers Island; ASPA No. 122 Arrival Heights, Hut Point Peninsula; and ASPA No. 139 Biscoe Point, Anvers Island. An open-ended intersessional contact group led by the United States was established to consider the submitted draft Management Plan and to report back to CEP VII. The United States will advise CEP contact points of their Convenor for this group.

(131) France introduced Working Paper ATCM XXVI/WP30 revising the Protected Area Management Plan for ASPA No. 120, Pointe Geologie Archipelago, Terre Adelie. The CEP agreed to refer the revised Management Plans to an intersessional contact group to be led by France which will report back to CEP VII.

(132) Australia introduced Working Paper ATCM XXVI/WP15 proposing draft management plans for Cape Denison, Commonwealth Bay, George V Land, noting that this proposal includes a nested approach of a central ASPA to protect historic huts, a Historic Site and Monument, and an ASMA for the surrounding valley to manage other values including artefact scatters. Australia sought the assistance of Members to consider this arrangement and the management plans for the areas through an Intersessional Contact Group to be led by Bruce Hull from Australia (bruce.hull@aad.gov.au), which will report back to CEP VII.

(133) The United Kingdom supported this innovative approach to the nesting of ASPAs and ASMAs and agreed to participate in the intersessional contact group on this matter.

(134) The United States presented Working Paper XXVI ATCM/WP27 proposing an Antarctic Specially Managed Area for the McMurdo Dry Valleys, which has been developed with New Zealand. The CEP agreed to refer this draft Management Plan to an Intersessional Contact Group, to be convened by Rebecca Roper-Gee of New Zealand, (r.ropergee@antarcticanz.govt.nz) which would report back to CEP VII.

(135) The United Kingdom introduced Working Paper ATCM XXVI/WP 17 on a Review of the List of Historic Sites and Monuments, noting that the descriptions of many sites had been updated, and that some sites no longer exist and should be removed from the List.

(136) The Committee thanked the United Kingdom for its substantial effort in co-ordinating this review. Several Members expressed various concerns about the use of national attribution for sites. The United Kingdom provided a revised version of the Working Paper ATCM XXVI/WP 17 rev. 1 removing the national attribution.

(137) The CEP agreed to recommend to the ATCM formal adoption of the updated List of Historic Sites and Monuments by means of a draft Measure (Appendix 5).

(138) Norway introduced Working Paper XXVI ATCM/WP 24 on Whalers Bay Historic Site, submitted jointly with Chile and the UK. The paper proposed modifications to HSM No 71, and the removal of HSM Nos 31 and 58 from the HSM list. These changes to the site are reflected in a draft Measure (Appendix 5).

(139) New Zealand introduced Working Paper XXVI ATCM/WP 28 Review of the 'Guidelines for CEP Consideration of New and Revised Management Plans for

Protected Areas'. Members noted some minor editorial matters that should be addressed, including making direct reference to the criteria set out in Decision 4 (1998) to determine when draft management plans for protected areas containing a marine component should be forwarded to CCAMLR for its approval. Members agreed that the amendments made to the Guidelines adequately reflected the agreement between the ATCM and CCAMLR.

(140) The CEP agreed to the revised 'Guidelines for CEP Consideration of New and Revised ASPA and ASMA Management Plans' are contained in Annex 4 of this report.

(141) Australia noted that the amended Guidelines need to be reflected in a revision of the 'Guide to the Preparation of Management Plans for Antarctic Specially Protected Areas' particularly in section 4.

(142) New Zealand introduced Working Paper XXVI ATCM/WP 20 on Systematic Environmental Protection in Antarctica, with references to Information Paper XXVI ATCM/IP001 on Environmental Domains for the Ross Sea region, as a pilot approach to a systematic environmental geographic framework as referred to in Article 3.2 of Annex V.

(143) Several Members and Observers congratulated New Zealand on their presentation and on their progress with this work. The Committee noted that the work is a science-based way forward that may have significant synergies with, and benefits for, several aspects of scientific interest and CEP competence under the Protocol, beyond the clear application to protected areas and specially protected species.

(144) It was noted that the work will require ongoing commitment and Members thanked New Zealand for its resolve in pursuing this matter. Interventions raised a number of technical points including the use of GIS, cell size in relation to geographically small areas of interest, various data issues, and incorporation of aesthetic and wilderness values.

(145) The CEP noted:

- the potential applicability of Environmental Domains Analysis (EDA) for establishing a systematic environmental geographic framework for Antarctica within which areas can be identified for special protection under Annex V of the Protocol;
- the feasibility of creating a SEGF for Antarctica using the EDA framework will depend on data availability and the ability to both access and extrapolate known datasets; and
- New Zealand's request to Members and Observers to identify researchers who may have spatial datasets suitable for Environmental Domains Analysis in Antarctica (especially in initial swaths west to the ice sheet from both McMurdo Sound and Terra Nova Bay) and to forward their contact details to New Zealand (hkeys@doc.govt.nz).

(146) The CEP asked New Zealand to continue with the development of a systematic environmental geographic framework, and to bring back reports of progress on this matter to CEP VII.

(147) The CEP noted that Information Paper XXVI ATCM/IP072 by IAATO on site specific guidelines will be discussed in Agenda Item 10 of the ATCM, and was not considered by the CEP.

(148) The United Kingdom introduced Information Paper XXVI ATCM/IP049, regarding an Information Archive for Antarctic Protected Areas. The UK also provided members with the Information Archive in CD format and noted that the Archive is also available on the Internet at the CEP website www.cep.aq.

(149) France introduced Information Paper XXVI ATCM/IP015 illustrating its work to rehabilitate the historic site Station Baleinere de Port Jeanne D' Arc.

(150) Chile introduced Information Paper XXVI ATCM/IP032 describing its management plan for its research base Gabriel Gonzalez Videla.

(151) Italy introduced Information Paper XXVI ATCM/IP054 indicating that it intends to propose a new protected area at Edmonson Point, Ross Sea. The CEP noted that the proposal will come forward formally to CEP VII. Estonia expressed concern about an option of extending the proposed ASPA to the ice free area south of Edmonson Point, which is the site selected for establishment of Estonian summer only research station. Italy that it had not yet fully formulated its proposal for the protected area, and undertook to ensure consultation with interested members and observers of the CEP.

(152) The United Kingdom introduced Information Paper XXVI ATCM/IP048 "Progress towards a Deception Island ASMA", noting that the development of the management plan has been a co-operative effort by Argentina, Chile, Norway, Spain, the UK, the USA, ASOC and IAATO. The Committee congratulated the Members, ASOC and IAATO, who participated productively to develop this ASMA management plan, and looks forward to a formal proposal at CEP VI.

(153) Argentina introduced Information Paper XXVI ATCM/IP057, regarding activities associated with the Historic Site and Monument #38, Nordenskjold Hill, Snow Hill Island. Sweden expressed its gratitude towards the Argentine contribution regarding this Historical Site.

(154) IUCN introduced Information Paper XXVI ATCM/IP116, regarding High Seas Marine Protected Areas Workshop held in Malaga, Spain, in 2003. The CEP congratulated IUCN on its work on this matter.

(155) India introduced Working Paper XXVI ATCM/WP38 containing a draft management plan for a proposed ASPA at the Dashkin Gongotri Glacier in the Schirmacher Oasis. India also introduced Working Paper XXVI ATCM/WP39 recommending a site for inclusion in the List of Historic Sites and Monuments, and Information Paper XXVI ATCM/IP115 reviewing the details of– Dakshin Gangotri,

site No. 44 on the List of Historic Sites and Monuments. India undertook to submit the Working Papers to CEP VII.

(156) The CEP noted that there has been substantial progress in implementing the provisions of Annex V reflected in the Working and Information papers considered by the meeting.

(157) The CEP noted that there appears to be a typographical error in the Final Report of XXV ATCM in paragraph 72 where it should refer to Appendix 6 rather than Appendix 5 as reported.

Item 5: Environmental Monitoring

(158) Uruguay introduced Information Paper ATCM XXVI/IP006 on a Magnetic Survey in the surroundings of Artigas Station.

(159) Chile introduced Information Paper ATCM XXVI/IP033 providing a summary of its Antarctic coastal environment monitoring program from 1996 to 2001.

(160) The United States introduced Information Paper ATCM XXVI/IP053 in collaboration with the United Kingdom, providing results of the Antarctic Site Inventory: 1994-2003, which has collected biological data and site descriptive information at 82 sites in the Antarctic Peninsula since 1994.

(161) Italy introduced Information Paper ATCM XXVI/IP055 on Environmental Monitoring at Terra Nova Bay and its surroundings.

(162) India presented Information Paper ATCM XXVI/IP113 regarding environmental monitoring and impact assessment of the Indian permanent station Maitri pursuant to the Protocol on Environmental Protection to the Antarctic Treaty.

Item 6: State of the Antarctic environment report

(163) New Zealand introduced Working Paper ATCM XXVI /WP21 submitted jointly with Australia reporting on intersessional discussions and a workshop held to make progress on the issue of State of the Antarctic Environment Reporting.

(164) The joint paper proposed an electronic system based on the Internet for reporting on the state of the Antarctic environment, making use of existing data sources and expertise. The joint paper also proposed a series of recommendations as to how the proposed model might be further developed.

(165) In presenting the paper New Zealand also noted that a substantial amount of discussion had already taken place within the CEP on this issue and noted the body of previous material on state of the Antarctic environment reporting listed in the paper.

(166) COMNAP noted that it collects information on environmental incidents in order to assist national operators in their efforts to minimise environmental harm. COMNAP has developed a system on the 'members' section of its Internet site to

record this data. Summary reports have been reported to the CEP at two previous meetings.

(167) The observer from CCAMLR indicated that in CCAMLR's experience, monitoring and collection of data on a variety of environmental and biotic variables should be clearly focused and should take account of potential costs and benefits. As such, the CCAMLR Ecosystem Monitoring Program (initiated in 1985) had been implemented in terms of specific objectives to be addressed, and in light of the intended use of any forthcoming information. In addition, indicators and locations had been chosen to best represent the attributes being addressed.

(168) SCAR noted that in previous discussions two approaches to state of the Antarctic environment reporting had been considered – global and local. SCAR recognised the value of selected and focused environmental indicators as outlined by the ICG and SCAR considered careful selection of these could provide a sound scientific basis for future environmental management decisions.

(169) New Zealand noted in particular the potential for using the proposed reporting system to address at least in part the recommendations on cumulative impacts contained in working paper XXVI ATCM/WP06.

(170) The CEP agreed to establish an Intersessional Contact Group to be jointly convened by New Zealand and Australia on State of the Environment Reporting to continue the work coordinated by these members. New Zealand and Australia will advise the CEP Contact Points of a convenor. The CEP agreed to the following Terms of Reference:

1. Consistent with the CEP's obligations under Article 12(1)(j) of the Protocol, and as a first step, identify a clear purpose (objective) and framework for advising on the state of the Antarctic environment;
2. On the basis of Working Paper ATCM XXVI/WP21 develop, as a proof of concept, an electronic reporting template that might be incorporated into the CEP website to help achieve this purpose, using one or two example indicators of human impacts;
3. Seek the advice of SCAR, CCAMLR and COMNAP and other expert bodies as appropriate in developing the pilot project, in particular in selecting indicators of human impact that would prove useful to the CEP in decision-making;
4. Prepare a clear framework for categorising and selecting a series of possible indicators for further development of the environmental reporting system;
5. In undertaking this work the ICG shall take into account the outcomes of the CEP's work on cumulative impacts ATCM XXVI/WP06 as well as other ongoing monitoring and reporting programs;
6. Report to CEP VII.

Item 7: Biological Prospecting

(171) The United Kingdom introduced the joint UK/Norway Information Paper XXVI

ATCM/IP075 on Bioprospecting, noting that the paper was presented as background material to assist discussion. The United Kingdom stressed that the paper did not necessarily reflect the views of either of the co-sponsoring governments. Nevertheless, Norway and the United Kingdom believed that the paper raised important issues and hoped it would assist discussion on the matter.

(172) New Zealand introduced Information Paper XXVI ACTM/IP047, a report of an academic workshop 'Bioprospecting in Antarctica', hosted by "Gateway Antarctica" in Christchurch in April 2003 as a further contribution to the discussion. New Zealand also noted that the paper did not necessarily represent the views of the NZ government.

(173) The Committee welcomed both papers and thanked the UK/Norway and New Zealand for their work on this issue. There was a wide-ranging debate amongst the Members.

(174) Chile stressed the value of the precautionary ecosystem approach to issues raised by bioprospecting in Antarctic marine areas and recalled that CCAMLR encompassed all living organisms in the Southern Ocean.

(175) Several Members considered that the current environmental impact of bioprospecting in Antarctica was small. One Member noted that the EIA procedures in Annex I of the Protocol could be used to assess bioprospecting proposals.

(176) Several Members said that it was important to differentiate between fundamental scientific research and commercial bioprospecting activities. Others noted that a definition of what is meant by bioprospecting might be useful in further considering the issue.

(177) SCAR noted that bioprospecting could raise important issues of freedom of scientific information if confidentiality required by commercial developments limited opportunities for scientific publication. SCAR also noted their concern that in the marine realm there could also be potential for harvesting of slow growing species containing compounds of pharmaceutical interest.

(178) The Committee noted that bioprospecting raises many complex legal and political issues, which may require consideration by the ATCM.

(179) The Committee agreed to refer the legal and political issues associated with bioprospecting to a future ATCM for further consideration.

Item 8: Emergency Response and Contingency Planning

(180) COMNAP briefly introduced Working Paper ATCM XXVI/WP09 on “Worst Case” and “Less than Worst Case” Environmental Scenarios. The CEP did not have any comments to provide to the ATCM on this matter. The Working Paper will be provided to the ATCM discussions on liability.

(181) The Chairman noted that the IAATO information papers ATCM XXVI/IP069, IAATO-wide Emergency Contingency Plan 2003/2004, and ATCM XXVI/IP070, Assessment of Environmental Emergencies Arising from Activities in Antarctica 2002-2003 Season, will be discussed in ATCM next week.

Item 9: Data and Exchange of Information

(182) Argentina introduced Information Paper ATCM XXVI/IP42, Progress on the Antarctic Treaty Information Exchange Web Site. Argentina informed the CEP on ways of adding data to the web page.

(183) ASOC sought clarification from the United States about the Environmental Impact Assessment of the proposed South Pole Route, following wide media coverage. ASOC also sought clarification about the reported use of fibre optic cables.

(184) The United States welcomed ASOC raising the issues and noted that a CEE, taking into account wilderness values and methods involved in creating the traverse route, will be prepared for consideration by the CEP. It also noted that some information in the media was not correct, in particular that involving fibre optic cable, for which there are no plans.

(185) The United States confirmed they have completed year one of a three year proof of concept activity involving a traverse route across the Ross Ice Shelf, up the Leverett Glacier, and across the polar plateau to the South Pole. An IEE has been completed and is publicly available. The timetable for the CEE will depend on information gathered during the proof of concept activity.

(186) Several Members noted that traverses across Antarctica are not new.

Item 10: Co-operation with other organisations

(187) Australia introduced Information Paper ATCM XXVI/IP038, Report of the CEP Observer to SC-CCAMLR XXI.

(188) The CEP noted the continuing problems arising from illegal, unregulated and unreported (IUU) fishing in and around the Treaty area, and noted particular concern about the high levels of incidental mortality of seabirds associated with IUU fishing.

(189) The CEP noted the continuing relevance of SC-CCAMLR work to its own deliberations and welcomed the further cooperation between the CEP and SC-CCAMLR.

(190) The CEP noted the Agreement on the Conservation of Albatrosses and Petrels and its relevance to the work of this Committee and the objectives of the Protocol. Spain, Chile, NZ, UK, Australia, South Africa and ASOC noted the importance of the Agreement on the Conservation of Albatrosses and Petrels and urged member countries to sign and ratify the Agreement as soon as possible. Several Members expressed their support for the Agreement and noted the intention of Spain and Chile to present a draft resolution on this matter to the XXVI ATCM.

(191) ASOC and IUCN noted that since their reports XXVI ATCM/IP065 and XXVI ATCM/IP098 respectively had already been introduced in the plenary of the ATCM, there was no need to reintroduce these in the CEP.

Item 11: Election of Officers

(192) The CEP expressed its deep appreciation to Dr Joyce Jatko for her efforts on the Committee including as Vice Chair, and wished her well in her future career. The Committee elected Mr Jose Maria Acero from Argentina, and Ms Anna Carin Thomer from Sweden to the two positions of Vice Chair. The Committee warmly welcomed these elections by acclamation.

Item 12: Preparation for CEP VII

(193) The Committee adopted the agenda from CEP VI as the draft agenda for CEP VII.

Item 13: Adoption of the Report

(194) The Committee adopted the draft final report.

Item 14: Closing of the Meeting

(195) The Chair Dr. Tony Press closed the Meeting, at the same time expressing the CEP's gratitude to the work of the rapporteurs, the secretariat and the interpreters and translators.

Annex 1

CEP VI Agenda and Final List of Documents

Item 1: Opening of the Meeting

Item 2: Adoption of Agenda

Item 3: Operation of The CEP

Paper No	Title	Submitted by
IP 013	Report of the Depository Government	United States
IP 060	Report of Romania on the Ratification of the Protocol of Madrid	Romania
IP 114	Drafting of Czech Act on the Antarctic	Czech Republic

Item 4: Compliance with the Protocol on Environmental Protection

4 a) General Matters

Paper No	Title	Submitted by
IP 002	Annual Report Pursuant to the Protocol on Environmental Protection to the Antarctic Treaty	Italy
IP 005	Informe Annual de acuerdo al Art. 17 del Protocolo al Tratado Antartico sobre la Proteccion del Medio Ambiente	Uruguay
IP 008	Informe Annual de Espana de Acuerdo con el Afrt. 17 del protocolo al Tratado Antartico sobre Proteccion del Medio Ambiente	Spain
IP 010	Final Rule for Protection of Antarctic Meteorites under US Law	United States
IP 011	Annual Report pursuant to Art. 17 of the Protocol	New Zealand
IP 013	Report of the Depository Government	United States
IP 016	Rapport Annuel Conformement a l'Article 17 du Protocol	France
IP 021	Report pursuant to Article 17 of the Protocol	Russia

IP 022	Snow-Ice Runway at the Russian Novolazarevskaya Station (Queen Maud Land)	Russia
IP 024	Annual Report of the Brazilian Antarctic Programme	Brazil
IP 029	Adaptacion de Infraestructuras y Bases al Medio Ambiente Antartico	Chile
IP 034	Installation of Wind Turbines at Mawson	Australia
IP 041	Acciones realizadas por espana en relacion con las resoluciones de la XXIV y XXV Reuniones Consultivas del Tratado Antartico	Spain
IP 062	Report on the Implementation of the Protocol as Required by Article 17	United Kingdom
IP 079	Annual Report Based on the Article 17 of the Environmental Protection protocol	Japan
IP 082	Annual Report under the Protocol on environmental Protection to the Antarctic Treaty	Norway
IP 083	Greenhouse Cultivation of Vegetables in Antarctic Mineral Soil enriched by Penguin guano	Poland
IP 084	Annual Report Pursuant to the Protocol of Environmental Protection	Sweden
IP 086	Annual Report on the Implementation of the Madrid Protocol (2002/2003)	China
IP 089	Annual Report pursuant to the Protocol on Environmental Protection to the Antarctic Treaty	South Africa
IP 090	Annual Report Pursuant to the Protocol on Environmental protection on the Antarctic Treaty Finland (Season 2002-2003)	Finland
IP 093	Annual Report of Germany pursuant Article 17 of the Protocol	Germany
IP 097	Annual Report pursuant to the Protocol on Environmental Protection to the Antarctic Treaty	Belgium
IP 104	Annual Report pursuant to the Protocol on Environmental Protection to the Antarctic Treaty	Korea
IP 111	Antarctic Meteorites: Status of Research in Japan and their Preservation	Japan

4 b) Consideration of Draft CEEs forwarded to the CEP in accordance with paragraph 4 of article 3 of Annex I of the Protocol

Paper No	Title	Submitted by
WP 01	Water sampling of the subglacial Lake Vostok - Draft Comprehensive Environmental Evaluation	Russian Federation
WP 02	Draft Comprehensive Environmental Evaluation of the ANDRILL Programme	New Zealand
WP 35	The report of the intersessional contact group convened by Australia to consider the ANDRILL CEE	Australia
WP 36	The report of the intersessional contact group convened by France to consider the Lake Vostok CEE	France
IP 018	Russian Studies of the Subglacial lake Vostok in 1995-2002	Russian Federation
IP 068	Czech Scientific Station in Antarctica Construction and Operation	Czech Republic
IP 081	Progress Report of Estonian Antarctic Activities	Estonia
IP 092	Advisory Review of the Draft Comprehensive Environmental evaluation water sampling of the Subglacial Lake Vostok	Norway
IP 094	Comment on the Draft Comprehensive Environmental Evaluation: Water Sampling of the Subglacial Lake Vostok	SCAR
IP 105	Response to the Comments of the ICG Convenors on the Draft Czech Scientific Station CEE	Czech Republic
IP 106	Report of the CEPICG on the Draft Comprehensive Environmental Evaluation for a Czech Scientific Station in Antarctica	Australia

4 c) Other Matters covered by Annex I (Environmental Impact Assessment)

Paper No	Title	Submitted by
WP 06	Final report from the Intersessional Contact Group on Cumulative Environmental Impacts	United States
WP 34	Noise and Anthropogenic acoustic discharges and their effect on marine mammals.	Spain
IP 007	Revision of the Artigas Antarctic Scientific Station IEE	Uruguay

IP 023	Additional 50m drilling of deep borehole at Vostok station Initial Environmental Evaluation	Russian Federation
IP 040	Comparison of EIA processes for Antarctic non government activities	Australia
IP 063	Annual list of Initial Environmental Evaluations (IEE) and Comprehensive Environmental Evaluations (CEE) Calendar Year 2002	Australia
IP 073	Marine acoustic technology and the Antarctic environment	ASOC
IP 077	Acoustic technology and the marine ecosystem	SCAR
IP 113	Environmental Monitoring and Impact Assessment of the Indian Permanent Station – Maitri Pursuant to the Protocol on Environmental Protection of the Antarctic Treaty	India

4 d) Matters covered by Annex II (Conservation of Antarctic Fauna and Flora)

Paper No	Title	Submitted by
WP 25	Progress Report of the CEP Intersessional Contact Group on Annex II	Argentina
WP 34	Noise and anthropogenic acoustic discharges, and their effect on marine mammals	Spain
IP 031	Synthesis on Antarctic pinnipeds pathologies at Cape Shirreff, Livingston Island, Antarctic	Chile
IP 056	La Pesca Ilegal: concertación Internacional para Reforzar los Mecanismos de Actuación	Spain
IP 100	Antarctic Specially Protected Species	SCAR

4 e) Matters covered by Annex III (Waste Disposal and Waste Management)

Paper No	Title	Submitted by
IP 035	Prince Charles Mountains Expedition of Germany and Australia (PCMEGA)	Australia
IP 036	Cleanup of Thala Valley waste disposal site near Casey	Australia
IP 043	Progress on the environmental restoration of Marambio station	Argentina
IP 050	The removal and clean up of abandoned British bases and waste dumps in Antarctica	United Kingdom
IP 087	Report Cleanup and Removal of the Old Power Building at the Great Wall Station	China

4 f) Matters covered by Annex IV (Prevention of Marine Pollution)

Paper No	Title	Submitted by
WP 37 Rev 1	Advice to Mariners and Vessel Operators on the Protocol's obligations.	UK
IP 064	Preventing marine pollution in Antarctic waters	ASOC
IP 117	Coastal Sediment Pollution at Sites Frequently Visited by Tourism Operations	ASOC

4 g) Matters Covered by Annex V (Area Protection and Management)

Paper No	Title	Submitted by
WP 07 Rev. 1	Final Revised Management Plans for: ASPA No. 152, Western Bransfield Strait, and ASPA No. 153, Eastern Dallmann Bay	United States
WP 08	Draft Management Plans for: ASPA 113, Litchfield Island, Arthur Harbor Anvers Island ASPA No. 122, Arrival Heights, Hut Point Peninsula and ASPA No. 139, Biscoe Point, Anvers Island	United States
WP 10	Draft Management Plan for Northern Coronation Island	United Kingdom
WP 15	Proposed Management Plans for Cape Denison, Commonwealth Bay, George V Land, east Antarctica	Australia
WP 16 Rev. 1	Review of draft Protected Area Management Plans - Report of the Australia-led Intersessional Contact Group (inc. Management Plans for North-east Bailey Peninsula Marine Plain and Frazier Islands ASPAs)	Australia
WP 17 Rev. 1	Review of the List of Historic Sites and Monuments	United Kingdom
WP 19 Rev. 1	Antarctic Protected Areas System Proposal for a new Antarctic Specially Protected Area Terra Nova Bay, Ross Sea	Italy
WP 20	Systematic Environmental Protection in Antarctica	New Zealand
WP 24	Whalers Bay Historic Site No71	Chile, Norway, United Kingdom
WP 27	Draft ASMA for McMurdo Dry Valleys	United States,

		New Zealand
WP 28	Review of the guidelines for CEP consideration of new and revised draft management plans for protected areas	New Zealand
WP 30	Antarctic Specially Protected Area No.120, Pointe Geologie Archipelago, Terre Adelie	France
WP 31	Review of ASPAs 105 131 154 155 and 156 (inc. Management plans for Beaufort Island, Botany Bay and Lewis Bay ASPAs)	New Zealand
WP 32	Review of draft Antarctic Specially Protected Area 118 Management Pla: report of intersessional contact group	New Zealand
WP 38	Draft Management Plan for Proposed Antarctic Specially Protected Area (ASPA) (Dashkin Gongotri Glacier, Schirmacher Oasis)	India
WP 39	Site Recommended for Inclusion in the List of Historic Sites and Monuments in Antarctica (India Point, Humboldt Mountains)	India
IP 001	Environmental Domains for the Ross Sea Region	New Zealand
IP 015	Rehabilitation d'un site historique en milieu austral: l'exemple de la restauration de la station baleiniere de Port Jeanne d'Arc a Kerguelen (Terres Australes et Antarctiques Francaises)	France
IP 032	Plan de gestion territorial de la base Gabriel Gonzalez Videla	Chile
IP 048	Progress towards a Deception Island Antarctic Specially Managed Area	Argentina, Chile, Norway, Spain, UK, USA, ASOC, IAATO
IP 049	Information Archive for Antarctic Protected Areas	United Kingdom
IP 054	Proposal for a new Antarctic Protected Area: Edmonson Point, Ross Sea	Italy
IP 057	Activities associated to the Historic Site and Monument No. 38, Nordenskjold Hut, Snow Hill Island	Argentina
IP 072	IAATO Site Specific Guidelines 2003	IAATO
IP 115	Review of the List of Historic Sites and Monuments: No. 44	India

IP 116	IUCN, WCPA and WWF High Seas Marine Protected Areas Workshop 15-17 January 2003, Malaga, Spain	IUCN
--------	--	------

Item 5: Environmental Monitoring

Paper No	Title	Submitted by
IP 006	Magnetic Survey in the Surroundings of Artigas Antarctic Scientific Station	Uruguay
IP 033	Resumen Programa Observación Ambiente Litoral Antartico 1996-2001	Chile
IP 053	Antarctic Site Inventory: 1994-2003	United States
IP 055	Environmental Monitoring at Terra Nova Bay and its Surroundings	Italy
IP 113	Environmental Monitoring and Impact Assessment of the Indian Permanent Station Maitri pursuant to the Protocol on Environmental Protection to the Antarctic Treaty	India

Item 6: State of the Antarctic Environment Report

Paper No	Title	Submitted by
WP 21	Report of the Intersessional Discussion Group on State of the Antarctic Environment Reporting	New Zealand, Australia

Item 7: Biological Prospecting

Paper No	Title	Submitted by
IP 047	Bioprospecting in Antarctica – an academic workshop	New Zealand
IP 075	Bioprospecting	UK/Norway

Item 8: Emergency Response and Contingency Planning

Paper No	Title	Submitted by
WP 09	“Worst Case” and “Less than Worst Case” environmental scenarios	COMNAP
IP 069	IAATO-wide emergency contingency plan 2003/04	IAATO
IP 070	An assessment of environmental emergencies arising from activities in Antarctica 2003-2003 season	IAATO

Item 9: Data and Exchange of Information

Paper No	Title	Submitted by
IP 042	Progress on the Antarctic Treaty Information Exchange Web Site www.infoantarctica.org.ar	Argentina

Item 10: Co-operation with other organisations

Paper No	Title	Submitted by
IP 038	Report of the CEP Observer to SC-CCAMLR XXI	Australia
IP 065	Report of the Antarctic and Southern Ocean Coalition	ASOC
IP 098	Report of the World Conservation unit Under Article III	IUCN

Item 11: Election of Officers**Item 12: Preparation for CEP VII****Item 13: Adoption of the Report****Item 14: Closing of the Meeting**

CEP National Contact Points

Member Country	Contact Person	E-mail Address
Chair	Tony Press	tony.press@aad.gov.au
Argentina	José María Acero Rodolfo Sanchez	jmacero@dna.gov.ar rsanchez@dna.gov.ar
Australia	Tom Maggs Simon Smalley	tom.maggs@aad.gov.au simon.smalley@aad.gov.au
Belgium	Hugo Declair	hdeclair@vub.ac.be
Brazil	Tania Aparecida Silva Brito A Rocha Campos	tania.brito@mma.gov.br
Bulgaria	Christo Pimpirev Nesho Chipev	polar@gea.uni-sofia.bg chipev@ecolab.bas.bg
Chile	José Valencia	jvalenci@inach.cl
China	Wei Wen Liang	chinare@public.bta.net.cn
Ecuador	Jose M Borju	embajado@mercator.es
Finland	Markus Tarasti Mika Kalakoski	markus.tarasti@ymparisto.fi mika.kalakoski@fimr.fi
France	Laurence Petitguillaume Yves Frenot	Laurence.petitguillaume@environnement.gouv.fr yfrenot@ifrtp.ifremer.fr
Germany	Antje Neumann	antje.neumann@uba.de
Greece		
India	Prem C. Pandey Ajai Saxena	pcpandey@ncaor.org ajai@dod.delhi.nic.in ajaisaxena@yahoo.com
Italy	Pietro Giuliani	internazio@enea.pnra.it

	Sandro Torcini	sandro.torcini@casaccia.enea.it
Japan	Tsutomu Tamura	antarctic@env.go.jp
Korea, Republic of	In-Young Ahn Jaeyong Choi	iahn@kordi.re.kr jchoi@kei.re.kr
Netherlands	Dick C. de Bruijn	Dick.DeBruijn@minvrom.nl stel@now.nl
New Zealand	Emma Waterhouse Neil Gilbert	Emma.Waterhouse@fish.govt.nz Neil.Gilbert@antarcticanz.govt.nz
Norway	Birgit Njaastad	njaastad@npolar.no
Peru	Juan Carlos Rivera	teconec@teconec.com teconec@hotmail.com inanpe@rree.gov.pe
Poland	Stanislaw Rakusa- Suszczewski Tom Janecki	profesor@dab.waw.pl
Romania	Teodor Gheroghe- Negoita	negoita_antarctic@yahoo.com
Russian Federation	Valery Lukin	lukin@raexp.spb.su
South Africa	Henry Valentine	henryv@antarc.wcape.gov.za
Spain	Manuel Catalan	cpe@mcyt.es
Sweden	Johan Sidenmark Anna Carin Thomer	johan.sidenmark@polar.se annacarin.thomer@environment.ministry.se
Ukraine	Lytvynov	antarc@carrier.kiev.ua
United Kingdom	John Shears Jane Rumble	JRS@bas.ac.uk Jane.Rumble@fco.gov.uk
United States of America	Fabio Saturni	SaturniFM@state.gov
Uruguay	Aldo Felici	antartic@iau.gub.uy

Observers 4a		
Observer	Contact person	Email address
Canada	Fred Roots	fred.roots@ec.gc.ca
Czech Republic	Zdenek Venera	venera@env.cz
Estonia	Mart Saarso	Mart.Saarso@mfa.ee

Observers 4b		
Observer	Contact Person	Email address
CCAMLR	Rennie Holt	Rholt@ucsd.educcamlr@ccamlr.org
COMNAP	Jack Sayers Karl Erb	jsayers@comnap.aq kerb@nsf.gov
SCAR	Peter Clarkson	execsec@scar.demon.co.uk

Observers 4c		
Observer	Contact Person	Email address
ASOC	Ricardo Roura ASOC Secretary	Ricardo.roura@worldonline.nl antarctica@igc.org
IUCN	Alan Hemmings	alan.d.hemmings@bigpond.com
IAATO	Denise Landau	iaato@iaato.org
UNEP	Christian Lambrechts	christian.lambrechts@unep.org
WMO	Hugh Hutchinson	h.hutchinson@bom.gov.au

**Internet addresses (URL) where Annual Report information is published in
accordance with Article 17 of the Protocol (as at 20 June 2003)**

COUNTRY	Web address for Article 17 information
Argentina	www.infoantarctica.org.ar
Australia	www.infoantarctica.org.ar
Brazil	www.mma.gov.br www.secirm.mar.mil.br
Bulgaria	TBA
Chile	www.inach.cl
Finland	www2.fimr.fi/en/etelamanner/ympariston-suojelu.html
France	TBA
Germany	http://www.awi-bremerhaven.de/logistics/antarktisvertrag/berichte/index-d.html
India	www.ncaor.org
Italy	www.pnra.it
Japan	www.en.go.jp/earth/nankyoku/kankyohogo/index.html (Japanese only, English version will be built up soon)
Norway	http://npolar.no/AntarcticTreatySystem
Peru	www.rree.gov.pe/inanpe
Poland	www.dab.waw.pol
Republic of Korea	www.sejong.kordi.re.kr
Romania	negoita_antarctic@yahoo.com
Russia	www.aeci.es/26atcmadrid IP021
Spain	www.mcyt.es/cpe
Sweden	www.polar.se
United Kingdom	www.infoantarctica.org.ac
United States	www.nsf.gov/od/opp/antarct/treaty/index.htm
Uruguay	www.antarctic.ian.gub.uy www.infoantarctica.org.ar

Guidelines for CEP Consideration of New and Revised Draft ASPA and ASMA Management Plans.

1. Draft management plans (new or revised) shall be submitted by the proponent to the CEP for consideration at its next meeting.
2. Draft management plans for proposed ASPAs or ASMAs shall also be forwarded by the proponent to SCAR for its consideration. For those areas that include a marine component, and which meet the criteria set out in Decision 4 (1998)¹, draft management plans shall also be forwarded by the proponent to CCAMLR for its consideration.
3. Proponents shall submit draft management plans to the CCAMLR Secretariat by mid-June to ensure that CCAMLR has adequate time to review the draft plans and provide comments within the timetable of the CEP's own review. Draft management plan(s) may be submitted to CCAMLR ahead of submission to the CEP depending on the timing of the CEP meeting in any one year.
4. At its meeting, the CEP shall establish, as needed and in accordance with Rule 9 of its Rules of Procedure, an open ended intersessional contact group to consider each draft management plan received.
5. If the CEP agrees at its meeting that the revised management plan has changes of only a minor technical nature, the CEP can decide at its meeting that the revised management plan does not need to go to intersessional review.
6. A coordinator for each contact group shall be appointed by the CEP and should normally be from the Party proposing the draft management plan.
7. The contact group(s) shall operate in accordance with the guidelines noted in paragraph 9 of the Final Report of CEP I.
8. In considering a draft management plan, contact groups shall examine the content, clarity, consistency and likely effectiveness of the draft management plan and for draft ASPA plans should take into account the Guide to the Preparation of Management Plans for Antarctic Specially Protected Areas (Resolution 2 (1998)).
9. The outcome of each group's deliberations, including any recommendations, and any comments provided by SCAR and CCAMLR shall be reported to the next meeting of the CEP by the coordinator.

¹ Decision 4 (1998) states that:

Draft management plans which require the approval of CCAMLR are those which include marine areas:

- In which there is actual harvesting or potential capability for harvesting of marine living resources which might be affected by the sites designation; or
- For which there are provisions specified in a draft management plan which might prevent or restrict CCAMLR-related activities.

And that:

Proposals for ASPAs and ASMAs which might have implications for CCAMLR Ecosystem Monitoring and Management (CEMP) sites should be submitted to CCAMLR for its consideration before any decision is taken on the proposal.

CEP ADVICE TO ATCM XXVI ON METEORITES

The CEP recalled Resolution 3 (2001), which stated that:

“Concerned at the potential loss to scientific research because of unrestricted collection of meteorites in Antarctica;

Urge Members to the Protocol on Environmental Protection to the Antarctic Treaty to take such legal or administrative steps as are necessary to preserve Antarctic meteorites so that they are collected and curated according to accepted scientific standards, and are made available for scientific purposes.”

The CEP affirmed its understanding that meteorites are “mineral resources” within the meaning of Article 7 of the Protocol on Environmental Protection to the Antarctic Treaty, and that therefore all Parties to the Protocol have an obligation under Article 7 to prohibit any activity in Antarctica relating to meteorites, other than for scientific research.

The CEP recommends that the ATCM endorse the views of the CEP.

Appendix 2

CEP ADVICE TO ATCM XXVI ON THE DRAFT CEE CONTAINED IN ATCM XXVI/WP01

With regard to the draft Comprehensive Environmental Evaluation for Water Sampling the Subglacial Lake Vostok (XXVI ATCM WP01), the Committee for Environmental Protection:

Having fully considered the draft CEE circulated by the Russian Federation, on February 6, 2003, as reported in paragraphs 19 to 26 in the report of CEP VI, and noting both the comments provided at the meeting by the Russian Federation on specific elements as well as the detailed explanations provided by the Russian Federation on these matters,

Recognising that the Russian Federation possesses considerable practical experience with deep ice drilling and ice coring,

The Committee for Environmental Protection has the following comments and advice:

In general, the Committee was impressed by the information contained in the draft CEE, which was well presented and well structured.

However, the Committee considered that parts of the draft CEE did not meet some of the requirements of Annex 1, Article 3, of the Protocol, specifically:

1. While the Committee recognised the importance of the long term science goals for subglacial lake exploration, the draft CEE provides insufficient consideration to reduce the potential environmental risks posed by the activity.
2. Insufficient information is provided on the special drilling fluid to support the conclusion that it is 'ecologically clean'.
3. The treatment of alternatives to the proposed activity is inadequate and should include alternative solutions.
4. The draft CEE does not adequately identify and discuss gaps in knowledge particularly as related to the question of the ice/water interface conditions and lake chemistry.
5. The draft CEE does not adequately address the risk of accidental release of drilling fluid into the lake and the potential consequences of this release.
6. Consistent with Annex 1, Article 3, paragraph 2(g), contingency plans should be developed to deal promptly and effectively with unforeseen impacts if the activities do not proceed as predicted.

In view of these concerns, the Committee

Recommends that the Russian Federation be urged to consider carefully this advice, and make such revisions in the final CEE as may be necessary to address the above insufficiencies and produce a final CEE that is fully consistent with the requirements of Annex 1 of the Protocol, and

Recommends that the ATCM endorse this view.

Appendix 3

CEP ADVICE TO ATCM XXVI ON THE DRAFT CEE CONTAINED IN ATCM XXVI/WP02

With regards to the draft Comprehensive Environmental Evaluation for ANDRILL Programme (ATCM XXVI/WP02), the Committee for Environmental Protection,

Having fully considered the draft CEE circulated by New Zealand, as reported in paragraphs 29 to 37 of the report of CEP VI, and

Having provided comments at the meeting to New Zealand on specific elements of the draft CEE,

Considered that, in general, the draft CEE was well structured and had provided an appropriate assessment of the impacts of the proposed project; and

Considered that the draft CEE was consistent with the requirements of Annex I of the Protocol.

The CEP therefore recommends that the ATCM endorse these views.

DRAFT MEASURE

Antarctic Protected Area System: Management Plans for Antarctic Specially Protected Areas

The Representatives,

Recalling Resolution 1 (1998) allocating responsibility among Consultative Members for the revision of Management Plans for protected areas;

Noting that the draft Management Plans appended to this Measure have been endorsed by the Committee for Environmental Protection and the Scientific Committee on Antarctic Research (SCAR);

Recognising that these Areas support outstanding natural features and biota of scientific interest;

Recommend to their Governments the following Measure for approval in accordance with paragraph 1 of Article 6 of Annex V to the Protocol on Environmental Protection to the Antarctic Treaty:

That the Management Plans for the following sites:

Antarctic Specially Protected Area No. 105 Beaufort Island, Ross Sea;

Antarctic Specially Protected Area No. 114, Northern Coronation Island, South Orkney Islands;

Antarctic Specially Protected Area No. 118 Cryptogam Ridge, Mt Melbourne, North Victoria Land and summit of Mt Melbourne, North Victoria Land;

Antarctic Specially Protected Area No. 135 North-East Bailey Peninsula, Budd Coast, Wilkes Land;

Antarctic Specially Protected Area No. 143 Marine Plain, Mule Peninsula, Vestfold Hills, Princess Elizabeth Land;

Antarctic Specially Protected Area No. 152 Western Bransfield Strait, Antarctic Peninsula;

Antarctic Specially Protected Area No. 153 Eastern Dallmann Bay, Antarctic Peninsula;

Antarctic Specially Protected Area No. 154 Botany Bay Cape Geology, Victoria Land;

Antarctic Specially Protected Area No. 156 Lewis Bay, Mount Erebus, Ross Island, Ross Sea;

Antarctic Specially Protected Area No. 160 Frazier Islands, Wilkes Land, East Antarctica;

Antarctic Specially Protected Area No. 161 Terra Nova Bay, Ross Sea;

and which are annexed to this Measure, be adopted.

DRAFT MEASURE

Antarctic Protected Areas System: Revised List of Historic Sites and Monuments.

The Representatives,

Recalling Recommendations I-IX, V-4, VI-14, VII-9, XII-7, XIII-16, XIV-8, XV-12, XVI-11, XVII-3 and Measures 4(1995), 2(1996), 4(1997), 2(1998), 1(2001) and 2(2001);

Noting the requirements of Article 8 of Annex V to the Protocol on Environmental Protection to the Antarctic Treaty to maintain a list of current Historic Sites and Monuments and that such sites shall not be damaged, removed or destroyed;

Desiring to update the descriptions of Historic Site and Monument numbers 5, 14, 15, 16, 17, 18, 19, 21, 22, 23, 27, 28, 30, 32, 33, 34, 35, 36, 37, 38, 39, 42, 43, 44, 48, 50, 53, 56, 57, 59, 61, 62, 63, 64, 65, 66, 67, 68, 69, 70, 71, 74;

Desiring also to de-list Historic Site and Monument numbers 25, 31 and 58, which no longer exist;

Recommend to their Governments the following Measure for approval in accordance with paragraph 2 of Article 8 of Annex V to the Protocol on Environmental Protection to the Antarctic Treaty:

That:

- i. the “List of Historic Monuments Identified and Described by the Proposing Government or Governments” annexed to Recommendation VII-9 and modified by the Recommendations and Measures recalled above, be terminated;
- ii. the revised and updated “List of Historic Sites and Monuments” annexed to this Measure be adopted.

