

**Report of the Committee
for Environmental Protection
(CEP IX)**

Report of the Committee for Environmental Protection

(CEP IX)

Edinburgh 12-16 June 2006

Item 1: Opening of the Meeting

- 1) The CEP Chair, Dr Tony Press (Australia), opened the meeting on Monday 12 June 2006.
- 2) The Chair thanked the United Kingdom for arranging and hosting the meeting, and also thanked the Secretariat of the Antarctic Treaty for their important work in administering the submission of papers and the meeting website.
- 3) The Chair briefly introduced a non-paper summarising the work undertaken by the Committee since CEP VIII, noting the substantial amount of work undertaken during the intersessional period.

Item 2: Adoption of the Agenda

- 4) The Committee adopted the following agenda and confirmed the allocation of papers to Agenda Items:
 1. Opening of the Meeting
 2. Adoption of Agenda
 3. Strategic Discussions on the Future Work of the CEP
 4. Operation of the CEP
 5. International Polar Year
 6. Environmental Impact Assessment
 7. Area Protection and Management
 8. Conservation of Antarctic Fauna and Flora
 9. Environmental Monitoring and Reporting
 10. Inspection Reports
 11. Emergency Response and Contingency Planning
 12. Waste Management
 13. Prevention of Marine Pollution
 14. Cooperation with Other Organisations
 15. General Matters
 16. Election of Officers
 17. Preparation for Next Meeting
 18. Adoption of the Report
 19. Closing of the Meeting
- 5) The Committee considered 38 Working Papers, 68 Information Papers and 3 Secretariat Papers (Annex 1).

Item 3: Strategic Discussions on the Future of the CEP

- 6) The United Kingdom introduced WP 42 *Antarctica's Future Environmental Challenges*. A summary report of the CEP Workshop and IP 113 (rev 1) *Antarctica's Future Environmental Challenges. Report of the CEP Workshop, Edinburgh, United Kingdom, 9–10 June 2006* which provided details of the workshop. The Committee agreed that the workshop had been productive. Follow-up discussions would be held to prioritise issues arising from the workshop.
- 7) The United Kingdom noted that some of the immediate actions from the workshop had been picked up in discussions during the week, but was keen not to lose sight of the other outstanding actions. They suggested that the steering committee continue to operate and develop a five-year forward action plan for consideration at CEP X. Many Members thanked the United Kingdom for organising a productive and useful workshop.
- 8) Sweden noted that the CEP should also take into account the challenging discussions on the future development of activities in Antarctica and their impact on the environment.
- 9) The CEP agreed to establish an intersessional contact group (ICG) to take forward the development of a five-year work plan and agreed the following terms of reference:
 - Review the outcomes of the CEP Workshop as recorded in ATCM XXIX / WP 42 and ATCM XXIX / IP 113 (rev 1);
 - Consider the work undertaken by CCAMLR to develop a five-year work plan for its WG-EMM, as a model example;
 - Take account of the IPY planning work considered at CEP IX;
 - On the basis of the above, develop a draft five-year, prioritised work plan for consideration at CEP X; and
 - Prepare advice for CEP X on practical measures that the CEP might consider in managing its work, including for example, themed meetings, standing groups and workshops.
- 10) The Committee agreed that Dr Neil Gilbert (New Zealand) would convene the ICG.
- 11) The Committee encouraged CEP Members, Observers and Experts to submit papers to CEP X on issues identified for immediate focus.

Item 4: Operation of the CEP

- 12) Australia introduced WP 11 *Committee for Environmental Protection (CEP) Handbook*, which presented a draft online CEP Handbook, prepared in response to discussions at CEP VIII (reported in Annex 6 to the CEP VIII Final Report). The draft handbook, comprising a compilation of CEP procedures and approved guidelines, was available on the CEP website. Several Members thanked Australia for developing the handbook, noting the value of such a tool in assisting the work of CEP representatives. The Committee strongly supported the concept of an online CEP Handbook and requested the Secretariat to take responsibility for maintaining and updating such a handbook with the assistance of Members, as appropriate.
- 13) The Secretariat introduced SP 10 *Template for Annual Reporting under Article 17 of the Environment Protocol* and demonstrated a proposed online system to help Members meet existing requirements relating to exchange of information under the Protocol. Several Members congratulated the Secretariat on preparing this useful tool. Some concern was expressed about ensuring the database did not go beyond the existing requirements of information exchange and did not include references to unofficial sources. Subject to these changes, the Committee considered that it would be useful to trial the online system for a year before committing to a transition from the current information exchange process.

Accordingly, the Secretariat was asked to make arrangements to allow Members to access the system on a trial basis.

- 14) The Secretariat provided an update on plans for the transfer of the CEP website following CEP IX, noting that it had undertaken intersessional consultation with Australia on this matter.
- 15) The list of CEP Contact Points was updated (Annex 2).

Item 5: International Polar Year

- 16) Dr David Carlson, Director of the IPY Programme Office, made a presentation on the International Polar Year. He emphasised the huge opportunities offered by the IPY for international collaboration in science and outreach programmes. He highlighted the various themes the projects would cover. Some 50,000 participants from 60 countries would be involved in IPY projects.
- 17) He commented that the IPY was a rare and unique opportunity for the Antarctic legacy and its sustainable future. He pointed out that there were indigenous peoples who would speak for the Arctic environmental legacy of the IPY but questioned who would speak for the Antarctic environmental legacy.
- 18) Many Members thanked Dr Carlson for an excellent presentation which stimulated much useful discussion. They all expressed support for the work of the IPY and looked forward to the advances in knowledge which will flow from it. Many also endorsed the importance of outreach work. A Member requested that the slides accompanying the presentation be made available on the CEP website.
- 19) Some Members expressed concern about the effect that so much activity would have on the Antarctic environment, and encouraged others to consider joint logistics whenever possible. To this end it was suggested that Parties make known their research plans as soon as possible.
- 20) Although one Member expressed disappointment that the CEP had not been more pro-active in feeding into IPY plans at an early stage, others noted that opportunities remained to create political momentum during the IPY through outreach programmes.
- 21) ASOC introduced IP 64 *A Glimpse into the Environmental Legacy of the IPY 2007-2008* which showed that a large number of projects were planning to leave physical infrastructure in Antarctica and at least 20 projects may need to submit IEEs or CEEs by 2007.
- 22) The Committee noted the encouraging discussions about IPY both at the CEP meeting and at the Workshop. The Committee wished the IPY team great success and agreed to continue to invite an IPY representative to CEP meetings.
- 23) The Members encouraged Parties to provide logistic and financial support for scientific research operations and outreach within the framework of the IPY.

Item 6: Environmental Impact Assessment

6a) Consideration of Draft CEEs forwarded to the CEP in accordance with paragraph 4 of Article 3 of the Protocol

- 24) Belgium made a presentation on WP 25 *Construction and operation of the new Belgian Research Station in Dronning Maud Land, Antarctica. Draft Comprehensive Environmental Evaluation (CEE)* and the accompanying IP 22 with the same title, which contained the full draft CEE document. Belgium also provided electronic and colour printed copies of the draft CEE.
- 25) The station will be situated near the Utsteinen Nunatak, at the foot of the Sør Rondane Mountains, Dronning Maud Land. The draft CEE had been approved and endorsed by the

Belgian Federal Ministries of Environment, Foreign Affairs and Science Policy. These ministries concluded that the global scientific importance and value to be gained by the construction and operation of the new Belgian station in the 1072 km-wide empty sector between the Japanese Syowa station and the Russian Novolazarevskaya station outweighs the more than minor and transitory impacts the station construction and operation will have on the Antarctic environment, and fully justifies the launch of this project.

- 26) The draft CEE was released by the Belgian Federal Science Policy (Belspo) on 10 February 2006 and notification of the report was sent to all Parties to the Protocol on Environmental Protection via diplomatic channels.
- 27) Many Members commended Belgium for the quality of the draft CEE document and for the innovative station design. A number of Members raised questions relating to fuel storage, solid waste management, monitoring of station impacts (including on flora and fauna), water generation, emergency facilities, the potential impacts of the nearby airstrip and the criteria used for assessing the intensity of environmental impacts. Belgium welcomed the feedback and undertook to address these issues when preparing the final CEE.
- 28) The Committee agreed that the draft CEE provided a comprehensive description and evaluation of the proposed activity and likely environmental impacts, and was therefore consistent with the requirements of Annex I to the Protocol.
- 29) The Committee also noted that there were no other facilities in the area that Belgium could share or take over. The construction of a new station was therefore justified.
- 30) ASOC also thanked Belgium for an excellent CEE but expressed its concern about the cumulative impacts on the Antarctic wilderness and other intrinsic values of Antarctica resulting from the establishment of new stations in near-pristine areas. The 'no-go' alternative had to be considered carefully, and the alternative to proceed had to be justified on scientific grounds.
- 31) Many Members and ASOC noted that the proposed station and other new stations in Antarctica were a model for sustainable management because they relied on renewable energy and they could be dismantled after use.
- 32) The CEP's advice to the ATCM on the draft CEE for 'Construction and operation of the new Belgian Research Station in Dronning Maud Land, Antarctica' is in Appendix 1.
- 33) The United Kingdom introduced IP 18 *Update on the Comprehensive Environmental Evaluation (CEE) for the Proposed Construction and Operation of Halley VI Research Station, Brunt Ice Shelf, Caird Coast, Antarctica*. The United Kingdom informed the Committee that the construction of Halley VI had been delayed by one year and is now planned to take place during the 2007/08 and 2008/09 seasons. The final CEE had therefore been delayed and would be made available for comment at the end of 2006. The final CEE would include the decommissioning and removal of Halley V.
- 34) Argentina noted that the process for CEP consideration of draft CEEs was problematic because it did not provide for intersessional discussion of issues in all four official languages. It also noted that this matter was particularly important because it involved the consideration of activities that would cause more than minor or transitory impacts on the Antarctic environment. One Member noted that this issue raised by Argentina was relevant.

6b) *Other EIA Matters*

- 35) The Secretariat introduced SP 8 *Annual list of Initial Environmental Evaluations (IEE) and Comprehensive Environmental Evaluations (CEE) prepared between April 1st 2005 and March 31st 2006*, noting that the reporting period had changed in accordance with the requirements of Resolution 1(2005). The information in this table, together with information submitted on IEEs and CEEs since 1988, could be accessed via the EIA database established

- on the ATS website. The Secretariat noted that the template should facilitate greater consistency in the reporting of this information.
- 36) ASOC introduced IP 94 *Station Sharing in Antarctica*, which promoted the sharing of existing facilities rather than the establishment of new stations by individual Parties.
 - 37) The Committee recognised that there are numerous examples of scientific and logistical cooperation in Antarctica, and encouraged Antarctic programmes to continue to explore opportunities for collaboration and cooperation. Some Members stressed that Annex VI on Liability should not be allowed to hinder joint logistical or scientific endeavours.
 - 38) Uruguay emphasised the importance of implementing Article 6 of the Protocol, and in this sense offered to share the ECARE station facilities in the Antarctic Peninsula, on both scientific and logistic levels.
 - 39) Recalling earlier discussions on the matter, and while recognising the need to support scientific research, the Committee reiterated its concern over the need to avoid a proliferation of bases in Antarctica. The Committee also noted that the Treaty Parties had indicated that the construction of a station or base in Antarctica was not a requirement for attaining Consultative Party status (Recommendation XV-17), and suggested that the ATCM consider reaffirming this position.
 - 40) The Russian Federation introduced IP 68 *Russian Studies of the subglacial Lake Vostok in the season of 2005-2006 and Work Plans for the season of 2006-2007* and IP 69 *Drilling of Additional 75 m in deep Borehole 5G-1 at Vostok Station. Initial Environmental Evaluation*. Lengthy discussion took place and several Members sought clarification on the timing of, and environmental issues surrounding, the drilling at Lake Vostok.
 - 41) The United Kingdom referred to recent British research suggesting that some Antarctic subglacial lakes may be interconnected, and questioned whether this had implications for the proposed penetration of Lake Vostok.
 - 42) SCAR noted that it was aware of recent scientific literature which suggested that if one subglacial lake was contaminated, contamination may spread downstream to connected lakes. SCAR's Subglacial Antarctic Lakes Exploration group (SALE) had discussed this possibility over the years, but many aspects remained unclear - including the extent of sub-ice drainage basins, the interconnectivity of subglacial systems, and the rate of water flow. These questions were critical to understanding the age, origins, structure, and evolution of subglacial systems and possible resident microorganisms. SCAR noted that the risks of continued drilling at Lake Vostok were twofold: (i) accidental penetration of the lake, and ensuing contamination; (ii) the potential for drilling fluids to percolate from the borehole into the lake through tiny cracks (hydrofracturing) in the deeper ice just above the lake surface. The new information should be duly considered in developing protocols for the environmental stewardship of these unique environments. SCAR considered that Russian scientists were taking new developments on board in an appropriate way in their published plans.
 - 43) New Zealand pointed out that IP 69 noted that "drilling fluid should be removed from the Vostok borehole" before the hole collided with the edge of the subglacial lake, and that "technological solutions [to] the process of drill fluid removal are currently available, however they require additional improvement". Considering the risks posed by borehole drill fluid, New Zealand asked when such technologies might be sufficiently improved to be planned for and widely implemented, and whether the final CEE that Russia is preparing could contain this information.
 - 44) Russia gave detailed answers to the above questions. It was noted that there were no objective scientific data on the existence of subglacial lake systems linked to Lake Vostok. Russian and US ground-based and airborne radar surveys of sub-ice structures did not provide any evidence of drainage systems similar to those identified by United Kingdom researchers at Dome Concordia. The soundness of theoretical conclusions made by the

Russian designers of the Lake Vostok drilling technology was confirmed by practical activities of Danish experts in northern Greenland in 2003-2004, and German experts at Antarctic Kohnen station (Dronning Maud Land) in 2005. The drill liquid used in both European drilling projects (a kerosene / freon mix) was the same as the one used by Russian scientists at Vostok. Following an unplanned contact of the drill liquid with subglacial water in the Danish and German boreholes, the drill liquid level rose a few dozen meters, which proved the absence of a negative flow from the borehole that characterises large subglacial drainage systems. Pollution studies of the ice-core from refrozen subglacial water that penetrated into the Greenland borehole indicated that only the upper 10 cm contact layer was actually contaminated.

- 45) The ice core from the Vostok borehole at 3,623-3,650 meters is still structured as large (up to 1.5 m diameter) crystals with insignificant intercrystal spaces, which largely prevents rapid leakage of the drill liquid towards the water body.
- 46) Russia indicated that its future drilling activities at Vostok would be fully consistent with the Environmental Protocol and Russian national legislation. The final CEE for Lake Vostok water sampling would be presented at CEP X.
- 47) New Zealand informed the Committee that the joint US/Italian/German/New Zealand Andrill drilling project will go ahead during the 2006/07 season, and provided the Committee with copies of the final CEE.
- 48) The Czech Republic made a presentation on IP 99 *The Czech Antarctic Station of Johann Gregor Mendel - from project to realization*. It thanked Institutes from several Parties for assistance in building the station, and extended an invitation to others to use their research facilities.
- 49) ASOC noted that while it was positive that complex projects such as routes, subglacial lake drilling and station construction involved CEEs, it was important to ensure that these were not merely administrative processes, but that they improved environmental protection.
- 50) Romania introduced IP 81 *Initial Environmental Evaluation. Law-Racovita Base*.
- 51) Italy introduced IP 42 *Initial Environmental Evaluation (IEE): Construction and operation of Enigma Runway for light aircrafts at the Mario Zucchelli Station (Terra Nova Bay, Ross Sea, Antarctica)*.
- 52) Other Information Papers submitted under this Agenda Item included:
 - IP 80 *Methodologies for Assessing Cumulative Impacts: A Progress Report* (New Zealand)
 - IP 63 *Beyond Direct Impacts of Multi-Year Maintained Ice Routes Case Study: McMurdo-South Pole Surface Re-Supply Traverse* (ASOC).

Item 7: Area Protection and Management

7a) Management Plans

- i. Draft management plans which had been reviewed by an ICG
- 53) The Committee considered six draft management plans for Antarctic Specially Protected Areas (ASPAs) and Antarctic Specially Managed Areas (ASMAs) under this category:
 - WP 8 *Management Plan for the Larsemann Hills Antarctic Specially Managed Area* (Australia, China, Romania, Russian Federation)
 - WP 12 *Antarctic Protected Areas System: Proposal for a New Protected Area at Edmonson Point, Wood Bay, Ross Sea* (Italy)

- WP 21 (rev1) *Proposal of classification as Specially Protected Area n° 46 Port-Martin (Terre-Adelie)* (France)
 - WP 24 (rev 1) *Revised Management Plan for Antarctic Specially Protected Area 127 Haswell Island (Haswell Island and Adjacent Emperor Penguin Rookery on Fast Ice)* (Russian Federation)
 - WP 26 (rev 1) *Review of the Admiralty Bay Antarctic Specially Managed Area Management Plan (ASMA No 1)* (Brazil, Peru, United States, Poland, Ecuador)
 - WP 30 *Revision of Management Plan for Antarctic Specially Protected Area No. 150 Ardley Island* (Chile).
- 54) On behalf of its co-authors, Australia presented WP 8: *Draft Management Plan for a Larsemann Hills Antarctic Specially Managed Area* (Australia, China, Romania, Russia), describing the development of the plan since 1997 and noting the proposed catchment-based approach to managing the area, consistent with its rich lake and freshwater systems.
- 55) The draft management plan included a Facilities Zone containing most of the existing station infrastructure, in a group of catchments which drain directly to the sea to the east of Broknes.
- 56) China, Russia and Australia had been active in the Larsemann Hills for many years, and in 2006 were joined there and in the authorship of the draft management plan by Romania, which now shares Law-Racovita Base with Australia.
- 57) The draft management plan had been available to members on the CEP Discussion Forum for 9 months after CEP VIII. The draft presented to the Committee under WP 8 addressed the comments received in the consultation period.
- 58) Some Members congratulated the authors of the management plan on concluding its protracted development over many years, despite language difficulties and the initial paucity of data for the region.
- 59) India reminded the meeting of its intention to establish a permanent station in the Larsemann Hills, recorded in paragraph 170 of the report of CEP VIII and further elaborated in WP 20 *Establishment of a New Indian Research Base in the Larsemann Hills, East Antarctica*, submitted under Agenda Item 15.
- 60) Several Members noted their disappointment that the draft management plan developed under the auspices of the CEP would now require considerable modification in the light of India's proposal to locate a station outside the proposed Facilities Zone.
- 61) The Chair requested the authors of WP 8 and WP 20 to discuss the potentially serious consequences of the evident inconsistencies between the provisions of the draft management plan and the activities India proposed, and report back to the meeting.
- 62) The authors of the management plan reported their regret that they were unable in the time available to adequately consider the significant issues raised by WP 20, particularly in relation to the establishment of a second facilities zone.
- 63) Given India's commitment to proceed with a new station, the authors were no longer able to confidently commend the draft management plan in WP 8 to the meeting, without major reconsideration by all stakeholders of all the proposed activities in the Larsemann Hills, and the implications for environmental management measures proposed in the plan.
- 64) Australia advised the Committee that the stakeholders had agreed to meet during the July 2006 COMNAP meeting in Hobart to thoroughly discuss India's proposed activities in the Larsemann Hills, and review the draft management plan to address the issues they raised. The resulting revised draft would be posted to the CEP Discussion Forum by September 2006, so that Members' comments could be sought and addressed. A new final draft would be submitted to CEP X with a view to recommending it to the ATCM for approval.

- 65) Following discussion with other Members, Chile agreed to convene an ICG to address matters raised in relation to the draft management plan for ASPA 150, primarily concerning the need to provide an appropriate alternative to the inclusion of a tourist zone within the ASPA. The Committee agreed that the ICG should operate in accordance with the Terms of Reference agreed at CEP VII and detailed in Annex 4 to the CEP VII Final Report.
- 66) Noting that the remaining four management plans had been considered by ICGs and revised to take into account comments received, the Committee agreed to refer them to the ATCM for approval. A list of these plans is in Appendix 2.

ii. Draft revised management plans which had not been reviewed by an ICG

- 67) The Committee considered three Working Papers containing ASPA management plans under this category:
- WP 9 *Revision of Management Plan for Antarctic Specially Protected Area No. 136 - Clark Peninsula, Budd Coast, Wilkes Land* (Australia)
 - WP 29 *Revision of Management Plan for ASPA 134 Cierva Point and offshore islands, Danco Coast, Antarctic Peninsula* (Argentina)
 - WP 31 *Review of Antarctic Specially Protected Area (ASPA) Nos. 116 and 131* (New Zealand)
- 68) The Committee considered that appropriate amendments had been made to these three management plans and agreed to refer them to the ATCM for approval (see Appendix 2).

iii. New draft management plans for protected/managed areas

- 69) The Committee considered WP 10 (rev 1) *Draft Antarctic Specially Protected Area (ASPA) Management Plan for Hawker Island, Vestfold Hills, Ingrid Christensen Coast, Princess Elizabeth Land, East Antarctica* (Australia). Noting that the plan was well prepared and provided for the protection of a species under consideration for listing as a Specially Protected Species under Annex II (southern giant petrel), the Committee agreed that the management plan should be referred to the ATCM for approval without intersessional review (see Appendix 2).

Other matters relating to management plans for protected / managed areas

- 70) Germany introduced WP 22 *Possibilities for environmental management of Fildes Peninsula and Ardley Island. Proposal to establish an intersessional contact group* (Brazil, China, Germany, Republic of Korea, Russian Federation), and proposed establishing an ICG to formalise the discussion process on a management system for the Fildes Peninsula region.
- 71) Some Members disagreed with this approach and instead recommended establishing an international working group, similar to the procedure followed during the development of the Deception Island ASMA management plan.
- 72) Spain drew the Committee's attention to the excellent results obtained in all scientific, logistic, tourist and environmental activities under the Deception Island ASMA management plan.
- 73) Uruguay welcomed any initiative to build on the present coordination of scientific, environmental management, logistic and tourism activities. It noted that the terms of reference for an organised working group should be broad to allow discussion of all possible alternatives, oriented to focus environmental management of Peninsula Fildes, including Site Guidelines as part of a step-by-step approach.
- 74) Consistent with paragraph 90 of the Final Report of ATCM XXVIII, without prejudice to any other effort to expand the protection of the Antarctic environment and dependent and associated ecosystems, and taking into account the view of WP 22/ATCM XXIX that the

Fildes Peninsula region (including Fildes Peninsula, Ardley Island and other adjacent smaller islands) needs a multiple use management system, it was agreed that:

- an international working group involving interested Parties is established in order to discuss management approaches, possibly aiming at drafting a management plan for an ASMA covering the Fildes Peninsula region;
 - the group will be open for government representatives of interested Parties and experts appointed by observer organizations. The group will be jointly convened by the German representative Ms Antje Neumann and the Chilean representative Ambassador Jorge Berguño. It will primarily work through an intersessional web-based exchange of information, in accordance with the CEP guidelines for ICGs, but it may meet at agreed intervals and venues provided by meetings of the Antarctic Treaty System; and
 - the group will take into account the data provided by the German research project “Risk assessment for the Fildes Peninsula and Ardley Island and the development of management plans for designation as Antarctic Specially Protected or Managed Areas”, the work of the CEP ICG on the draft revision of the management plan for Ardley Island prepared by Chile, and any other contribution which Parties to the international working group may provide.
- 75) The Committee noted that Chile, as a country with large and long-standing installations on King George Island, would host a workshop to prepare the input on this issue for discussion at CEP X.
- 76) The Secretariat introduced SP 7 *Register of the Status of Antarctic Specially Protected Area and Antarctic Specially Managed Area Management Plans (ATS)*, and explained the online register. In particular, it noted that the current static table could be made dynamic, with hyperlinks to digital copies of management plans. The CEP welcomed the work undertaken by the Secretariat and encouraged its further development as suggested in the paper.
- 77) The United Kingdom introduced IP 19 *Deception Island Antarctic Specially Managed Area (ASMA) Management Group*, on behalf of Argentina, Chile, Norway, Spain, United Kingdom and the United States. The paper outlined the considerable progress made by the Deception Island Working Group in implementing the Management Plan for ASMA N° 4, Deception Island. Previously reported conflicts of interest between science and tourism on the island had been largely resolved. The group expressed its concerns about the proliferation of graffiti at HSM N° 71, Whalers Bay. A new website (www.deceptionisland.aq) was launched this year in English and Spanish, describing the most relevant aspects of the Deception Island ASMA, and including a discussion forum for exchanging information.
- 78) Spain drew Members’ attention to uncontrolled yacht visits to Deception Island which had the potential to disturb remote scientific instruments.
- 79) The Russian Federation introduced WP 23 *Proposed improvements to measures designed to prevent environmental damage in Antarctica* and stated that this issue had been discussed in many ATCMs. The Environmental Protocol requires an EIA prior to any activity. Despite that, some operators do not comply with that requirement and carry out their activities with no intervention or control from the Parties. Since this implies a possible risk for the safety of those operators, the Russian Federation proposed a draft Decision for the Secretariat to establish a database containing a list of all permits issued to vessels and aircraft heading for Antarctica, the last harbour visited by the vessel, and copies of the EIAs.
- 80) The Committee agreed that this issue would be best discussed in the context of the existing requirements for exchange of information in accordance with Resolution 6(2001). Accordingly, Russia agreed that it would refer the paper to the Legal and Institutional Working Group.

- 81) The United States introduced IP 78 *McMurdo Dry Valleys Antarctic Specially Managed Area (ASMA No. 2) Management Group Report* on behalf of Italy, New Zealand and the United States. A workshop held in New Zealand in April 2006 had discussed issues relating to information exchange, education and outreach, and the results of inspections. During the next year the Management Group aimed to further develop practical management materials and tools, including a GIS and website.

7b) Historic Sites and Monuments

- 82) France introduced WP 19 *Proposed registration of the Landing Rock on the list of historical sites and monuments*, noting the historic importance of the rock upon which the French Dumont d'Urville Expedition landed in 1840. The Committee agreed to refer the site to the ATCM for inclusion on the list of Historic Sites and Monuments (see Appendix 3).
- 83) Chile introduced IP 92 *Antarctic Protected Area System: Revised list of historic Sites and Monuments. Measure 3 (2003). Draft Guidelines for its Application*. Chile reminded Members that Measure 3 (2003) consolidated the "List of Historical Monuments Identified and Described by the Proposing Government or Governments". Chile focused on this list as a management tool. The Committee welcomed this helpful paper.
- 84) With reference to IP 92, Norway provided information on the International Polar Heritage Committee (IPHC) under ICOMOS and reminded Members that the IPHC could provide useful support in the historic heritage work of the Committee and its Members.

7c) Other Annex V Matters

Marine Protected Areas

- 85) CCAMLR introduced WP 7 *The Work of CCAMLR on Marine Protected Areas*, outlining recent progress made by the 2005 CCAMLR Workshop on Marine Protected Areas (MPAs) (Workshop Report attached to WP 7), and recommendations subsequently agreed by CCAMLR-XXIV. It noted the importance of developing a strategic approach and harmonised regime to protect the Antarctic marine environment across the Antarctic Treaty System.
- 86) CCAMLR also outlined proposed work to undertake a bioregionalisation of the Southern Ocean, with the aim of providing a scientific basis for identifying representative areas for protection. A CCAMLR Steering Committee had been established to coordinate work towards a workshop in 2007 on this topic. CCAMLR invited the Committee to participate in the work of this Steering Committee towards the proposed workshop, and to initiate the work necessary to undertake a bioregionalisation of the coastal provinces.
- 87) The United Kingdom introduced WP 4 *Marine Protected Areas (MPAs): tools for protection and management*, and echoed CCAMLR in highlighting the importance of developing a harmonised approach to protecting the marine environment across the Southern Ocean. It noted that MPAs could encompass a broad range of protection and management tools, including ASPAs and ASMAs, as well as area-based management measures currently used by CCAMLR.
- 88) The United Kingdom also introduced IP 3 *Rationale for the development of MPAs in Antarctica*, which contained further background information on the objectives of MPAs, the types of areas that might be considered for protection, and the ways in which these objectives might be achieved using the tools available under the Environmental Protocol and CCAMLR.
- 89) The United Kingdom outlined the objectives of undertaking a bioregionalisation of the Southern Ocean, and the importance of such analysis in contributing to ongoing work by the CEP to elaborate a systematic environmental-geographic framework for protected areas. Delegates were referred to IP 6 *Approaches to marine bioregionalisation of the Southern Ocean* (United Kingdom), which provided further information on the methodologies that

might be used in such an analysis, including examples of where this type of work had been undertaken elsewhere, and details on the types of scientific information that may be required.

- 90) The Committee thanked CCAMLR and the United Kingdom for their papers and presentations on marine protected areas.
- 91) IUCN introduced IP 59 *Marine Protected Areas in the Southern Ocean: a focus on CCAMLR*. Having had a long interest in the use of MPAs, it welcomed this discussion by the Committee and offered to assist future work.
- 92) In relation to IP 104 (rev 1) *Notes on Bioregionalisation in Antarctica and the Southern Ocean* (Chile), Argentina acknowledged the efforts of Chile but reserved its position with respect to several aspects of this paper, *inter alia*, the alleged sub-Antarctic character of certain South American islands, and other references.
- 93) The United Kingdom supported Chile's concept that any bioregionalisation exercise of the Southern Ocean must duly take into account dependent and associated ecosystems lying north of 60° S. The United Kingdom reserved its position in respect of the Argentine statement.
- 94) In discussion, Members highlighted the need to base any further work on MPAs on a sustainable and scientific approach. In addition, risk should be a primary consideration for selecting areas for protection. It was also proposed that the Committee should consider other options for protecting and conserving the marine environment, alongside the development of MPAs.
- 95) Further points raised in discussion were the need to draw on experience from, and be consistent with, other areas of the world in developing a bioregionalisation of the Southern Ocean. In this regard, physical data must be used initially, and overlaid with biological information where available. The importance of considering the three-dimensional nature of marine biogeographic patterns was also noted. It was important to increase the availability of scientific information and to develop criteria to support the designation of MPAs.
- 96) Further work on MPAs should draw on a wide range of technical and scientific experts from all CEP Parties, Observers and Experts. It should also link with the Committee's work on Environmental Domains of Antarctica in the terrestrial environment. Consideration should be given to future workshops to provide information on data gaps and direct research.
- 97) The Observer from CCAMLR welcomed the discussion of collaboration with SC-CAMLR on this issue, and the participation of the CEP in working towards bioregionalisation in the Southern Ocean and the proposed 2007 workshop.
- 98) The Committee accepted in principle the recommendations outlined in WP 4, and agreed to:
 - continue its work towards the elaboration of a 'systematic environmental-geographic framework' and give further specific consideration to the inclusion of marine areas within such a framework;
 - endorse cooperation with CCAMLR on the protection of the marine environment, and particularly on the development of scientifically-based principles and criteria for MPAs;
 - welcome the proposal for a CCAMLR workshop on MPAs in 2007, and support the formation of a steering committee with participation from the CEP to work towards this workshop in accordance with the guidelines set out in paragraph 100 below; and
 - consider how it might best contribute to the proposed work towards a bioregionalisation of the Antarctic marine environment, by initially focusing on work on the coastal areas.
- 99) The Committee agreed that it should engage constructively with CCAMLR on the issue of bioregionalisation and MPAs. The Committee further agreed that, during the intersessional

period up to CEP X, the Chair of the CEP should represent the CEP on the Steering Committee.

- 100) The following guidelines were agreed to clarify the participation of the CEP Chair on the Steering Committee during this period, and to guide potential further collaboration of the CEP with SC-CAMLR on MPA development. The CEP Chair would:
- consult with CEP Members on the development of the terms of reference for the Steering Committee;
 - once the terms of reference have been agreed, consult with CEP Members on the nomination of additional CEP representatives, and a co-chair for the Steering Committee, as appropriate; and
 - report back to CEP X.
- 101) It was further recognised that, in parallel with the work of the Steering Committee, the CEP should continue to consider its requirements and priorities for developing a scientific approach to the protection of the marine environment. This could include consideration of a range of options and tools including, but not restricted to, MPAs.

Site Guidelines

- 102) The United Kingdom introduced WP 1 *Report of the CEP Intersessional Contact Group on Site Guidelines for Visitors to Antarctica*. The ICG was established to review the Site Guidelines adopted under Resolution 5 (2005) and any further Site Guidelines proposals. The terms of reference for the ICG were to consider the content, clarity, consistency and likely effectiveness of Site Guidelines. In addition to a paper review of the Site Guidelines and consideration of their user-friendliness, the United Kingdom led an on-site review to visit 10 of the 11 sites for which Site Guidelines had been prepared. The review team included representatives from the United Kingdom, Argentina, Australia, Norway, USA and IAATO. The results of the on-site review, together with further comments from ICG participants, were used to prepare revisions of 11 Site Guidelines for consideration by the Committee.
- 103) The Committee welcomed the work of the ICG and particularly commended the work undertaken by the on-site review team. It recognised that Site Guidelines were an important tool and complementary to the wider framework of area protection and management. The revised format greatly improved this tool.
- 104) The Committee agreed that the 11 Site Guidelines included in WP 1 should be referred to the ATCM for adoption (see Appendix 4).
- 105) IAATO introduced IP 66 *Brief Update on the Antarctic Peninsula Landing Site Visits and Site Guidelines*, which reported on sites visited by IAATO members during the 2005-2006 season. The paper also noted that IAATO intended to develop additional Site Guidelines, consistent with the format outlined in WP 1, over the next two years.
- 106) The United Kingdom introduced WP 2 *Policy Issues Arising from On-Site Review of Guidelines for Visitor Sites in the Antarctic Peninsula*, which was co-sponsored by Argentina, Australia, Norway and the United States, and prepared in conjunction with IAATO. This paper set out a range of recommendations for consideration by the CEP arising from the on-site review outlined in WP 1.
- 107) The review team considered that a range of management tools were appropriate for each site for which Site Guidelines had been prepared, and that these guidelines were suitable for the current level and type of visit to each site. The paper noted, however, that while the Site Guidelines established a daily maximum visitation rate, it was not desirable for any of the sites to have visitation up to these limits every day throughout the austral summer season.

- 108) Members endorsed the recommendations in the paper which were relevant to the CEP, noting that the CEP should:
- add Site Guideline issues to its wider consideration of area protection and management and work with SCAR to look at options for further studies on the potential impacts of Antarctic tourism;
 - consider options to work with the tourist industry to develop realistic likely future scenarios of Antarctic tourism and review the Site Guidelines if there is any significant change in the current level and type of visits to any of the sites;
 - consider establishing a framework for the consideration of all newly proposed Guidelines and for the review of Site Guidelines;
 - consider options for systematic and regular monitoring of sites covered by Site Guidelines;
 - together with Observers and Experts with specific knowledge of visited sites not already covered by visitor guidelines or other forms of site management, undertake site reviews and draft Site Guidelines, using a consistent format, as appropriate;
 - encourage those preparing new management plans (ASMAs) to look at those visitor management issues addressed by the Site Guidelines review ICG.
 - work with IAATO (and other interested Observers and Experts) to consider the issue of training for expedition leaders;
 - further consider the effectiveness of the proposed management tools in minimising visitor impacts in the context of ongoing work on monitoring and reporting; and
 - give further consideration to other options aimed to ensure effective visitor management at all landing sites in Antarctica.
- 109) In welcoming these recommendations, there was particular focus on the importance of ongoing monitoring of visitor sites, and the need for a framework for the review of existing Site Guidelines and consideration of new draft Site Guidelines. In this respect several Members highlighted that the review of Site Guidelines should be considered alongside other area protection and management issues.
- 110) SCAR noted that it has been involved in work on cumulative impacts and would be happy to be involved in the scientific aspects of site monitoring.
- 111) IAATO confirmed that it would continue to provide details of activities undertaken by its members at each site. The post-visit site report form also provided an opportunity for highlighting potential environmental impacts. IAATO also noted that it was in the process of developing a training and certification scheme for expedition leaders and field guides.
- 112) The Committee agreed to address the wider recommendations from WP 2 at CEP X.
- 113) France introduced WP 18 *Establishment of “areas of special tourist interest”* which followed on from IP 12 submitted to ATCM XXVIII. The establishment of such tourist areas would help to avoid conflict of site use between scientists and tourists and enable the cumulative impact of humans on the environment to be studied. The paper suggested that establishing basic infrastructure (observation huts, duckboards, light fences, information boards etc) at some main tourist sites may be appropriate. The paper highlighted the importance of keeping tourists’ needs in mind when considering appropriate sites for tourism.
- 114) Several delegations thanked France for their paper but some raised concerns about creating infrastructure specifically for tourists. One Member suggested that the term “visitor” might be more appropriate than “tourist” because scientists as well as tourists impact on the

- environment. IAATO valued the discussion but agreed with some Members that infrastructure was not necessary; existing management techniques were sufficient.
- 115) ASOC thanked France for an interesting paper and noted that it offered new approaches and perspectives about understanding and managing tourism that were lacking in other analyses.
- 116) France noted that the paper had been intended to promote discussion and welcomed other views. Its concern was to minimise the environmental impact of all visitors, scientists and tourists. France agreed to introduce WP 18 to the Tourism Working Group for further discussion.
- 117) The United Kingdom presented WP 40 *Site Guidelines for Goudier Island, Port Lockroy* and explained the importance of this historic site. It considered that the adoption of Site Guidelines would assist protection, following several recent examples of difficulties with visits to the area by non IAATO-affiliated yachts. The Committee agreed to refer these Site Guidelines to the ATCM for adoption (see Appendix 4).
- 118) The United States introduced IP 27 *Antarctic Site Inventory: 1994-2006*, which updated results of the Antarctic Site Inventory through February 2006. In twelve seasons, the Inventory had made 704 visits to 103 locations in the Antarctic Peninsula, including repetitive visits to all of the sites most frequently visited by expedition tourists. It was noted that the Inventory regularly censuses the sites that are subject to the Site Guidelines referred to the ATCM for approval, and that continued reporting of the census results would assist the Committee's future review of these Guidelines.
- 119) The Committee acknowledged the ongoing importance of long-term monitoring of biological indicators at visited sites, and welcomed the work of Oceanites Inc. Particularly since the revised format of site use guidelines included less background detail than the original drafts, it remained essential that tour ships carry the Compendium of Antarctic Peninsula Visitor Sites as the key reference for such background information.
- 120) Argentina introduced IP 31 *Tourism development in the Antarctic Peninsula: a regional approach*, aiming to contribute to a better understanding of the dynamics of tourist activities in the Antarctic Peninsula during the first half of this decade. A statistical analysis of visits to sites in the four regions of the Antarctic Peninsula was made. The paper highlighted the increasing proportion of tourist landings which occur at sites along the Gerlache Strait. Argentina noted that this kind of analysis would help prioritise sites to be considered for Site Guidelines, and would also provide a basis for assessment of trends over time.
- 121) ASOC introduced IP 65 *Managing Antarctic Tourism: A Critical Review of Site-Specific Guidelines*. It noted the problems posed by the *de facto* appropriation of sites for almost exclusive tourism use, which might result in granting tourism the same rights and access given to scientific activities. ASOC noted that, notwithstanding the progress made so far in the development of site-specific guidelines, these guidelines were insufficient to manage tourism since this activity involves more than landing passengers at certain sites.

Systematic Environmental Geographic Framework

- 122) New Zealand made a presentation on WP 32 *Systematic Environmental Protection in Antarctica*, which provided an update on progress towards a "systematic environmental geographic framework" under Annex V. The paper noted that the "proof of concept" classification of Antarctica into 20 Environments (an environmental regionalisation) using Environmental Domains Analysis, as presented at CEP VIII, had been checked and refined. Ice temperature data, information in management plans for ASPAs and ASMAs, and the ice-free digital data layer in SCAR's Antarctic Digital Database had been used for this.
- 123) New Zealand thanked the Russian Federation and Australia for contributing data that had helped refine the continental- and fine-scale classification. A fine-scale classification of the Larsemann Hills area would soon be available as another example of how the domains approach can help in small areas of high interest. Analyses to date had shown that a few of

the initially classified Environments are well represented in ASPAs or ASMAAs but several ice-free and ice sheet environments that may face risks from human activities are not.

- 124) The Committee expressed warm appreciation for this work by New Zealand. Some Members emphasised how it would help the Committee carry out a variety of environmental protection tasks. The Committee encouraged New Zealand to bring final results to CEP X.

Item 8: Conservation of Antarctic Fauna and Flora

Quarantine and non-native species

- 125) The United Kingdom presented WP 5 (rev1) *Practical Guidelines for Ballast Water Exchange in the Antarctic Treaty Area*. The aim of the guidelines was to support early implementation of the ‘International Convention for the Control and Management of Ships’ Ballast Water and Sediments, 2004’ (IMO Ballast Water Management Convention). The practical guidelines set out in the Working Paper would reduce the risk of introducing non-native marine species into Antarctica through ballast water. Before CEP IX, the draft guidelines were circulated to COMNAP members and all comments were taken on board. The guidelines were also discussed at the 54th session of the Marine Environment Protection Committee (MEPC) of the IMO and received significant support.
- 126) The Committee thanked the United Kingdom for the work and agreed to submit the guidelines to the ATCM for adoption, and subsequent submission to the 55th session of the IMO’s MEPC for consideration of extending them to all shipping activities (see Appendix 5).
- 127) New Zealand introduced WP 13 *Non-native Species in the Antarctic. Report of a Workshop* and the accompanying IP 46 “*Non-native Species in the Antarctic*” *A Workshop*. The workshop took place in New Zealand from 10 to 12 April 2006 and arose from discussion at CEP VIII of Australia’s WP 28. The key issues outlined in the paper included, but were not limited to, the transfer of species both into and within the Antarctic, and the need for practical preventive measures.
- 128) Several Members thanked New Zealand for the paper and agreed that the introduction of non-native species to the region requires close consideration, particularly as a warming climate is expected to increase the ability of new introduced species to survive in the Antarctic. The Chair recalled that similar issues had been recognised as important during the recent CEP Workshop on “Antarctica’s Future Environmental Challenges” (WP 42).
- 129) The Committee strongly supported the six key recommendations arising from the workshop, including that:
- the issue of non-native species should be given the highest priority consistent with the high environmental standards set out in the Protocol; a “zero tolerance approach”
 - the CEP should take the lead on this issue;
 - the CEP should give consideration to sharing information with, and seeking advice from, other bodies, notably SCAR, CCAMLR, COMNAP, IAATO, IUCN and other organisations as appropriate (e.g. IMO);
 - dedicated research is required to improve understanding of, *inter alia*, existing biological and genetic diversity, species distributions and bio geographic zones, the potential implications of a warming climate and identification of high risk areas and ecosystems; particular research attention needs to be given to microbial communities and marine ecosystems;
 - to the extent possible, non-native species issues concerns should be built into existing procedures and practices; notably EIA procedures and the protected areas system; and

- a set of comprehensive and standardised guidance and/or procedures should be developed, aimed at all operators in the Antarctic, based on a “Prevention, Surveillance, Response” approach.
- 130) Argentina stressed that the zero tolerance approach should be applied consistently, including to fishing vessels. Germany suggested that it would be very helpful to Members if a central database recording new species was created. SCAR underlined the importance of establishing a baseline against which to evaluate new introductions and change over time, noting that the RiSCC program in particular was looking at this issue for terrestrial systems. Australia suggested that the Life Sciences Standing Scientific Group of SCAR might be able to work with SCARMarBIN to assist with increasing understanding of marine species distribution.
- 131) New Zealand thanked Members for their helpful feedback and noted that there was a global invasive species database co-ordinated in Auckland by IUCN. New Zealand would make contact with the group to investigate opportunities for using the database to help work related to non-native species in the Antarctic. New Zealand also said that it recognised that not all risks were uniform, and that the greatest risks should be identified. The Committee gratefully accepted New Zealand’s offer to collaborate with colleagues to continue work on this issue during the intersessional period.
- 132) SCAR made reference to the *Code of Conduct for field work: Transfer of alien species to Antarctica and subantarctic islands and between location transfer of species*, which was circulated for the information of the Committee. SCAR offered to reiew and update these in the intersessional period and submit them for the Committee’s consideration at CEP X.
- 133) New Zealand undertook to convey the workshop papers and details of the Committee’s discussions to CCAMLR.

Specially Protected Species

- 134) SCAR introduced WP 38 *Proposal to list Southern Giant Petrel as a Specially Protected Species under Annex II*. The proposal had been prepared to conform to the *Guidelines for CEP Consideration of Proposals for New and Revised Designations of Antarctic Specially Protected Species under Annex II of the Protocol* agreed at CEP VIII and included in the CEP Report at Annex 8.
- 135) SCAR noted that the analysis had been undertaken at a global scale and clearly indicated that, on the basis of data available in 2005, the species was classified as Vulnerable, a category agreed by the CEP to justify listing for Special Protection (Resolution 1 (2002)). SCAR also noted that at the recent meeting of the ACAP Status and Trends Working Group, new population data had been tabled for populations outside the Treaty Area, which could change the level of global threat assessment.
- 136) SCAR indicated that these data indicated a substantial increase in the global population, sufficient to require a reappraisal of the IUCN category in the near future. If such a reappraisal changed the status from Vulnerable to Near Threatened, then listing as a Specially Protected Species would not be justified under the procedure agreed by the CEP (Annex 8 of the Final Report of CEP VIII).
- 137) During the discussion a wide variety of views were expressed and it was clearly recognised that, even if the level of threat assessment was reduced for the species globally, there would still be great concern over the declines in Antarctic regional populations. Pending the outcome of the anticipated reappraisal, the Committee recommended that the ATCM adopt a Resolution to ensure that colonies of this species are not negatively impacted by those visiting Antarctica.
- 138) The Committee urged SCAR to prepare, in the intersessional period, a draft Action Plan to facilitate development of an agreed template before CEP X. SCAR was also urged to prepare proposals for listing other species that fell into the appropriate IUCN status

categories, following CEP guidelines and including the direct application of the five risk assessment criteria currently used by IUCN to further clarify the process.

- 139) It was recognised that while SCAR had been asked to assess species at a global level there were important concerns for negative population trends in the Antarctic region. Members were invited to consider the issue of giving Specially Protected status to regional populations in the Antarctic to provide a basis for discussion at CEP X.
- 140) SCAR presented WP 39 *Proposal to De-list Antarctic Fur Seals as Specially Protected Species*. SCAR said that the fur seals were a conservation success-story, noting that the populations within the Antarctic Treaty Area were expected to continue to increase.
- 141) New Zealand noted that an assessment of the future vulnerability of fur seals using the up-to-date IUCN criterion E had not been made. The concern was mainly about future risks from incidental fur seal mortality in the krill fishery and impacts of the krill fishery on seal food availability, rather than present or past risks. Good data on these now would enable future risks from trends in seal by-catch and food sources to be monitored and assessed. New Zealand recognised that the issue of delisting fur seals was complex, not least because of past exploitation, future environmental change and public concerns. New Zealand also stressed that protection of the New Zealand fur seal would not in anyway be lessened by a decision to delist Antarctic and Subantarctic fur seals.
- 142) Chile agreed with the concerns expressed by New Zealand in consideration of the yet to be published data, which suggest that there could be ecological interactions at the local level in the region of the Antarctic Peninsula.
- 143) The Committee considered that the scientific advice outlined in WP 39 was comprehensive, consistent with the Guidelines adopted at CEP VIII, and sufficient to inform a decision to propose delisting. It agreed to recommend that the ATCM remove the two fur seal species from the list of Specially Protected Species under Annex II. In doing so, the Committee emphasised its understanding that the species would continue to receive the comprehensive general protection afforded to all Antarctic seal species under the Protocol.
- 144) The Committee requested that SCAR take regular advice from CCAMLR on the level of incidental seal mortality, potential impacts of krill harvest on seal populations, and the development and effectiveness of mitigation measures in the krill fishery.

Marine acoustics

- 145) SCAR introduced WP 41 *SCAR Report on Marine Acoustics and the Southern Ocean* which reported on the third SCAR workshop on the subject of marine acoustics in the Southern Ocean. It also introduced IP 98 *Broadband Calibration of Marine Seismic Sources – A Case Study*. SCAR reported that it had used the COMNAP survey of marine acoustic systems employed by National Antarctic Program Vessels (submitted to the CEP as IP 84) and, following discussions with the IWC Secretariat and others, had updated risk assessments undertaken two years earlier. SCAR noted that the recommended mitigation procedures were being used by most permitting authorities, however further data was needed to ensure these procedures were as relevant and effective as possible. In particular further research was needed to establish the natural levels of background noise as well as that emanating from human activities. SCAR noted that conclusions drawn from the use of military sonar were not relevant in the Antarctic Treaty Area.
- 146) Spain noted that COMNAP cooperates closely with the HCA/IHO on nautical cartography and had undertaken the survey of acoustic instruments used by national operators to inform studies into the possible effects of anthropogenic noise on marine mammals in Antarctic waters. Germany suggested that COMNAP also needed to take account of the use by some Parties of fixed acoustic sounding equipment in this study. IAATO stated it had detailed information on its members' vessels' routes and equipment and could contribute this information towards future discussions.

- 147) Several delegations thanked SCAR for its important work on this complex subject. The Committee noted the recommendations from the workshop and looked forward to further SCAR updates as more information became available. The Committee agreed to keep this subject on the agenda and discuss it again at CEP X along with the report from the recent IWC workshop on marine acoustics.
- 148) Germany informed the Committee of a workshop on the use of seismic devices to be held in Dessau, Germany, 6-8 September 2006, and would provide further information on this subject to Members as soon as possible.
- 149) COMNAP agreed with the recommendations in WP 41 and was happy to continue with this work. However COMNAP noted the work was unlikely to be completed before the next CEP.
- 150) ASOC introduced IP 61 *An Update on Recent Noise Pollution Issues* which built on previous papers submitted to the ATCM and included recommendations for consideration by the Committee. ASOC commented that SCAR WP 41 and COMNAP IP 84 *Marine Acoustic Systems used by National Antarctic Program Vessels* were helpful contributions to the debate. ASOC reported that other international organisations were working on the management of, as well as research into, marine acoustics.

Other matters relating to the conservation of Antarctic fauna and flora

- 151) SCAR introduced WP 37 *Biodiversity in the Antarctic*, which had been submitted to ATCM XXVIII as IP 85 and was submitted to CEP IX at the request of several Parties. SCAR commented that biodiversity encompasses various levels of complexity, from the genetic level to the ecosystem level. The differences in biodiversity between the marine, freshwater and terrestrial environments also vary with both latitude and longitude. SCAR highlighted the need for further surveys, particularly in Eastern Antarctica, to improve understanding of Antarctic biodiversity. The Chair commented that this issue had also been raised at the recent CEP workshop.
- 152) Australia highlighted the opportunity the IPY provided to improve knowledge of Antarctic marine biodiversity, noting that data from the Census of Antarctic Marine Life (CAML) should be available shortly after the end of the IPY.
- 153) The Committee thanked SCAR for its excellent paper, and requested that SCAR keep the CEP informed of its ongoing efforts to improve knowledge of Antarctic biodiversity.
- 154) COMNAP introduced IP 82 *The use of Anti-fouling Biocide Paints by National Antarctic Program Vessels*. COMNAP asked Members to comply with requests for information on biocides in order to increase the understanding of their impact.
- 155) Other papers submitted under Agenda Item 8 included:
 - IP 44 *Principles underpinning Australia's approach to Antarctic quarantine management* (Australia)
 - IP 57 *Antarctic non-native species; what can we learn from the global situation?* (IUCN)
 - IP 83 *The Use of Ballast Water in Antarctica* (COMNAP)

Other matters relating to conservation of Antarctic Fauna and Flora

- 156) The United Kingdom introduced WP 3 *Wildlife Awareness Information for Aircraft Operations in Antarctica* and IP 2 *Wildlife Awareness Manual for the Antarctic Peninsula, South Shetland and South Orkney Islands*. The United Kingdom developed the Wildlife Awareness Manual to provide practical information on breeding wildlife colony locations for those operating aircraft within the Antarctic Peninsula. The manual helped with the

practical implementation of Resolution 2(2004), which set out *Guidelines for the Operation of Aircraft Near Concentrations of Birds in Antarctica*.

- 157) The Committee congratulated the United Kingdom on the work it had undertaken and agreed that the manual would be useful for all air operations, both by governmental and non-government operators. It was also noted that this type of manual would be useful for other regions of Antarctica, and that it would be a useful source of information for the revision and development of protected area management plans.
- 158) The Committee supported the recommendations in WP 3, and requested COMNAP to consider:
- options for providing readily accessible information about the location of wildlife concentrations for all areas of Antarctica in which aircraft operations may take place;
 - options for how such information could best be presented to aircrew for both fixed and rotating wing aircraft; and
 - the practicalities of how such a product might best be developed and updated.
- 159) COMNAP confirmed that it was happy to consider these options further. Argentina indicated that it was content to work with COMNAP to look at the possibility of translating COMNAP material into Spanish.

Item 9: Environmental Monitoring and Reporting

- 160) France introduced WP 16 *Environmental Monitoring and Reporting. Report of the Intersessional Contact Group*. France commented that there was limited participation in this work, likely due to the broad scope of the terms of reference. The ICG had emphasised the need to have a clear question to help inform the development of a monitoring program. It considered that monitoring could be usefully divided into two categories: (i) operational monitoring; (ii) environmental monitoring. Finally, it may be helpful to consider opportunities to draw on relevant environmental monitoring and reporting work being undertaken in the Arctic.
- 161) Members warmly welcomed the report and the efforts by France in coordinating the intersessional work on this complex subject. It was generally agreed that the proposed distinction between operational and environmental monitoring was helpful.
- 162) CCAMLR offered to share with the CEP its experience in ecosystem monitoring over the last 20 years, along with existing ecosystem models it had developed. The Committee welcomed this offer.
- 163) As host of the international secretariat of the Arctic Monitoring and Assessment Program (AMAP), Norway offered to bring information on AMAP's work to CEP X. Norway also noted that the biodiversity monitoring work of the Conservation of Arctic Fauna and Flora (CAFF) program may provide some guidance to the CEP's ongoing work on similar matters. It noted that both these Arctic bodies had permanent secretariats and funding, which was essential in facilitating their work. Norway suggested that the Committee may wish to consider whether it would be appropriate to establish a permanent group to deal with ongoing environmental monitoring and reporting issues, a suggestion that was also raised during the recent CEP workshop as reflected in WP 42. The Committee welcomed this offer from Norway and looked forward to receiving further information on this matter at a future meeting.
- 164) ASOC also thanked France for its work. ASOC looked forward to monitoring methodologies that could be readily applied, since monitoring issues had been discussed for many years, during which time there had been significant changes in Antarctica that posed further challenges.

- 165) COMNAP informed the Committee of IP 114 *COMNAP Report to ATCM XXIX* (submitted under Agenda Item 14) which reported on its work in relation to environmental monitoring and reporting. COMNAP asked the Committee to consider what operational indicators may assist its future work on this important subject.
- 166) SCAR introduced IP 88 *Practical Biological Indicators of Human Impacts in Antarctica* on behalf of COMNAP and SCAR. This paper focused on the outcomes of the meeting in Texas, attended by 44 participants from 14 countries. It focused on biological, rather than chemical or physical, indicators. However, the meeting had concluded that biological data alone would not provide a sound basis for decision-making; they should be used in tandem with chemical and physical indicators for a balanced picture. The importance of long-term datasets in underpinning this monitoring was emphasised.
- 167) Members were grateful to receive the summaries of activities outlined in WP 16, IP 114 and IP 88. The Committee recognised the substantial challenges in progressing this important issue and encouraged SCAR and COMNAP to report back to the CEP on further progress with environmental monitoring related work.
- 168) SCAR introduced IP 89 *Plans for an Antarctic Climate Assessment – Trends and Impacts* and highlighted the importance of this research. SCAR noted that 3 of its 5 main programmes relate to climate change matters. SCAR reported on work to be undertaken in conjunction with the World Climate Research Programme to assess the impacts of climate change on the Antarctic environment. The report of this work would be subject to peer review before submission to scientific journals. SCAR invited Parties to contribute to the assessment and consider joining the international steering committee to be formed at an international meeting in Hobart in July 2006.
- 169) Many Members emphasised the importance of research into the effects of climate change on the Antarctic environment and welcomed SCAR's proposal, and asked SCAR to keep the Committee updated on related research. In particular, these Members suggested that the Committee should consider the completed Assessment once it was published.
- 170) Another Member, while strongly supporting scientific research on climate change, did not support SCAR undertaking an Antarctic Climate Assessment and took the view that this was a matter for the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change.
- 171) New Zealand referred to IP 47 *Conference on Climate Change and Governance, Wellington, March 2006* which had addressed issues of relevance to the present discussions.
- 172) ASOC introduced IP 62 *The Antarctic and Climate Change*. ASOC commented on the importance of scientific research in Antarctica in improving understanding of climate change and the need to share knowledge in national and international fora. It noted that IP 62 echoed the vigorous discussions that took place at the CEP workshop, which raised the need to incorporate climate change into conservation and management decisions in Antarctica. ASOC also commented on the need to use the scientific knowledge learned from Antarctica in domestic and international fora to reduce the risk of dangerous climate change.
- 173) Other papers submitted under Agenda Item 9 included:
- IP 11 *An Update on the Antarctic Visitor Site Assessment Scheme: VISTA* (New Zealand)
 - IP 93 *The SCAR Marine Biodiversity Information Network (www.SCARMarBIN.be): A SCAR core IPY project* (Belgium)

Item 10: Inspection Reports

- 174) New Zealand introduced WP 33 *A Proposed Checklist for Inspecting Protected Areas in Antarctica* on behalf of New Zealand, the United Kingdom and the United States, and explained that New Zealand had created a checklist to ensure consistency across inspection sites. New Zealand proposed that the Committee review the draft checklist and consider

forwarding it to the ATCM for inclusion in the package available for inspections under Article 7 of the Treaty.

- 175) Argentina voiced some concerns about duplication between this checklist and the Antarctic Specially Protected Area Visit Report form in the *Guide to the Preparation of Management Plans for Antarctic Specially Protected Areas* appended to Resolution 2 (1998). It noted that some of the questions included in the draft checklist were not adequately formulated. Australia suggested that the checklist could be a useful framework when reviewing management plans. The United Kingdom agreed and explained that the checklist was not intended as a tool for post visit site reports but was a useful tool to use in the field to ensure consistency. The Committee agreed to revisit the matter at CEP X.
- 176) New Zealand introduced WP 34 *Ross Sea Protected Area Inspections 2006* on behalf of New Zealand, United Kingdom and the United States. New Zealand noted that Article 10 to Annex V of the Protocol provides for Parties to make arrangements for inspection visits to ASPAs and ASMAs. However, no formal comprehensive inspections of ASPAs or ASMAs had been conducted. The inspection team had used this opportunity to test the provisions of the Treaty for formal inspection visits.
- 177) The process had worked well and the paper contained a list of recommendations resulting from the visits. New Zealand reported that it had already incorporated some of the recommendations with regard to the Cape Bird site (ASPAs 116) into a review of its Management Plan for the area.
- 178) The United Kingdom commented on this excellent example of international cooperation and wished to remind Parties of the need to clearly mark and label all scientific equipment and to remove any equipment promptly when no longer required.
- 179) The Committee noted the report and was satisfied with the procedures followed and the outcomes of the inspections. It encouraged the use of the inspection process as a tool for assessing the status of protected areas in Antarctica.

Item 11 Emergency Response and Contingency Planning

- 180) France introduced WP 17 *Contingency Planning and Emergency Response* and explained that it was intended to promote discussion. France suggested that an intersessional group be convened to address safety concerns affecting operations and the environment. France suggested that this group should start by considering the historical record with regard to safety and take stock of existing means and contingency plans.
- 181) Several Members thanked France for raising this important issue and suggested that since this involved operational as well as environmental safety, COMNAP was best placed to take this work forward. COMNAP offered to submit an IP or WP on the subject to the Working Group on Operational Matters and the CEP next year. The Committee thanked COMNAP and noted that France had also submitted this Paper under Item 9 to the ATCM.
- 182) Ukraine introduced WP 36 *The Replacement of Fuel Tanks at Vernadsky Station* and reported that work would commence in the last quarter of 2006 and should be completed in 2007. Ukraine said that all work would be carried out in accordance with the Environmental Protocol, and that it would evaluate the environmental impact during both the building and operational phases.
- 183) The United Kingdom commended Ukraine and said it was pleased to see this work being undertaken as fuel storage at Verdansky had been the subject of recommendations in inspection reports.
- 184) Other papers submitted under Agenda Item 11 included:
 - IP 34 *Report of the Decommissioning of the Emergency Base (E Base) in Antarctica* (South Africa)

- IP 91 *IAATO Vessel Emergency Contingency Plan. An Update* (IAATO)

Item 12: Waste Management

185) No Working Papers were presented under this Agenda Item, and the Information Papers below were taken as read:

- IP 21 *Clean-up programme at Indian Scientific Base 'Maitri', Antarctica during Season: 2004-2005* (India)
- IP 45 *Fuel spill management in Antarctica: recent advances in first response and remediation* (Australia)
- IP 60 *Wastewater Treatment in Antarctica: Challenges and Process Improvements* (United States)
- IP 77 *Monitoring the remediation of the Thala Valley waste disposal site at Casey station* (Australia)
- IP 115 *Clean up of abandoned Cape Hallett Station* (New Zealand, United States).

Item 13: Prevention of Marine Pollution

186) Uruguay introduced IP 51 *Relevamiento de Desechos Marinos en la Costa Septentrional de la Base Científica Antártica Artigas (BCAA) en la Isla Rey Jorge / 25 de Mayo. Contribución a la Efectivización del Anexo IV "Prevención de la Contaminación Marina" del Protocolo*. Uruguay emphasised that it was important to cooperate with CCAMLR on monitoring marine debris, and this was its motivation for IP 51 which contained consolidated data from the last five years of survey at King George Island (Isla 25 de Mayo).

187) The Committee noted CCAMLR's Resolution to improve the safety of fishing vessels working at high latitudes in ice-covered areas, as well as that organisation's ongoing dialogue with the IMO on the matter.

Item 14: Cooperation with Other Organisations

188) Argentina introduced WP 28 *Cooperation between the CEP and SC-CAMLR: a synthesis and opportunities for the future*. The paper gave an overview of the cooperation between the Committee and CCAMLR since the establishment of the CEP. The paper also highlighted some specific areas of further possible cooperation and various ways to improve the cooperation between these two bodies.

189) Several Members and Observers welcomed Argentina's proposal and stressed that it was important to strengthen the cooperation between the CEP and the Scientific Committee of CCAMLR.

190) ASOC said that the paper underscored the need for greater integration and cooperation between the CEP and SC-CCAMLR to ensure the protection of the Antarctic environment and dependent and associated ecosystems in the Antarctic Treaty Area.

191) The Committee agreed that, as of CEP X, the report of the CEP observer to SC-CAMLR be presented as a Working Paper to ensure more detailed consideration by the CEP of areas of joint interest and, in this way, to generate a greater level of cooperation. The Committee also agreed that such reports include a list of contacts of those delegates responsible for the working groups of SC-CAMLR, such as the Working Group on *Ecosystem Monitoring and Management* and the Working Group on *Fish Stock Assessment*, as well as clear references to those sites where electronic versions of the final reports of the Meetings of SC-CAMLR can be found. This would facilitate and inspire the establishment of informal links between the representatives of the CEP and SC-CAMLR.

- 192) The Committee supported the proposal that the SC-CAMLR present, at future meetings of the CEP, syntheses of relevant issues (including baseline information, results, and expected tendencies), like the work of CEMP, fishery status, and marine debris monitoring activities.
- 193) The CCAMLR observer offered to provide an overview of SC-CAMLR's work at CEP X. This would focus on CCAMLR's advances in implementing its ecosystem approach to management, ecosystem monitoring and strategic model development. The Committee agreed that such a presentation would be useful.
- 194) The Chair, as CEP observer to SC-CAMLR, introduced IP 58 *Report of the CEP Observer to the twenty-fourth meeting of the Scientific Committee to CCAMLR, 24 to 28 October 2005*). The Chair noted the common interests between the work of SC-CAMLR and the CEP. The Chair highlighted the success, *inter alia*, of CCAMLR's measures to mitigate seabird by-catch in the long line fishery, but noted also that, in contrast, the incidental mortality of seabirds in long line fisheries outside the CCAMLR area remained very high with an estimated mortality of at least 13,500 birds, of which more than 10,000 were petrels or albatrosses. IUU fishing was also having a devastating impact on sea birds. The Chair noted that by-catch mitigation measures similar to CCAMLR in adjacent fisheries would dramatically reduce the global annual mortality of seabirds.
- 195) The Committee welcomed the information provided in IP 58 and noted in particular the reports of seabird by-catch and expressed its concern over the continuing high level of seabird by-catch due to illegal, unreported and unregulated fishing, and in long line fisheries adjacent to the Treaty and CCAMLR areas. In light of its discussions on Specially Protected Species the Committee welcomed the success of CCAMLR Members in reducing seabird by-catch through Conservation Measures, and CCAMLR's ongoing dialogue with other organisations.
- 196) The Committee recommended that the ATCM urge CCAMLR to work with the Secretariats of adjacent RFMOs in order to share information and best practice on ways to reduce seabird by-catch.
- 197) The Committee also requested SC-CAMLR to keep it informed of seabird by-catch data.
- 198) Australia introduced IP 67 *Progress with the implementation of the Agreement on the Conservation of Albatrosses and Petrels (ACAP): Report to ATCM XXIX & CEP IX from the ACAP Interim Secretariat hosted by the Australian Government*, on behalf of the depositary for the Agreement. The Committee agreed that it was important to maintain close cooperation and contact with ACAP and recalled its decision at CEP VIII to recommend that the ATCM invite the interim secretariat of ACAP to be an Observer at meetings of the CEP. The Committee hoped that ACAP would be able to take up the offer at CEP X.
- 199) The Committee also noted ACAP's suggestion to consider designating ASPAs in order to afford protection to breeding populations of southern giant petrels. The Committee noted that it had agreed to recommend that ATCM XXIX adopt the management plan for Hawker Island in the Vestfold Hills in order to protect the breeding populations of southern giant petrels.
- 200) The Committee agreed to consider further ASPAs for this purpose at CEP X.
- 201) COMNAP reminded Members that its IP 114 *COMNAP Annual Report to ATCM XXIX* included updates on a number of COMNAP activities relevant to the work of the CEP, in particular: (1) review of fuel storage and handling guidelines; and (2) accident, incident and near-miss reporting.
- 202) Recalling discussions under Agenda Item 8, the Members agreed that a representative of the Scientific Committee of the IWC be invited to present, if possible, a report on the IWC marine acoustics workshop to CEP X.

Item 15: General Matters

- 203) India introduced WP 20 *Establishment of a New Indian Research Base in the Larsemann Hills, East Antarctica*. India made a presentation on WP 20, explaining its plans to establish a new scientific base in the Larsemann Hills and the geological links between the Eastern Ghats in India and this part of Antarctica.
- 204) Australia offered to share with India scientific data and information about past and current research in the area. India warmly welcomed this offer.
- 205) ASOC thanked India for its presentation and noted that the building of a new base in the Larsemann Hills represented a diminution of the wilderness values of the region. It also noted that the location of the proposed base should be decided after a CEE which had taken into consideration the alternatives.
- 206) New Zealand expressed disappointment with the delay in the application of environmental impact assessment to the base proposal.
- 207) Germany introduced IP 43 *Start of the Antarctic Discussion Forum of Competent Authorities (DFCA)* on behalf of Germany and the Netherlands. Germany reported that a DFCA had been established in accordance with a decision taken at CEP VIII. Competent authorities were invited to take part in both the forum and a workshop to be held in Berlin later in 2006 to further develop the concept and application of the forum.
- 208) Estonia informed the Committee that it hoped to accede to the Protocol early in 2007.
- 209) Other papers submitted under Agenda Item 15 included:
- SP 10 *Template for Annual Reporting under Article 17 of the Environment Protocol* (Secretariat)
 - IP 1 *Report on the Implementation of the Protocol on Environmental Protection as required by Article 17 of the Protocol* (United Kingdom)
 - IP 4 *Annual Report submitted by France on the Protocol on Environmental Protection to the Antarctic Treaty as required by Article 17 of the Protocol, 2006* (France)
 - IP 14 *Annual Report of China Pursuant to Article 17 of the Protocol on Environmental Protection to the Antarctic Treaty* (China)
 - IP 15 *Informe anual de España de acuerdo con el Artículo 17 del Protocolo al Tratado Antártico sobre Protección del Medio Ambiente* (Spain)
 - IP 16 *Annual Report pursuant to the Protocol on Environmental Protection to the Antarctic Treaty* (Belgium)
 - IP 17 *Annual Report Pursuant to the Protocol on Environmental Protection to the Antarctic Treaty* (South Africa)
 - IP 26 *Annual Report pursuant to Article 17 of the Protocol on Environmental Protection to the Antarctic Treaty* (Italy)
 - IP 32 *Chinese Antarctic Environmental Report (2005-2006)* (China)
 - IP 36 *Annual report pursuant to the Protocol on Environmental Protection to the Antarctic Treaty* (Romania)
 - IP 48 *Annual report pursuant to Article 17 of the Protocol on Environmental Protection to the Antarctic Treaty* (Ukraine)
 - IP 50 *Informe Anual de Acuerdo al Artículo 17 del Protocolo al Tratado Antártico sobre Protección del Medio Ambiente. Periodo 2005 – 2006* (Uruguay)
 - IP 75 *Annual Report of New Zealand pursuant to Article 17 of the Protocol on Environmental Protection to the Antarctic Treaty 2005/2006* (New Zealand)

- IP 100 *Annual Report pursuant to Article 17 of the Protocol on Environmental Protection to the Antarctic Treaty Japan 2005/2006 Season* (Japan)
- IP 105 *Annual Report Pursuant to the Protocol on Environmental Protection to the Antarctic Treaty* (Korea, Republic of)

Item 16: Election of Officers

210) Dr Neil Gilbert was elected to the position of CEP Chair and Dr Tania Brito was elected to the position of Vice-chair. The Committee warmly welcomed these appointments, to take effect from the end of CEP IX. The Committee also expressed its sincere thanks and appreciation to the outgoing Chair, Dr Tony Press, for his excellent guidance of the Committee's work over the last four years.

Item 17: Preparation for CEP X

211) The Committee adopted the agenda for CEP X in Appendix 6.

Item 18: Adoption of the Report

212) The Committee adopted the draft Report.

Item 19: Closing of the Meeting

213) The Chair closed the meeting on Friday 16 June 2006.

ANNEX 1

CEP IX Agenda and Final List of Documents

<i>Paper No.</i>	<i>Title</i>	<i>Submitted By</i>
Item 1: Opening of the Meeting		
Item 2: Adoption of the Agenda		
Item 3: Strategic Discussion on the Future of the CEP		
WP 42	Antarctica's Future Environmental Challenges. A summary report of the CEP Workshop	United Kingdom, Australia, France
IP 113 (rev 1)	Antarctica's Future Environmental Challenges. Report of the CEP Workshop, Edinburgh, United Kingdom, 9-10 June 2006	United Kingdom, Australia, France
Item 4: Operation of the CEP		
WP 11	Committee for Environmental Protection (CEP) Handbook	Australia
SP 10	Template for Annual Reporting under Article 17 of the Environment Protocol	ATS
Item 5: International Polar Year		
IP 64	A Glimpse Into The Environmental Legacy Of The International Polar Year 2007-2008	ASOC
Item 6: Environmental Impact Assessment		
6a) Draft Comprehensive Environmental Evaluations		
WP 25	Construction and operation of the new Belgian Research Station in Dronning Maud Land, Antarctica. Draft Comprehensive Environmental Evaluation (CEE)	Belgium
IP 22	Construction and operation of the new Belgian Research Station in Dronning Maud Land, Antarctica. Draft Comprehensive Environmental Evaluation (CEE)	Belgium
IP 18	Update on the Comprehensive Environmental Evaluation (CEE) for the Proposed Construction and Operation of Halley VI Research Station, Brunt Ice Shelf, Caird Coast, Antarctica	United Kingdom
6b) Other EIA Matters		
SP 8	Annual list of Initial Environmental Evaluations (IEE) and Comprehensive Environmental Evaluations (CEE) prepared between April 1st 2005 and March 31st 2006	ATS
IP 94	Station Sharing in Antarctica	ASOC
IP 68	Russian Studies of the subglacial Lake Vostok in the season of 2005-2006 and Work Plans for the season of 2006-2007	Russian Federation
IP 69	Drilling of Additional 75 m in deep Borehole 5G-1 at Vostok Station. Initial Environmental Evaluation	Russian Federation
IP 99	The Czech Antarctic Station of Johann Gregor Mendel - from project to realization	Czech Republic
IP 81	Initial Environmental Evaluation. Law-Racovita Base	Romania

IP 42	Initial Environmental Evaluation (IEE): Construction and operation of Enigma Runway for light aircrafts at the Mario Zucchelli Station (Terra Nova Bay, Ross Sea, Antarctica)	Italy
IP 80	Methodologies for Assessing Cumulative Impacts: A Progress Report	New Zealand
IP 63	Beyond Direct Impacts of Multi-Year Maintained Ice Routes Case Study: McMurdo-South Pole Surface Re-Supply Traverse	ASOC

Item 7: Area Protection and management Plans

7a) Management Plans

i. Draft management plans which have been reviewed by an intersessional contact group (ICG)

WP 8	Management Plan for the Larsemann Hills Antarctic Specially Managed Area	Australia, China, Romania, Russian Federation
WP 12	Antarctic Protected Areas System: Proposal for a New Protected Area at Edmonson Point, Wood Bay, Ross Sea	Italy
WP 21 (rev 1)	Proposal of classification as Specially Protected Area n° 46 Port-Martin (Terre-Adelie)	France
WP 24 (rev 1)	Management Plan for Antarctic Specially Protected Area 127 Haswell Island (Haswell Island and Adjacent Emperor Penguin Rookery on Fast Ice)	Russian Federation
WP 26 (rev 1)	Review of the Admiralty Bay Antarctic Specially Managed Area Management Plan (ASMA No 1)	Brazil, Peru, United States
WP 30	Revision of Management Plan for Antarctic Specially Protected Area No. 150 Ardley Island	Chile

ii. Draft revised management plans which have not been reviewed by an ICG

WP 9	Revision of Management Plan for Antarctic Specially Protected Area No. 136 - Clark Peninsula, Budd Coast, Wilkes Land	Australia
WP 29	Revisión del Plan de Gestión de la ZAEP 134 Punta Cierva e Islas Offshore, Costa Danco, Península Antártica	Argentina
WP 31	Review of Antarctic Specially Protected Area (ASPA) Nos. 116 and 131	New Zealand

iii. New draft management plans for protected/managed areas

WP 10 rev 1	Draft Antarctic Specially Protected Area (ASPA) Management Plan for Hawker Island, Vestfold Hills, Ingrid Christensen Coast, Princess Elizabeth Land, East Antarctica	Australia
-------------	---	-----------

Other matters relating to Management Plans for Protected / Managed Areas

WP 22	Possibilities for environmental management of Fildes Peninsula and Ardley Island. Proposal to establish an intersessional contact group	Brazil, China, Germany, Republic of Korea, Russian Federation
SP 7	Register of the Status of Antarctic Specially Protected Area	ATS

	and Antarctic Specially Managed Area Management Plans	
IP 19	Deception Island Antarctic Specially Managed Area (ASMA) Management Group	Argentina, Chile, Norway, Spain, United Kingdom, United States
WP 23	Proposed improvements to measures designed to prevent environmental damage in Antarctica	Russian Federation
IP 55	Update on the Draft Management Plan for ASMA ? Amundsen-Scott South Pole Station, South Pole	United States
IP 78	McMurdo Dry Valleys Antarctic Specially Managed Area (ASMA No. 2) Management Group Report	Italy, New Zealand, United States

7b) Historic Sites and Monuments

WP 19	Proposed registration of the Landing Rock on the list of historical sites and monuments	France
IP 92	Antarctic Protected Area System: Revised list of historic Sites and Monuments. Measure 3 (2003)	Chile

7c) Other Annex V Matters

Marine Protected Areas

WP 7	The work of CCAMLR on Marine Protected Areas	CCAMLR
WP 4	Marine Protected Areas (MPAs) – Tools for Protection and Management	United Kingdom
IP 3	Rationale for the development of Marine Protected Areas (MPAs) in Antarctica	United Kingdom
IP 6	Approaches to Marine Bioregionalisation for the Southern Ocean	United Kingdom
IP 59	Marine Protected Areas in the Southern Ocean: A focus on CCAMLR	IUCN
IP 104 (rev 1)	Notes on Bioregionalisation in Antarctica and the Southern Ocean	Chile

Site Guidelines

WP 1	Report of the CEP Intersessional Contact Group on Site Guidelines for Visitors to Antarctica	United Kingdom
IP 66	Brief Update on the Antarctic Peninsula Landing Site Visits and Site Guidelines	IAATO
WP 2	Policy Issues Arising from On-Site Review of Guidelines for Visitor Sites in the Antarctic Peninsula	United Kingdom
WP 18	Establishment of “areas of special tourist interest”	France
WP 40	Site Guidelines for Goudier Island, Port Lockroy	United Kingdom
IP 27	Antarctic Site Inventory: 1994-2006	United States
IP 31	Tourism development in the Antarctic Peninsula: a regional approach	Argentina
IP 65	Managing Antarctic Tourism: A Critical Review of Site-Specific Guidelines.	ASOC

Systematic Environmental Geographic Framework

WP 32	Systematic Environmental Protection in Antarctica	New Zealand
-------	---	-------------

Item 8: Conservation of Antarctic Flora and Fauna

Quarantine and non-native species

WP 5 (rev 1)	Practical Guidelines for Ballast Water Exchange in the Antarctic Treaty Area	United Kingdom
WP 13	Non-native Species in the Antarctic. Report of a Workshop	New Zealand
IP 46	“Non-native Species in the Antarctic” A Workshop	New Zealand

Specially Protected Species

WP 38	Proposal to List Southern Giant Petrel as a Specially Protected Species	SCAR
WP 39	Proposal to De-list Antarctic Fur Seals as Specially Protected Species	SCAR

214) Marine acoustics

WP 41	SCAR Report on Marine Acoustics and the Southern Ocean	SCAR
IP 98	Broadband Calibration of Marine Seismic Sources – A Case Study	SCAR
IP 61	An Update on Recent Noise Pollution Issues	ASOC
IP 84	Marine Acoustic Systems used by National Antarctic Program Vessels	COMNAP
WP 37	Biodiversity in the Antarctic	SCAR
IP 82	The use of Anti-fouling Biocide Paints by National Antarctic Program Vessels	COMNAP

215) Other Papers

IP 44	Principles underpinning Australia’s approach to Antarctic quarantine management	ASOC
IP 57	Antarctic non-native species; what can we learn from the global situation?	IUCN
IP 85	Land-Based Tourism and the Development of Land-based Tourism Infrastructure in Antarctica: An IAATO Perspective	IAATO
IP 83	The Use of Ballast Water in Antarctica	COMNAP

216)

Item 9: Environmental Monitoring and Reporting

WP 16	Environmental Monitoring and Reporting. Report of the Intersessional Contact Group.	France
IP 88	Practical Biological Indicators of Human Impacts in Antarctica	COMNAP, SCAR
IP 89	Plans for an Antarctic Climate Assessment – Trends and Impacts	SCAR
IP 47	Conference on Climate Change and Governance, Wellington, March 2006	New Zealand

IP 62	The Antarctic and Climate Change	ASOC
IP 11	An Update on the Antarctic Visitor Site Assessment Scheme: VISTA	New Zealand
IP 93	The SCAR Marine Biodiversity Information Network (<i>www.SCARMarBIN.be</i>): A SCAR core IPY project	Belgium

Item 10: Inspection Reports

WP 33	A Proposed Checklist for Inspecting Protected Areas in Antarctica	New Zealand, United Kingdom, United States
WP 34	Ross Sea Protected Area Inspections 2006	New Zealand, United Kingdom, United States

Item 11: Emergency Response and Contingency Planning

WP 17	Contingency Planning and Emergency Response	France
WP 36	The Replacement of Fuel Tanks at Vernadsky Station	Ukraine
IP 34	Report of the Decommissioning of the Emergency Base (E Base) in Antarctica	South Africa
IP 91	IAATO Vessel Emergency Contingency Plan. An Update	IAATO

Item 12: Waste Management

IP 21	Clean-up programme at Indian Scientific Base 'Maitri', Antarctica during Season: 2004-2005	India
IP 45	Fuel spill management in Antarctica: recent advances in first response and remediation	Australia
IP 60	Wastewater Treatment in Antarctica: Challenges and Process Improvements	United States
IP 77	Monitoring the remediation of the Thala Valley waste disposal site at Casey station	Australia
IP 115	Clean up of abandoned Cape Hallett Station	New Zealand, United States

Item 13: Prevention of Marine Pollution

IP 51	Relevamiento de Desechos Marinos en la Costa Septentrional de la Base Científica Antártica Artigas (BCAA) en la Isla Rey Jorge / 25 de Mayo. Contribución a la Efectivización del Anexo IV "Prevención de la Contaminación Marina" del Protocolo.	Uruguay
-------	---	---------

Item 14: Cooperation with Other Organisations

WP 28	Cooperation between the CEP and SC-CAMLR: a synthesis and opportunities for the future	Argentina
IP 58	Report of the CEP Observer to the twenty-fourth meeting of the Scientific Committee to CCAMLR, 24 to 28 October 2005	Australia
IP 67	Progress with the implementation of the Agreement on the Conservation of Albatrosses and Petrels (ACAP): Report to ATCM XXIX & CEP IX from the ACAP Interim Secretariat	Australia

	hosted by the Australian Government	
IP 114	COMNAP Report to ATCM XXIX	COMNAP

Item 15: General Matters

WP 20	Establishment of a New Indian Research Base in the Larsemann Hills, East Antarctica	India
IP 43	Start of the Antarctic Discussion Forum of Competent Authorities (DFCA)	Germany, Netherlands
IP 1	Report on the Implementation of the Protocol on Environmental Protection as required by Article 17 of the Protocol	United Kingdom
IP 4	Annual Report submitted by France on the Protocol on Environmental Protection to the Antarctic Treaty as required by Article 17 of the Protocol. 2006	France
IP 14	Annual Report of China Pursuant to Article 17 of the Protocol on Environmental Protection to the Antarctic Treaty	China
IP 15	Informe anual de España de acuerdo con el Artículo 17 del Protocolo al Tratado Antártico sobre Protección del Medio Ambiente	Spain
IP 16	Annual Report pursuant to the Protocol on Environmental Protection to the Antarctic Treaty	Belgium
IP 17	Annual Report Pursuant to the Protocol on Environmental Protection to the Antarctic Treaty	South Africa
IP 26	Annual Report pursuant to Article 17 of the Protocol on Environmental Protection to the Antarctic Treaty	Italy
IP 32	Chinese Antarctic Environmental Report (2005-2006)	China
IP 36	Annual report pursuant to the Protocol on Environmental Protection to the Antarctic Treaty	Romania
IP 48	Annual report pursuant to Article 17 of the Protocol on Environmental Protection to the Antarctic Treaty	Ukraine
IP 50	Informe Anual de Acuerdo al Artículo 17 del Protocolo al Tratado Antártico sobre Protección del Medio Ambiente. Periodo 2005 - 2006	Uruguay
IP 75	Annual Report of New Zealand pursuant to Article 17 of the Protocol on Environmental Protection to the Antarctic Treaty 2005/2006	New Zealand
IP 100	Annual Report pursuant to the Article 17 of the Protocol on Environmental Protection to the Antarctic Treaty. Japan 2005/2006 Season	Japan
IP 105	Annual Report Pursuant to the Protocol on Environmental Protection to the Antarctic Treaty	Korea, Republic

Item 16: Election of Officers

Item 17: Preparation for CEP X

Item 18: Adoption of the Report

Item 19: Closing of the Meeting

ANNEX 2**CEP National Contact Points**

Member Country	Contact Person	Email address
Argentina	Memolli Mariano Rodolfo Sánchez	<i>mgm@mrecic.gov.ar</i> <i>rsanchez@dna.gov.ar</i>
Australia	Tom Maggs Michael Stoddart	<i>tom.maggs@aad.gov.au</i> <i>michael.stoddart@aad.gov.au</i>
Belgium	Alexandre de Lichtervelde	<i>alexandre.delichtervelde@health.fgov.be</i>
Brazil	Tania Aparecida Silva Brito	<i>tania.brito@mma.gov.br</i>
Bulgaria	Christo Pimpirev Nesho Chipev	<i>polar@gea.uni-sofia.bg</i> <i>chipev@ecolab.bas.bg</i>
Canada	Fred Roots	<i>fred.roots@ec.gc.ca</i>
Chile	Verónica Vallejos	<i>vvallejos@inach.cl</i>
China	Wei Wen Liang Chen Danhong	<i>chinare@263.net.cn</i> <i>hydane@vip.sina.com</i>
Czech Republic	Zdenek Venera	<i>venera@env.cz</i>
Ecuador	Arturo Romero Velázquez	<i>digeim@digeim.armada.mil.ec</i>
Finland	Markus Tarasti Mika Kalakoski	<i>markus.tarasti@ymparisto.fi</i> <i>mika.kalakoski@fimr.fi</i>
France	Yves Frenot Laurence Petitguillaume	<i>yves.frenot@ipev.fr</i> <i>laurence.petitguillaume@environnement.gouv.fr</i>
Germany	Heike Herata Antje Neumann	<i>Heike.herata@uba.de</i> <i>antje.neumann@uba.de</i>
Greece	Gounaris, Emmanouil	
India	Shri Rasik Ravindra Ajai Saxena	<i>rasik@ncaor.org</i> <i>ajaisaxena@yahoo.com</i>
Italy	Sandro Torcini	<i>sandro.torcini@casaccia.enea.it</i>
Japan	Kousei Masu	<i>KOUSEI_MASU@env.go.jp</i>
Korea, Republic of	In-Young Ahn Jaeyong Choi	<i>iahn@kordi.re.kr</i> <i>jchoi@kei.re.kr</i>

Netherlands	Gerie Jonk	<i>gerie.jonk@minvrom.nl</i>
New Zealand	Neil Gilbert	<i>n.gilbert@antarcticanz.govt.nz</i>
Norway	Birgit Njaastad	<i>njaastad@npolar.no</i>
Peru	Hugo de Zela Fortunato Isasi-Cayo	<i>hdezela@ree.gob.pe</i> <i>fisassi@ree.gob.pe</i>
Poland	Mr Andrzej Tatur	<i>tatura@interia.pl</i>
Romania	Teodor Gheroghe-Negoita	<i>negoita_antarctic@yahoo.com</i>
Russian Federation	Valery Lukin Valery Martyshchenko	<i>lukin@raexp.spb.su/lukin@aari.nw.ru</i> <i>seadep@mcc.mecom.ru</i>
South Africa	Henry Valentine	<i>henryv@antarc.wcape.gov.za</i>
Spain	Manuel Catalan	<i>cpe@mec.es</i> <i>manuel.catalan@uca.cs</i>
Sweden	Olle Melander Marianne Lillieskold	<i>Olle.melander@polar.se</i> <i>Marianne.lillieskold@naturvardsverket.se</i>
Ukraine	Gennady Milinevsky	<i>science@uac.gov.ua</i>
United Kingdom	John Shears Jane Rumble	<i>JRS@bas.ac.uk</i> <i>Jane.Rumble@fco.gov.uk</i>
United States of America	Polly Penhale Fabio Saturni	<i>ppenhale@nsf.gov</i> <i>SaturniFM@state.gov</i>
Uruguay	Aldo Felici	<i>ambiente@iau.gub.uy</i>

Observers 4a		
Observer	Contact person	Email address
Estonia	Mart Saarso Enn Kaup	<i>mart.saarso@antarktika.ee</i> <i>kaup@gi.ee</i>

Observers 4b		
Observer	Contact Person	Email address
CCAMLR	Edith Fanta	<i>ccamlr@ccamlr.org</i> <i>e.fanta@terra.com.br</i>
COMNAP	Antoine Guichard Gérard Jugie (Chairman)	<i>sec@comnap.aq</i> <i>chair@comnap.aq</i>
SCAR	Colin Summerhayes Steven Chown	<i>cps32@cam.ac.uk</i>

	David Walton	
--	--------------	--

Observers 4c		
Observer	Contact Person	Email address
ASOC	Ricardo Roura James Barnes	<i>ricardo.roura@worldonline.nl</i> <i>jimbo0628@mac.com</i>
IAATO	Denise Landau Kim Crosbie David Rootes	<i>iaato@iaato.org</i>
IHO	Hugo Gorziglia	<i>hgorziglia@ihb.mc</i>
IUCN	Maj de Poorter	<i>m.depoorter@auckland.ac.nz</i>
UNEP	Christian Lambrechts	<i>christian.lambrechts@unep.org</i>
WMO	Stephen Pendlebury	<i>h.hutchinson@bom.gov.au</i>

Appendix 1

CEP ADVICE TO ATCM XXIX ON THE DRAFT CEE CONTAINED IN ATCM XXIX-WP 25 & IP 22 (Belgium)

The Committee for Environmental Protection,

With regard to the draft Comprehensive Environmental Evaluation for *the Construction and operation of the new Belgian Research Station, Dronning Maud Land, Antarctica*,

Having fully considered the draft CEE circulated by Belgium on February 10, 2006, as reported in paragraphs 24 - 32 of the CEP IX Final Report, and

Having noted the comments provided by the Parties to Belgium, and the response of Belgium to those comments,

Provides the following advice to the ATCM:

The draft CEE and the process followed by Belgium conform to the requirements of Article 3 of Annex I to the Environmental Protocol;

The draft CEE is thorough, well-structured and comprehensive and provides an appropriate assessment of the impacts of the proposed project;

The information contained in the draft CEE supports its conclusion that the proposed activity will have a more than minor or transitory impact on the Antarctic environment, but that the scientific importance to be gained by the construction and operation of Princess Elisabeth Station, Utsteinen Nunatak, outweighs the impact the station will have on the Antarctic environment and fully justifies the activity proceeding;

The draft CEE demonstrates that Belgium has considered environmental issues as a high priority in the planning of the station, and that the facility will provide a benchmark for environmentally sound operations at isolated locations in Antarctica;

Furthermore, it is clear that there are no existing facilities in this area of Antarctica which could usefully be used by or transferred to Belgium as an alternative to the construction of a new station;

Belgium will address the questions raised by Parties in advance of and during the discussion in the CEP in the the final CEE and in the further development of the project.

The CEP recommends that the ATCM endorse these views.

Appendix 2

LIST OF ASPA AND ASMA MANAGEMENT PLANS REFERRED BY THE CEP TO THE ATCM FOR ADOPTION

Antarctic Specially Protected Areas

ASPA No. 116 New College Valley, Cape Bird, Ross Island

ASPA No. 127 Haswell Island

ASPA No. 131 Canada Glacier, Taylor Valley, Victoria Land

ASPA No. 134 Cierva Point and offshore islands, Danco Coast, Antarctic Peninsula

ASPA No. 136 Clark Peninsula, Budd Coast, Wilkes Land

ASPA No. 165 Edmonson Point, Wood Bay, Ross Sea*

ASPA No. 166 Port Martin, Terre Adelie*

ASPA No. 167 Hawker Island, Vestfold Hills, Ingrid Christensen Coast, Princess Elizabeth Land, East Antarctica*

Antarctic Specially Managed Areas

ASMA No. 1 Admiralty Bay, King George Island, South Shetland Archipelago*

* New ASPA or ASMA

Appendix 3

LIST OF HISTORIC SITES AND MONUMENTS REFERRED BY THE CEP TO THE ATCM FOR ADOPTION

Landing Rock, Terre Adélie

Appendix 4

LIST OF SITE GUIDELINES REFERRED BY THE CEP TO THE ATCM FOR ADOPTION

1. Barrientos Island, Aitcho Islands (Lat. 62° 24' S; Long. 59° 47' W);
2. Cuverville Island (Lat. 64° 41' S; Long. 62° 38' W);
3. Goudier Island, Port Lockroy (Lat 64°49' S; Long 63°29' W);
4. Hannah Point (Lat. 62° 39' S; Long. 60° 37' W);
5. Jougla Point (Lat 64°49' S; Long 63°30' W);
6. Neko Harbour (Lat. 64° 50' S; Long. 62° 33' W);
7. Paulet Island (Lat. 63° 35' S; Long. 55° 47' W);
8. Penguin Island (Lat. 62° 06' S; Long. 57° 54' W);
9. Petermann Island (Lat. 65° 10' S; Long. 64° 10' W);
10. Pleneau Island (Lat. 65° 06' S; Long. 64° 04' W);
11. Turret Point (Lat. 62° 05' S; Long. 57° 55' W); and
12. Yankee Harbour (Lat. 62° 32' S; Long. 59° 47' W).

Appendix 5

PRACTICAL GUIDELINES FOR BALLAST WATER EXCHANGE IN THE ANTARCTIC TREATY AREA

1. The application of these Guidelines should apply to those vessels covered by Article 3 of the IMO's International Convention for the Control and Management of Ships' Ballast Water and Sediments (the Ballast Water Management Convention), taking into account the exceptions in Regulation A-3 of the Convention. These Guidelines do not replace the requirements of the Ballast Water Management Convention, but provide an interim Ballast Water Regional Management Plan for Antarctica under Article 13 (3).
2. If the safety of the ship is in any way jeopardised by a ballast exchange, it should not take place. Additionally these guidelines do not apply to the uptake or discharge of ballast water and sediments for ensuring the safety of the ship in emergency situations or saving life at sea in Antarctic waters.
3. A Ballast Water Management Plan should be prepared for each vessel with ballast tanks entering Antarctic waters, specifically taking into account the problems of ballast water exchange in cold environments and in Antarctic conditions.
4. Each vessel entering Antarctic waters should keep a record of ballast water operations.
5. For vessels needing to discharge ballast water within the Antarctic Treaty Area, ballast water should first be exchanged before arrival in Antarctic waters (preferably north of either the Antarctic Polar Frontal Zone or 60° S, whichever is the furthest north) and at least 200 nautical miles from the nearest land in water 200 metres deep (If this is not possible for operational reasons then such exchange should be undertaken in waters 50 nautical miles from the nearest land in waters of 200 metres depth).
6. Only those tanks that will be discharged in Antarctic waters would need to undergo ballast water exchange following the procedure in Paragraph 5. Ballast Water Exchange of all tanks is encouraged for all vessels that have the potential/capacity to load cargo in Antarctica, as changes in routes and planned activities are frequent during Antarctic voyages due to changing meteorological and sea conditions.
7. If a vessel has taken on ballast water in Antarctic waters and is intending to discharge ballast water in Arctic, sub-Arctic, or sub-Antarctic waters, it is recommended that ballast water should be exchanged north of the Antarctic Polar Frontal Zone, and at least 200 nautical miles from the nearest land in water at least 200 metres deep. (If this is not possible for operational reasons then such exchange should be undertaken in waters 50 nautical miles from the nearest land in waters of 200 metres depth).
8. Release of sediments during the cleaning of ballast tanks should not take place in Antarctic waters.
9. For vessels that have spent significant time in the Arctic, ballast water sediment should preferably be discharged and tanks cleaned before entering Antarctic waters (south of 60°S). If this cannot be done then sediment accumulation in ballast tanks should be monitored and sediment should be disposed of in accordance with the ship's Ballast Water Management Plan. If sediments are disposed of at sea, then they should be disposed of in waters greater than 200 nautical miles from the shoreline in waters 200 metres deep.
10. Treaty Parties are invited to exchange information (via COMNAP) on invasive marine species or anything that will change the perceived risk associated with ballast waters.

Appendix 6

CEP X PROVISIONAL AGENDA

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. International Polar Year
6. Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA)
 - a. Draft Comprehensive Environmental Evaluations
 - b. Other EIA Matters
7. Area Protection and Management Plans
 - a. Management Plans
 - b. Historic Sites and Monuments
 - c. Site Guidelines
 - d. Systematic Environmental Geographic Framework
 - e. Other Annex V Matters
8. Conservation of Antarctic Flora and Fauna
 - a. Quarantine and Non-native Species
 - b. Specially Protected Species
 - c. Marine Acoustics
 - d. Other Annex II Matters
9. Environmental Monitoring and Reporting
10. Inspection Reports
11. Emergency Response and Contingency Planning
12. Waste Management
13. Prevention of Marine Pollution
14. Cooperation with Other Organisations
15. General Matters
16. Election of Officers
17. Preparation for Next Meeting
18. Adoption of the Report
19. Closing of the Meeting