

**Report of the Committee
for Environmental Protection**

(CEP X)

Report of the Committee for Environmental Protection

(CEP X)

New Delhi April 30 - May 4, 2007

Item 1: Opening of the Meeting

- 1) The CEP Chair, Dr Neil Gilbert (New Zealand), opened the meeting on Monday 30 April 2007.
- 2) The Chair thanked India for arranging and hosting the meeting, and also thanked the Secretariat of the Antarctic Treaty for its support during the intersessional period.
- 3) The Chair summarized the work undertaken by the Committee since CEP IX, noting that the majority of actions arising had either been addressed or would be the subject of further attention at CEP X. The Chair also noted that two intersessional contact groups had been established at CEP IX to deal with respectively, the draft Larsemann Hills ASMA management plan and the development of a five-year workplan for the CEP. The Chair noted that the outcomes to these ICGs would be addressed during the meeting.

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
 - a) Draft Comprehensive Environmental Evaluations
 - b) Other EIA Matters
 7. Area Protection and Management
 - 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 Fauna and Flora
 - 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
- 5) The Committee considered 32 Working Papers, 75 Information Papers and 4 Secretariat Papers (Annex 1).
 - 6) The Chair commented that many papers had been submitted after the agreed deadlines and some very close to the start of the meeting. This created difficulties not only for the Secretariat and the translators, but also for all delegates in preparing for the meeting. The Chair urged all Members to submit Working and Information Papers to the Secretariat in accordance with the Revised Guidelines on Circulation and Handling of CEP Documents (Decision 2 (2001)).

Item 3: Strategic Discussions on the Future of the CEP

- 7) The Chair of the CEP introduced WP 15 A *Five-Year Work plan for the CEP: Report of the Intersessional Contact Group* (New Zealand). The Chair reminded the meeting of the discussions that had taken place at the informal workshop held in Edinburgh in advance of CEP IX to discuss “*Antarctica’s Future Environmental Challenges*”. In discussing the outcomes to the workshop CEP IX had agreed to establish an intersessional contact group (ICG) to develop a five-year work plan for the Committee.
- 8) The ICG had agreed that the CEP is unable effectively to continue to try and address every issue at every meeting and that there was a pressing need to prioritise the CEP’s workload and to consider other ways of managing the work. To that end the ICG had prepared a series of tables setting out the main issues facing the CEP divided into tools (i.e. management mechanisms under the Protocol) and environmental pressures. Using a risk based approach these issues had been prioritised and a timetable for addressing the issues developed over the next five meetings, based on the agreed priority rating.
- 9) In commending this five-year plan to the Committee the ICG had noted that it would be important for the plan to be routinely reviewed and updated to ensure that it remained current. If endorsed by the CEP and the ATCM, the ICG noted that the CEP’s agenda would also need to be routinely modified to ensure consistency with the work plan.
- 10) The Chair also noted that the ICG had identified the potential to establish one or more subsidiary bodies to assist in managing certain elements of the CEP’s work load. However, the ICG had not been able to conclude discussions on key aspects of this proposal including how subsidiary bodies might be established, whether they would be expected to meet intersessionally, and if so whether funding might be available to support intersessional meetings.

- 11) The Committee thanked the CEP Chair for coordinating the intersessional discussions and agreed that good progress had been made.
- 12) In discussing the ICG report many Members agreed that the CEP has a high workload and noted that the majority of papers submitted to an ATCM are handled by the Committee. It was therefore important to consider options for improving the efficiency with which the Committee undertakes its work programme.
- 13) Several Members therefore supported the work plan as outlined by the ICG. These Members noted that a prioritised work plan would assist the CEP in developing a more strategic and proactive approach to its work, as well as providing dedicated time at CEP meetings to make significant progress on key issues.
- 14) In supporting the plan some Members and ASOC highlighted the need for the Committee to also develop a more strategic framework, including the setting of longer-term objectives and goals. The Chair also noted in this regard that the Edinburgh informal workshop had produced a number of other ideas and proposals that the Committee may wish to continue to explore.
- 15) However, some Members expressed concern over the process for assigning priorities to the CEP's task list within the draft five year plan, noting that a more objective approach should be explored. Some Members questioned whether a prioritised work plan would restrict the right of any Member of the CEP to present papers at any meeting on issues it considered to be of importance.
- 16) The Committee agreed that it would be important to retain flexibility in any work plan as well as on the CEP's annual agenda, and to retain the option for Members to submit papers at any meeting on issues they considered to be important. Some Members expressed the view that at this stage the proposed prioritised work plan in WP 15, might be considered to be no more than an indicative plan to be used by the CEP as a guide for future work.
- 17) The Committee therefore agreed to endorse the five year work plan as set out in WP 15 on a provisional basis, and to append it to the Final Report of CEP X (Appendix 1). The Committee also agreed that the provisional five year plan should be posted on the CEP discussion forum, to provide an opportunity for all Members to comment further on it during the intersessional period. The Chair offered to provide a summary of all the comments received to assist further discussion of the plan at CEP XI.
- 18) On the issue of establishing subsidiary bodies, many Members agreed that this was a useful opportunity to reduce the workload at annual CEP meetings and supported the proposal contained in WP 15, to establish a subsidiary body on a trial basis to assess and report on new and revised protected area management plans. However, other Members expressed concern over the status of such bodies, how they might be constituted, the possible financial implications and the need to provide for the four languages of the Treaty to ensure opportunity for participation by all Members countries.
- 19) On the issue of subsidiary bodies Australia introduced WP 10 *Intersessional CEP Consideration of Draft Management Plans*, on the need for an effective intersessional process for reviewing draft Management Plans as a means for reducing the workload of the annual CEP meeting. The paper proposed the establishment of a Standing Group as a way to guarantee a coordinated intersessional process to review new and revised management plans. Australia also suggested that such a standing group might, in due course, also undertake other tasks related to Annex V.
- 20) Many Members thanked Australia for their constructive paper.
- 21) The Committee considered several issues raised by Members in relation to Australia's proposal including whether a subsidiary body established to review Management Plans would:

- hold physical meetings, or operate remotely;
 - require funding to facilitate its operation;
 - have formal status as a subsidiary body under the CEP Rules of Procedure;
 - need to operate in all official languages;
 - make recommendations to the CEP or have formal decision-making power.
- 22) The Committee agreed that establishing a formal subsidiary body under the CEP Rules of Procedure would require detailed consideration of such issues, and was unlikely to be resolved in the context of the present discussions. Nevertheless, it was considered important that such detailed consideration be given to that issue in the future.
- 23) There was good support for the objectives of WP 10, and the Committee agreed it could be helpful to trial some elements of the proposal. Recalling the discussion of subsidiary bodies outlined above, several Members noted the importance of ensuring the informal nature of any group convened to support such a trial. While the original proposal referred to a standing group, it was felt this term could imply an inappropriate degree of formality or permanency for a trial. The group discussed alternative descriptors, such as “provisional”, “ad hoc” and “informal” – the latter term is used below to capture the sentiment of these discussions.
- 24) The Committee agreed that a trial of such an informal group:
- could operate generally in accordance with the Terms of Reference proposed in WP 10;
 - should be coordinated by a convenor agreed by the CEP (possibly a CEP Vice-chair);
 - should focus only on reviewing draft Management Plans referred by the CEP for intersessional review;
 - should remain open to participation by all Members and Observers volunteering to participate;
 - should operate remotely, using the CEP Discussion Forum;
 - could utilise the translation services offered by the Secretariat to post to the Discussion Forum in all official languages its recommendations to proponents;
 - should outline its recommendations to the CEP on the adoption or otherwise of draft Management Plans in a report submitted as a Working Paper. Such a report should indicate areas of consensus agreement and areas where differing views are expressed;
- 25) It was noted that such a trial would not differ greatly from the present practice for ICGs, and have little or no impact on the Secretariat’s workload or expenditure, but would have the potential for improvements over individually convened ICGs, by providing centrally coordinated advice to proponents and to the CEP, and by providing translation for key documents.
- 26) The Committee also noted the need to identify an appropriate timeline for the intersessional process. Based on the contact group discussions, modified versions of the ‘Proposed terms of reference’ and ‘Possible timeline for consideration of draft management plans’ in WP 10 are attached (Appendix 2).
- 27) The Committee welcomed the offer from Tania Brito (Brazil) in her capacity as CEP Vice Chair to act as the convenor of the informal group. The Committee encouraged Members wishing to participate in the group to contact Tania Brito.

Item 4: Operation of the CEP

- 28) The Secretariat presented SP 2, *Secretariat Report 2006/07*, reporting on its activities to support the work of the CEP during the intersessional period. Among the tasks achieved the Secretariat noted that the CEP website had been transferred from the Australian Antarctic Division, redesigned and integrated into the ATS website. In addition the CEP Handbook had been translated into the four Treaty languages, copies of which were distributed to each delegation. Further, key datasets had been maintained and updated including the EIA and Protected Areas databases.
- 29) The Committee thanked the Secretariat for the substantial work it had achieved during the intersessional period.
- 30) Argentina noted that the EIA database contained very few EIAs and consisted largely of metadata. The Committee encouraged all Members to submit electronic copies of past EIAs for inclusion in the database.
- 31) The Secretariat also introduced SP 11, on the *Electronic Information Exchange System (EIES)*, which reported on the trial system developed by the Secretariat and tested by a number of Parties during the intersessional period. The Secretariat recalled that at CEP IX it was required to trial the online system for a year before committing to a transition from the current information exchange process. The Secretariat made an online presentation on the results of the intersessional work.
- 32) Those Members that had participated in the intersessional trial commented on the usefulness of the electronic system as a mechanism for exchanging information required by Article 17 of the Protocol. However, some Members expressed concern that the EIES included prompts for information that is not required to be exchanged by the Protocol. The Committee agreed to continue with the trial system during the intersessional period, and agreed that all Members should participate in populating the system with key information. The Committee also agreed to send further comments on the EIES to the Secretariat in a timely manner, to assist the Secretariat in finalising the system.
- 33) Other papers submitted under Agenda Item 15 were:
 - IP 8 *Annual Report of Spain Pursuant to Article 17 of the Protocol on Environmental Protection to the Antarctic Treaty*, (Spain)
 - IP 14 *Annual Report submitted by France on the Protocol on Environmental Protection to the Antarctic Treaty as required by Article 17 of the Protocol 2007*, (France)
 - IP 17 *Annual Report of China Pursuant to Article 17 of the Protocol on Environmental Protection to the Antarctic Treaty*, (China)
 - IP 27 *Informe Anual de Acuerdo al Artículo 17 del Protocolo al Tratado Antártico sobre la Protección del Medio Ambiente Periodo 2006 - 2007*, (Uruguay)
 - IP 31 *Annual Report Pursuant to Article 17 of the Protocol on Environmental Protection to the Antarctic Treaty*, (Ukraine)
 - IP 39 *Annual Report of New Zealand pursuant to Article 17 of the Protocol on Environmental Protection to the Antarctic Treaty 2006/2007*, (New Zealand)
 - IP 47 *Annual Report of the Republic of Korea Pursuant to Article 17 of the Protocol on Environmental Protection to the Antarctic Treaty*, (Korea)
 - IP 55 *Report on the Implementation of the Protocol on Environmental Protection as Required by Article 17 of the Protocol*, (United Kingdom)
 - IP 70 *Annual Report Pursuant to Article 17 of the Protocol on Environmental Protection to the Antarctic Treaty 2006-2007*, (Italy)

- IP 89 *Annual Report Pursuant to the Protocol on Environmental protection to the Antarctic Treaty* (Romania)
 - IP 93 *Informe Anual del Perú de acuerdo con el Artículo 17 del Protocolo al Tratado Antártico sobre Protección del Medio Ambiente* (Peru)
 - IP 96 *Informe Anual del Ecuador de acuerdo con el Artículo 17 del Protocolo al Tratado Antártico sobre Protección del Medio Ambiente* (Ecuador)
 - IP 129 *Annual Report Pursuant to the Article 17 of the Protocol on Environmental Protection to the Antarctic Treaty* (Japan)
- 34) The list of CEP Contact Points was updated (Annex 2).

Item 5: International Polar Year

- 35) The IPY International Programme Office (IPY-IPO) provided a presentation on the current status of the International Polar Year (IPY) describing IPY related activities and gave examples of specific projects. More than 30 institutions, organizations and nations had conducted IPY launch celebrations. The IPY Launch Opening Ceremony (Paris, March 2007) had a broad international participation. All these events received important and extensive international press coverage.
- 36) IPY-IPO noted that IPY currently has 227 endorsed Projects: 170 in wide areas of science, 1 broad international collaboration on data management, and 57 education, outreach and communication activities. Of the IPY science Projects, 82 focussed on Antarctic systems or on global processes that connect to and influence Antarctic systems. These Antarctic Projects included a very broad range of science, from geology to glaciology and from archaeology to astronomy. Unlike previous Polar Year's, IPY 2007-2008 included a very strong focus on ecology, biodiversity and biological processes, particularly in the Southern Ocean. The 57 IPY Endorsed Education and Outreach Projects included films, books, museum exhibitions, atlases, classroom materials, conferences, workshops, voyages, and expeditions.
- 37) The IPY-IPO was pleased to report on plans for a series of science conferences to consider the results of IPY-specific or IPY-focused research events every 2 years, starting in 2008. SCAR introduced IP 73, *IPY Report for ATCM XXX - 30 March 2007*, noting that Arctic Council countries had recently agreed a statement on the establishment of a pan-Arctic monitoring network. Similarly, SCAR suggested that the ATCM adopt a similar statement urging Treaty Parties to maintain and extend long-term monitoring of change in all parts of the Antarctic, and request its subsidiary bodies to co-operate with SCAR in efforts to create a co-ordinated Antarctic observing network.
- 38) The Salekhard Declaration, 26 October 2006, of the Arctic Council Ministers urged "coordinated action...to ensure the full realisation of a comprehensive Arctic Observing Network". The Committee fully supported this proposal recognising CEP interests in state of the environment monitoring and reporting and encouraged the ATCM to adopt such a statement, perhaps by means of a Resolution.
- 39) ASOC presented IP 86, *The Human Footprint of the IPY 2007-2008 in Antarctica*. As part of the IPY endorsed project no. 454 ASOC examined the endorsed projects in Antarctica during the IPY and found that these included some 350 research activities planned around existing centres of human activity (e.g., the Peninsula) as well as in areas that have been hitherto seldom accessed (e.g., Gamburtsev Mountains). ASOC contends that IPY is likely to expand the human footprint in Antarctica and increase pressure on Antarctica's wilderness values. It urged Treaty Parties to ensure that all IPY projects take place in full compliance of the Protocol, and highlighted the need for strategic-level planning and cumulative impact assessments.

- 40) IPY-IPO welcomed the ASOC paper and noted that all IPY endorsed projects must conform fully with the requirements of the Environmental Protocol. IPY-IPO also noted that the IPY website included a statement of ethical policy that it expects all IPY projects to conform to.
- 41) The Committee urged all Parties and national programmes to ensure that all Antarctic IPY related projects were assessed and undertaken in full compliance with the provisions of the Protocol as with all other projects. IPY-IPO supported this view and agreed to ensure that the IPY Programme Office was made aware of this statement from the Committee.
- 42) India presented IP 59 *IPY - Indian Contribution* informing the meeting on its scientific and outreach program for the IPY. India noted that two scientific programs related to monitoring of ocean circulation and to aerosol impact on Antarctica had received endorsement from IPY. An extensive outreach programme for school children during the IPY had also been launched.

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

- 43) India made a presentation on WP 4 *Draft Comprehensive Environmental Evaluation of New Indian Research Base at Larsemann Hills, Antarctica* and IP 7, with the same title, which contained the full draft CEE document and IP 139.
- 44) India proposes to locate the station on an unnamed promontory between Stornes and Broknes Peninsula in the Larsemann Hills area. The CEE was prepared by the National Centre for Antarctic and Ocean Research (NCAOR), an R&D wing of Ministry of Earth Sciences, Government of India, which coordinates and manages all the activities of India in the Antarctic region. The station would be used for carrying out long-term research in various domains of polar, ocean and atmospheric sciences for complementing the existing studies at Maitri and adjoining areas from an additional location. It is planned to have a life span of 25 years, accommodating 25 people during summer and 15 people during winter.
- 45) India informed the Committee that the conceptual design of the station has been obtained through global tenders for innovative ideas and that the architect/consultants were selected on the basis of their experience to build environmentally friendly stations in Antarctica, by a committee of experts, drawn from the national organizations and academic institutions involved in building design, construction and environmental engineering. India noted that the selected conceptual design meets the Madrid Protocol requirements.
- 46) After the CEP and ATCM consideration, the construction of the station would be initiated during the subsequent austral summer. The station is expected to be commissioned in two years time from the initiation of construction activity. India considered that construction and operation of the proposed Indian research base would have more than a minor or transitory impact on the Antarctic environment and announced that mitigation measures have been proposed to minimize the expected impacts.
- 47) The Committee thanked India for its presentation. Several Members made comments on the draft CEE and asked India to clarify a number of points. France asked India to clarify the means to be taken to minimise or prevent the introduction of non-native species during construction and operation of the new base.
- 48) India mentioned that several measures would be taken including inspections of containers, sterilisation of equipment, cleaning of vegetables, restrictions in the importation of some products, and on ballast water exchange. These provisions would be in full compliance with relevant Indian legislation.

- 49) Germany asked India to clarify how they had selected the proposed location for the new station.
- 50) India responded that they had taken the decision on the basis of a number of factors, including the need to avoid additional pressure on Broknes peninsula, ease of access to the selected site and available potable water.
- 51) The US asked India to comment on the potential impacts on the local lakes for supplying water and whether this would compromise the scientific value of the lakes. The US noted that in their experience reverse osmosis plants had less impact on the local environment.
- 52) India responded that there were several lakes in the area and it was their intention to minimise impacts on these freshwater bodies. To do this India intended to extract water only from the lake at the lower end of the promontory. They also intended to regularly monitor the lakes to ensure the lake levels were not altered.
- 53) ASOC commended India on their plans to remove the station after 25 years and asked how India intended to monitor cumulative impacts.
- 54) India responded that they had already undertaken a baseline study of the area and that further monitoring was planned once the station was established.
- 55) New Zealand noted the need to provide examples of good environmental practice within the Antarctic Treaty System and that one of the primary reasons for designating areas such as the Larsemann Hills as an ASMA was to encourage co-operation between all operators. New Zealand suggested that the need for early notification and more inclusive co-operation were important lessons to learn with respect to the new station and the proposed ASMA.
- 56) Australia noted that the additional information circulated by India in IP 139 stated the final CEE would address many of the comments Australia had provided to India during the intersessional period. Australia thanked India for its responses to those matters, and sought reassurance that its other comments would also be addressed.
- 57) India explained that the 2006/07 expedition to the Larsemann Hills had collected additional information, which would inform its responses to the other comments.
- 58) Several Members expressed similar concern over the limited acknowledgement of the proposed ASMA for the Larsemann Hills in the draft CEE and asked how the two activities would be integrated.
- 59) The Chair proposed that in order to assist the discussion and to consider the two activities jointly, the draft ASMA management proposal be introduced at this point.
- 60) On behalf its co-authors, Australia introduced WP 8 *Larsemann Hills east Antarctica, Antarctic Specially Managed Area Management Plan* (Australia, China, India, Romania and Russian Federation, noting that the idea of establishing an Antarctic Specially Managed Area in the Larsemann Hills goes back to discussions held between Australia, China and the Russian Federation in the mid to late 1990s.
- 61) A draft management plan had been submitted to CEP VIII as Working Paper 27, and referred for intersessional review. A revised version, taking into account comments received from the United Kingdom, was submitted to CEP IX as Working Paper 8 by Australia, China, the Russian Federation and Romania.
- 62) Following unresolved discussions at CEP IX about the relationship between the ASMA proposal and India's intentions to establish a new station in the Larsemann Hills, outlined in Working Paper 20 also submitted to that meeting, the draft management plan was referred for a second round of intersessional review.
- 63) A revised version of the management plan was prepared following stakeholders discussions at the July 2006 COMNAP. Comments received from the United States,

United Kingdom and Ecuador were considered and incorporated in the final revised Management Plan appended to WP 8.

- 64) The Larsemann Hills is a rare and important ice-free oasis on the coast of East Antarctica, and the management plan aims to protect the environment of the Larsemann Hills by promoting coordination and cooperation by Parties in the planning and conduct of all human activities in the Area.
- 65) Australia noted that the management plan did not indicate a specific site for India's station. The stakeholders agreed that to do so would pre-empt the CEP's consideration of India's draft CEE (WP 4 and IP 7), and the required consideration of alternatives, including alternative locations.
- 66) India commented that it looked forward to working with those countries working in the area to accommodate the new base within the ASMA management plan.
- 67) New Zealand asked how sensitive to human activities were the identified restricted areas within the ASMA.
- 68) Australia commented that these ice-free areas were of significance and that scientific advice received suggested that these sites were likely to be sensitive to human activity and were therefore deserving of increased protection.
- 69) Romania emphasised the importance of wide dissemination of the ASMA management plan to ensure that all those working in the area were aware of its requirements. To this end Romania suggested translation of the plan into the languages of all scientists working in the Larsemann Hills.
- 70) Having considered the draft CEE and its implications for the ASMA proposal in depth, the CEP agreed its advice to the ATCM (Appendix 3) on the draft Indian CEE.
- 71) On the basis of the Committee's advice to the ATCM with respect to the draft CEE, Australia submitted a slightly revised version of the Larsemann Hills ASMA management plan (WP 8 Rev 1). Australia noted that the plan would need further revision in due course to take full account of the construction of the new Indian research station.
- 72) On this basis, the Committee recommended that the ASMA management plan be forwarded to the ATCM for adoption.

6b) Other EIA Matters

- 73) Ukraine introduced IP 30 *The Replacement of Fuel Tanks at Vernadsky Station*, and provided a presentation on the draft CEE process associated to this activity, and the construction of the fuel tanks during the 2006/2007 season. It informed that the need for the replacement was recommended by different inspections in 1993, 1999 and 2005.
- 74) Ukraine explained that the first initial public discussion of this Project was carried out at the International Workshop of Antarctic Competent Authorities, in Berlin, in November 2006. But, considering the unsatisfactory technical conditions of old fuel tanks, the decision was taken to start with the replacement in the 2006-2007 season, in order to avoid any environmental emergency situation.
- 75) Ukraine informed the Committee that construction work and operational activities were in compliance with the requirements of the Environmental Protocol.
- 76) The CEP Chair explained that, despite the best efforts of Ukraine, the draft CEE had not been circulated in accordance with the requirements of the Protocol. Intersessional consultation with all Members suggested that the document should be submitted to CEP X as an Information Paper.
- 77) Many Members questioned whether a CEE was the appropriate level of EIA for this activity and gave examples of similar activities that had been held under an IEE.

- 78) Germany asked what Ukraine intended with the old fuel tanks.
- 79) Ukraine responded that they intended first to clean the old fuel tanks and would then take a decision whether to dismantle and remove them or leave them in place.
- 80) Some Members suggested that Ukraine might present an update of this activity at the next meeting of the CEP.
- 81) Italy informed on IP 71, *Initial Environmental Evaluation. Construction and Operation of Nansen Ice Runway (Terra Nova Bay, Ross Sea, Antarctica)*, and IP 72, *Initial Environmental Evaluation. Restructuring works of the pier at the Mario Zucchelli Italian Scientific Station (Terra Nova Bay, Ross Sea, Antarctica)*. Both IPs had attached the full IEE documents. These activities were necessary to support logistic and scientific activities at Mario Zuchelli Station. As a result of the IEEs, the environmental impacts associated with those activities were predicted to be no more than minor or transitory.
- 82) With respect to IP 71, New Zealand noted the importance of consulting with other national operators with experience of operating blue-ice runways. New Zealand also asked Italy for clarification of the reference in the IEE to the potential use of the runway for tourist activities.
- 83) Italy commented that at present they were unaware of any plans for tourist flights in to the region now or in the future. To clarify the situation Italy offered to revise IP 71 and issue a Rev 1 of the paper.
- 84) Some Members commented that an activity of this scale, should in their view, be the subject of a CEE. Some other Parties noted that the level of EIA to apply, in accordance with the Protocol, is dependent on the significance of the impacts identified and not on the type of activity *per se*.
- 85) Spain noted that according to the Madrid Protocol, the level of EIA to apply, remains the decision of each competent national authority.
- 86) The Russian Federation presented IP 63 *Preliminary results of Russian expedition studies of the sub glacial Lake Vostok in 2006-2007*, on the studies undertaken over the lake area by the 52nd Russian Antarctic Expedition. Based on a preliminary EIA, Russia continued with the ice drilling samples in the deep bore hole 5-G1.
- 87) Russia informed the Meeting that in January 2007 further drilling at a depth of 3658.26 m had resulted in the drill becoming stuck. The drilling operations in the borehole were suspended and significant effort put into extracting the drill from the borehole. In order to free the drill from the borehole bottom, about 200 litres of antifreeze was delivered using a special device to its lower part, which allowed melting the ice in the area of its contact with the stuck bore bit and release it. The drill was successfully recovered to the surface in February 2007. The antifreeze was later recovered although its use had left a significant void in the bottom of the borehole. As a result the drill had to be redesigned for further drilling activity. Russia plans to restart drilling operations in May 2007.
- 88) Russia noted that ongoing research in the region of the subglacial Lake Vostok during the season of 2006-07 made a significant contribution to the existing information about this unique water body. Russia informed the Meeting that the Final CEE for the water sampling in the lake will be presented at ATCM XXXI.
- 89) New Zealand asked Russia to explain in more detail the means by which fluids had been extracted from the base of the borehole.
- 90) Russia explained that a special instrument has been developed for pumping out drill fluids using the drilling tool itself. Russia offered to provide further detail on this at the next CEP meeting.

- 91) Romania presented IP 88 *Initial Environmental Evaluation law-Racovita Base*, on the assessment of impacts associated to scientific and logistic activities at Law-Racovita Base, Larsemann Hills, during the Romanian Antarctic Expedition 2006/07.
- 92) ASOC introduced IP 79, *The Case Against Tourism Landings From Ships Carrying More Than 500 Passengers*, which, based on the ongoing rapid growth and diversification of Antarctic tourism, proposed prohibiting landings from ships carrying more than 500 passengers. ASOC argued that the reasons behind this were related to changes in industry standards, safety of operations, potential conflict of interest among users, and environmental impact associated with these activities. In this context, a prohibition on landings from very large vessels would be a first step towards “stabilising” tourism operations.
- 93) A number of Members thanked ASOC for its report.
- 94) The Chair recalled also the question posed to the CEP by ATCM XXIX (para 152 of the Final Report of ATCM XXIX) on whether the proposal to prevent ships carrying more than 500 passengers from landing in Antarctica was an environmentally responsible and precautionary approach, or whether they would recommend an alternative.
- 95) Several Members commented that the passenger carrying capacity of a vessel does not necessarily have a direct influence on the nature of impacts ashore, and that there is currently little scientific data, or routine tourism monitoring being undertaken that would allow the Committee to comment specifically on a ban on landings from ships carrying more than 500 passengers.
- 96) It was stressed that environmental impacts including cumulative impacts at any site from vessels landing passengers could be dependent upon the sensitivity of the receiving environment. Therefore, any limits on the numbers of people visiting a site ideally need to be made on a site-by-site basis, taking into account the specific values, features and sensitivities of the area. Spain considered that these situations could frequently be solved via self regulation or via the Codes of Conduct of their respective ASMAs
- 97) However, several Members noted that larger vessels posed significant concerns with relation to safety of navigation, search and rescue, and environmental consequences should an accident occur.
- 98) New Zealand noted that if an environmental risk assessment approach was taken it would likely show that larger vessels posed an increased risk to the environment due to the need for increased time ashore, increased contact time with wildlife, larger draft and windage of vessels operating close to shore, as well as larger fuel quantities and fuel types.
- 99) In relation to this issue, Argentina suggested that the Committee ask the ATCM to re-emphasise the importance of Measure 4 (2004) and Resolution 4 (2004), which, if fully applied, are important means of reducing the risk of accidents or incidents. It also noted that it could not support the proposed “prohibition” of certain types of tourism as proposed in the ASOC paper, as tourism is a permitted activity under the provisions of the Protocol. This would establish a bad precedent because this type of position would restrict the scope of the Madrid Protocol.
- 100) IAATO agreed with the previous interventions that it is very difficult to consider this question in isolation as the limit depends significantly on other factors and management tools (including how and where the activity is being conducted). IAATO noted that it has already self imposed this restriction as an appropriate maximum as being both prudent and precautionary. Since the CEP-endorsed Site Guidelines already acknowledge that the 500 limit is appropriate at some sites but not at others, IAATO would suggest that the CEP consider 500 as an appropriate maximum limit but over time assess, through Site Guideline work, whether this maximum is suitable for specific sites.

- 101) Several Members noted that ultimately the decision would need to be taken on political rather than environmental grounds.
- 102) The vast majority of Members concluded that they could support a precautionary approach as referred to by the ATCM and endorsed the proposal to prevent ships carrying more than 500 passengers from landing.
- 103) However, the Committee recommended that more consistent and dedicated monitoring of tourism impacts be undertaken to ensure that data and information are available to support such decision making.
- 104) The Committee also recommended that site-specific guidelines continue to be developed for all sites visited by tourists.
- 105) ASOC presented IP 84, *Strengthening the CEE Process*. Based on the analysis of all CEEs prepared so far, ASOC noted that some significant generic limitations are still evident in the CEE process. Among these limitations, ASOC noted that in no case had a consideration of draft CEEs by the CEP led to substantial modification of the activity as first elaborated by the proponent, nor to a decision not to proceed with the activity, despite this being a mandatory consideration in Annex I of the Protocol.
- 106) The Committee commended ASOC on their paper and agreed that the EIA provisions were a fundamental and significant component of the Protocol.
- 107) Sweden noted that the handling of EIAs and CEEs would be considerably facilitated if there was a vision for the future of Antarctica. Sweden also stated that the environment would benefit from an increased cooperation amongst countries such as, for example, the Concordia Station and the Nordic expeditions.
- 108) Germany commented that there was a need for a more standardised approach as to the level of EIA that should be applied to certain types of activity. However, several Members responded that this could only be judged on a case by case basis through individual national processes.
- 109) New Zealand supported the proposal in the ASOC paper to have earlier notification of draft CEEs that are in preparation, as a means of facilitating early consultation between Members.
- 110) Argentina supported this view and suggested that having draft CEEs translated into the four Treaty languages would help improve assessment of the document by CEP Member countries.
- 111) France, supported by several other Members, suggested that a more automatic, rather than voluntary, process of assessing draft CEEs ahead of annual CEP meetings, coupled with the idea of having the documents translated may also aid improved scrutiny of these important documents. It was also noted that the need for a standing group for draft CEEs had been identified in the context of the CEP 5 year plan and that an automatic process could provide a way forward with regard to this.
- 112) The Committee agreed and modified the Guidelines for CEP handling of Draft CEEs and operational procedures accordingly (Appendix 4).
- 113) The Committee also agreed that the translation of draft CEEs would be very useful and agreed therefore to ask the ATCM to consider allocating funds to allow for the translation of draft CEEs into the four Treaty languages, by the Treaty Secretariat.
- 114) In this regard the Committee noted that since the Protocol entered into force, 11 draft CEEs have been sent to the CEP in accordance with Annex I to the Protocol, an average of approximately 1 per year. However, the Committee recalled that the frequency with which draft CEEs are submitted has varied with no draft CEEs in some years and up to three being submitted in other years.

- 115) The Secretariat introduced SP 8 *Annual list of Initial Environmental Evaluations (IEE) and Comprehensive Environmental Evaluations (CEE) prepared between April 1st 2006 and March 31st 2007*, in accordance with the requirements of Resolution 1 (2005). The Secretariat noted that this information, together with information submitted on IEEs and CEEs since 1988, was also available in the EIA database located at the ATS website. The Secretariat noted that the online template for uploading information on EIAs was used by some members during the intersessional period which had facilitated submission and consistency of the information reported. The EIA database now contains information on EIAs prepared since 1988 including many actual EIA documents in electronic format.
- 116) Other Information Papers submitted under this agenda item were: IP 2 *Initial Environmental Evaluation for Placement of Shelter Huts at the proposed site of new Indian Research Base, Larsemann Hills, East Antarctica* (India); IP 19 *Future perspectives for Kohnen Station (Dronning Maud Land)* (Germany); IP 51 *Construction and Operation of the new Belgian Research Station, Dronning Maud Land, Antarctica. Final Comprehensive Environmental Evaluation (CEE)* (Belgium); IP 102, *Final Comprehensive Environmental Evaluation (CEE) for the Proposed Construction and Operation of Halley VI Research Station, and the Demolition and Removal of Halley V Research Station, Brunt Ice Shelf, Caird Coast, Antarctica* (UK); IP132, *Initial Environmental Evaluation. Replacement of Fuel tanks at the Comandante Ferraz Antarctic Station* (Brazil).

Item 7: Area Protection and Management

7a) Management Plans

i. Draft management plans which had been reviewed by an ICG

- 117) The Committee considered 2 draft management plans for Antarctic Specially Managed Areas (ASMAs) under this category.
- 118) The United States presented WP 3 *Draft Management Plan for ASMA No. X: Amundsen-Scott South Pole Station, South Pole*. The ASMA will be located on the polar plateau at the geographic South Pole, at 90°S covering an area of approximately 26,400 km². The area encompasses the Amundsen-Scott South Pole Station as well as long-term research and monitoring sites. It was proposed as an Antarctic Specially Managed Area to manage human activities for the protection of scientific, environmental, and historical values.
- 119) The United States submitted the draft Management Plan to CEP VIII in 2005. After review by an ICG, the United States presented an update on the status of the Management Plan to the CEP IX in 2006. Comments received were considered and small changes related to the South Pole Modernization Project were incorporated. Therefore the United States considered the revision process is now complete and the draft Management plan was presented for consideration by Committee for Environmental Protection.
- 120) The UK supported the proposal recognising the high scientific value of the area, and welcomed in particular the zonation of the ASMA as a tool for managing sites with different values and activities.
- 121) Norway commended the US on the draft management plan and supported its adoption by the ATCM. Norway also requested further information on the proposed website.
- 122) The US responded that the website was under development, but was seen as a good way for exchanging information on the ASMA as well as for disseminating information on the science undertaken at Amundsen-Scott base.

123) The Committee endorsed the management plan and recommended its adoption by the ATCM.

124) WP 8 *Larsemann Hills, East Antarctica, Antarctic Specially Managed Area Management Plan* (Australia) was also submitted under this agenda item, but was addressed by the meeting under agenda item 6a.

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

125) The Committee considered 4 draft management plans for Antarctic Specially Protected Areas (ASPAs) under this category:

- WP 11 *Review of Antarctic Specially Protected Area (ASPAs) No. 130 Tramway Ridge, Mt Erebus, Ross Island*, (New Zealand).
- WP 25 *Revisión del Plan de Gestión de la Zona Antártica Especialmente Protegida N° 150 Isla Ardley, Bahía Maxwell, Isla Rey Jorge (Isla 25 de Mayo)*, (Chile).
- WP 30 *Revised Management Plan for Antarctic Specially Protected Area No. 129, Rothera Point, Adelaide Island*, (United Kingdom)
- WP 31 *Revised Management Plan for Antarctic Specially Protected Area No. 109 Moe Island, South Orkney Islands*, (United Kingdom)

126) In introducing WP 11, New Zealand noted that a review of the management plan had been undertaken including consultation with scientists working in the ASPA and with other Parties working in the area. The review had concluded that no changes to the management plan were required.

127) The Committee accepted the proposal by New Zealand that no changes to the management plan were needed, and agreed that the five year review procedures of Annex V to the Protocol, required only that a plan be reviewed and that these provisions did not necessarily require plans to be modified.

128) In introducing WP 25 Chile recalled that it had indicated its interest in establishing an ICG to consider revising the management plan for ASPA 150. Chile regretted that they had not had the opportunity to do this during the intersessional period. However, the submitted plan had been modified and Chile suggested that an informal group now be established to consider the revised plan.

129) Following a question from ASOC regarding the criteria that had been used to determine the area of Ardley Island not included in the ASPA, Chile responded that this is seen as a buffer zone and is already used as a transit route for scientists working in the site.

130) The Committee agreed to refer the plan for intersessional review using the CEP Discussion Forum.

131) The UK introduced WP 30 and WP 31, noting the minor changes that had been made to the management plans.

132) The Committee therefore agreed to refer these two ASPA management plans to the ATCM for adoption.

iii. New draft management plans for protected/managed areas

133) The Committee considered WP 5 *Draft Management Plan for Antarctic Specially Managed Area No. X: Southwest Anvers Island and Palmer Basin* (USA). The region, that includes southwest Anvers Island and the Palmer Basin and its fringing island groups, has a wide range of important natural, scientific and educational visitor values and is an area of considerable and increasing scientific, tourist and logistic activities.

- 134) The importance of these values and the need to provide an effective means to manage the range of activities had been recognised with adoption of the area as a Multiple-Use Planning Area (MuPA) for voluntary observance at the XVI Antarctic Treaty Consultative Meeting (1991). With the acquisition of new data and information and changes to logistics and the pressures arising from human activities in the region, the original plan has been comprehensively revised and updated to meet current needs as an Antarctic Specially Managed Area (ASMA).
- 135) The United States, therefore, proposed the ASMA draft Management Plan for the Committee's consideration.
- 136) Chile commented favourably on the importance of scientific research and monitoring activities in this region and recognised that the plan that had been presented was very complete. The Committee agreed to refer the plan for intersessional review, and also agreed that, due to the marine component of the Area, the draft plan should be submitted to CCAMLR for its consideration.
- 137) Australia introduced WP 9 *Draft Antarctic Specially Protected Area (ASP)* *Management Plan for Amanda Bay, Ingrid Christensen Coast, Princess Elizabeth Land, East Antarctica* (Australia and China). The Management Plan aimed to protect the breeding colony of approximately 3000 pairs of emperor penguins annually resident in the south-west corner of Amanda Bay, while providing for continued collection of valuable long-term research and monitoring data.
- 138) The United Kingdom presented the WP 21 *Area Protection and Management Proposal for a new Antarctic Specially Protected Area at Marion Nunataks, Charcot Island, Antarctic Peninsula*. The Area, of 116 km², is proposed primarily for its unique species assemblage, in particular for the absence of key ecological components such as predatory arthropods and springtails. This provides unique scientific opportunities.
- 139) The draft Management Plan contains comprehensive and wide ranging precautions to protect these ecological and scientific values, in particular measures to prevent the introduction locally non- native species.
- 140) SCAR endorsed the management plan proposal noting the exceptional nature of the site due to the absence of springtails and arthropod predators in the terrestrial community.
- 141) China Presented WP 32 rev. 1 *Draft Management Plan for the Antarctic Special Protected Area Mount Harding, Grove Mountains, East Antarctica*. China made a visual presentation on the natural features of the site proposed to be protected by the proposed ASPA. China noted that designation was based on the integral remains of the advance and retreat of the ice sheet of inland Antarctica and the precious physiognomy of glacier erosion preserved in the ice sheet of inland Antarctica, which is of great scientific, aesthetic and wilderness values. China informed that the aim of this protected area was to preserve its scientific, aesthetic and wilderness values.
- 142) Several Members congratulated China for its presentation, noting that such a presentation provided a very clear understanding of the proposed protected area.
- 143) The Committee agreed to refer these three draft management plans for intersessional review and encouraged all Members to participate in reviewing the plans ahead of CEP XI.

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

- 144) The Secretariat introduced SP 7 *Register of the Status of Antarctic Specially Protected Area and Antarctic Specially Managed Area Management Plans, updated March 2007*, noting that the online version now links to all ASPA and ASMA management plans. The Secretariat also informed the meeting that both this register and the Archive on Protected Areas are now using the same information from the same database, so possible mistakes have been significantly reduced.

7b) Historic Sites and Monuments

- 145) Chile Introduced WP 41, *Monument to the Antarctic Treaty*, proposing the addition to the List of Historic Monuments and Sites of the “Monument to the Antarctic Treaty”, which was installed close to the Frei, Bellingshausen and Escudero Bases, at Fildes Peninsula, King George Island. It occupies a central position in the inter-face of the above mentioned bases and the path towards the settlement designated as “Villa Las Estrellas”, and immediately attracts the attention of visitors to King George Island. Chile also noted that they intended to add a plaque to the monument commemorating the signatories to the Antarctic Treaty.
- 146) The Committee supported the proposal and referred it for adoption by the ATCM.
- 147) Chile introduced WP 38 *Antarctic Protected Area System: Revised List of Historic Sites and Monuments. Measure 3 (2003). Draft Guidelines for its Application*. Chile proposed changes and improvements to the guidelines for selecting and designating historic sites and monuments (HSMs), and proposed testing the revised guidelines on the existing list of HSMs, and its application in respect of any new HSM proposals.
- 148) Argentina and Spain made comments in respect of certain historic references in the paper. Spain expressed its interest in participating in any review of this document. While thanking Chile, with respect to Appendix 1 to WP 38, Argentina noted that well before 1819 sealers from Buenos Aires hunted for fur seals in the South Shetland Islands. It also noted that vessels referred to were granted patents as corsairs by the Government in Buenos Aires and were under the joint command of Admiral Brown, himself taking part at that time in the wars leading to South American independence in the service of Buenos Aires.
- 149) The UK welcomed the Chilean proposal and indicated their interest in working with Chile on revising the HSM guidelines.
- 150) The US also welcomed the proposal and noted the importance of ensuring all HSMs were properly managed as a legacy for future Antarctic generations.
- 151) The US, Spain, and Argentina expressed their interest in working with Chile and the UK on revising the guidelines in the intersessional period.
- 152) Chile presented IP 94, *Avances al plan de gestión territorial, manejo ambiental y conservación del patrimonio histórico de la base Gabriel González Videla, Verano 2007*, on an approach for the management historic Chilean Station, which considered the various historic, and natural resources of the area. Chile informed the Committee that around the station there is an important Gentoo penguin colony as well as two historic sites (HSMs 30 and 56).
- 153) In introducing IP 123 *Historical Sites of Byers Peninsula, Livingston Island, South Shetland Islands, Antarctica*, Chile noted that an inventory of archaeological sites on Byers Peninsula needed further consultation with the UK as the principal interested Party.
- 154) Chile introduced IP 127 *historic Sites of the Northern Coast of Fildes Peninsula, King George Island (South Shetland Group)*. Chile reported on the difficulties of protecting historic sites from both natural and human impacts, particularly when such artefacts tempted visitors to remove them as souvenirs. It was suggested that a code of conduct would be needed at this site such as the Resolution on the handling of pre-1958 historic remains (Resolution 2 (2001)). In the particular case of this region, significant human activity made it particularly difficult to apply that Resolution.
- 155) The UK welcomed the Chilean paper noting that this was possibly the first report to the CEP of archaeological finds in Antarctica, and noting the challenges of protecting such material. The UK suggested that there were a number of options for managing such sites including designation as ASMA, ASPA and site guidelines. In this instance the UK felt that site guidelines might be useful.

7c) Site Guidelines

- 156) The United Kingdom introduced the WP 22 *Site Guidelines for Brown Bluff, Tabarin Peninsula*, which was co-sponsored by the United States and prepared in conjunction with IAATO.
- 157) The United Kingdom noted that WP 2 tabled at XXIX ATCM had highlighted a range of policy issues arising from the work of the review team and included recommendations for the further development of Site Guidelines. One of the recommendations was that “priority be given to preparing visitor Guidelines for Brown Bluff”, recognizing that this site was the only site in the top 15 visited sites in Antarctica without site specific visitor guidelines and not covered by a management plan or managed by a national operator.
- 158) The guidelines were prepared by IAATO and reviewed by the US group Oceanites. The draft guidelines had also been the subject of on-site review in January 2007 by the UK, in the same way as the 12 existing site guidelines had been reviewed. Therefore it was proposed that the CEP recommends to the ATCM the adoption of the Site Guidelines for Brown Bluff.
- 159) Some Members raised general questions on the draft guidelines including, the rationale for the numbers of passengers allowed ashore at any one time, the scientific basis for including a resting period of no visitation, and the basis for the 5m separation distance from fauna.
- 160) The UK said that the Site Guidelines previously adopted had used similar mechanisms and urged adoption of the guidelines for Brown Bluff as soon as possible to avoid leaving the site with no management in place. A number of Members agreed with this view.
- 161) ASOC requested IAATO for clarification regarding what appeared to be contradictory guidelines about the extent of free roaming that was acceptable, and whether the landing should be suspended in the event that the beach was crowded.
- 162) IAATO encouraged early adoption of the Brown Bluff guidelines and noted that the 5m distance from fauna had been in practice for many years and experience had suggested that this was an appropriate precautionary distance. In response to ASOC’s question IAATO noted that the beach had adequate capacity to cope with a number of passengers stated in the guidelines.
- 163) After a request from the CEP, SCAR agreed to provide a report on the current state of knowledge with respect to human disturbance of wildlife.
- 164) Australia, supported by the US, reminded the meeting that site guidelines do not exempt Parties and other operators from their obligations with respect to undertaking environmental impact assessments, which should also address these issues.
- 165) Argentina introduced WP 40, *Site Visitor Guidelines for Snow Hill* (Argentina and Sweden) noting that both the ATCM and the CEP had considered the designation of visitor site guidelines as an important and complementary tool to the wider framework of area protection and management. In particular, at CEP IX the Committee asked members and observers that, for visited sites not already covered by visitor guidelines or other forms of site management, they should undertake site reviews and draft Site Guidelines, using a consistent format, as appropriate.
- 166) Therefore Argentina, in conjunction with Sweden, expressed the view that these guidelines for Snow Hill aimed to improve the management of the increasing tourist visits to the Otto Nordenskjöld expedition hut and its surroundings, designated as HSM 38. The guidelines will help to ensure tourist visits do not impact on the conservation activities being undertaken. Both countries noted that the elaboration of these guidelines was supported by a visit this summer to the site. Likewise Argentina and Sweden stated that maintenance and conservation work in the area will continue.

- 167) Several Members and IAATO congratulated Argentina and Sweden on developing the guidelines for this important historical site and for their conservation work. Some Members suggested minor changes and corrections to the Guidelines.
- 168) Taking into account the suggested changes, the Committee endorsed these two sets of guidelines and recommended their approval by the ATCM.
- 169) ASOC introduced IP 83, *A Commentary on Policy Issues Arising from On-Site Review of Guidelines for Visitor Sites in the Antarctic Peninsula*, making comments on the recommendations presented at CEP IX by the site guidelines on-site review team that reported on ATCM XXIX WP 2. ASOC expressed the view that Parties should consider how Antarctic tourism as a whole could and should develop, and how it should be most effectively managed before investing too much effort in the development of Site Guidelines. ASOC expressed the view that the guidelines cannot and should not be the main mechanism for tourism management in the Antarctic and that the CEP should develop a long-term process for reviewing all visited sites to determine whether visitation is appropriate, and at what level.
- 170) IAATO introduced IP114, a *Brief Update on the Antarctic Peninsula Landing Site Visits and Site Guidelines*. The paper outlines the changes in levels of use at landing sites in this area where the majority of tourist activities take place. IAATO intends to provide this information annually to the CEP and ATCM to ensure that these bodies have good information on which to base their debates. The second part of the paper provided feedback and analysis on the twelve adopted site guidelines. Overall the guidelines have been well received and data analysis indicates that they worked well throughout the season, with queries only being raised with regard to the quality of maps and seasonal appropriateness.
- 171) The United States presented IP 11, *Antarctic Site Inventory: 1994-2007*, updating the results of the Antarctic Site Inventory project through February 2007. This program has collected biological data and site-descriptive information in the Antarctic Peninsula since 1994. In 13 seasons the Inventory has made 784 visits and collected data at 114 Antarctic Peninsula locations. During the recently concluded 2006-07 field season, the Inventory made 80 visits and collected data at 41 sites, including 10 sites not previously visited by Inventory researchers. The United States commented that the Inventory Project regularly censuses the 12 visitor locations for which site guidelines were adopted at ATCM XXIX.
- 172) Sweden congratulated the US and Oceanites on their long-term monitoring work and suggested that this data should be taken into account to assist SCAR's review of wildlife disturbance information.
- 173) South Africa also offered to assist SCAR's review based on considerable experience of South African bird biologists.
- 174) SCAR encouraged any unpublished data and information to be supplied to the SCAR contact, Professor Steven Chown, to assist in its review.

7d) Systematic Environmental Geographic Framework

- 175) New Zealand introduced WP 12 *Systematic Environmental Protection in Antarctica: Final progress report on Environmental Domains Analysis for the Antarctic continent*. The document and accompanying presentation provided a revised classification of the Antarctic Environmental Domains Analysis (EDA) at the continental scale and improved the "proof of concept" presented both at CEP VIII and CEP IX.
- 176) In its presentation, New Zealand, noted that this last version better incorporated the ice-free terrain and that a reapplication of the ice sheet temperature "ground truthing", which had been presented at CEP IX, showed that the classification remained realistic for the ice sheet

- 177) New Zealand commented that the addition of further data, including biotic and permafrost/soils databases at the continental scale would continue to improve the EDA. The current classification was expected to provide a scientifically sound basis for a systematic spatial classification of Antarctica into 21 Environments of quantifiable character.
- 178) New Zealand announced that a final report will be presented to the CEP XI as a dynamic basis for a systematic environmental geographic framework for the continent.
- 179) New Zealand also presented IP 41 *Systematic Environmental Protection in Antarctica: local and regional scale application of Environmental Domains Analysis for the Antarctic continent*, noting that a regional scale classification around the Larsemann Hills ice-free area showed that the system could also work at finer scales.
- 180) New Zealand thanked COMNAP and the Treaty Secretariat for their support in determining methods for disseminating and using the EDA.
- 181) The Committee commended New Zealand and Harry Keys in particular for this excellent work and for the progress made in providing a tool to meet the systematic environmental geographic framework requirements of the Protocol.
- 182) The UK noted that they had used the EDA in preparing the draft management plan for Charcot Island.
- 183) Russia commented that Antarctic lakes would be a useful layer in the EDA given their important scientific and environmental value.
- 184) New Zealand agreed that this was an environmental domain that needed to be included, but such a fine scale data layer was technically challenging to include. Nevertheless, New Zealand agreed to consider Russia's suggestion in preparing the final version of the EDA.
- 185) SCAR recalled that they had been requested by New Zealand to undertake an assessment of the EDA. Rather than undertaking a desktop review, SCAR was proposing to assess the potential fit of existing biological data into the EDA, which it considered would be a more beneficial exercise. SCAR anticipated reporting on this at CEP XI. The Committee welcomed this proposal.
- 186) Australia noted that whilst this work had stemmed from the need to fulfil a requirement of Annex V to the Protocol, it was now evident that the EDA tool would support a much wider range of tasks of relevance to the CEP.

7e) *Other Annex V Matters*

Marine Protected Areas

- 187) The Russian Federation introduced WP17 *On the concept of the Antarctic Marine Protected Areas*. This paper noted the objectives of the CEP and CCAMLR in relation to protection of the marine environment, and highlighted the importance of cooperation with CCAMLR on the issue of marine protected areas. The Russian Federation noted the mechanism for marine ASPAs and ASMAs to be designated in accordance with the approval of CCAMLR, and emphasized the need to clarify the procedure for coordinating proposals for MPA designation with CCAMLR.
- 188) The CCAMLR observer welcomed the Russian paper and noted the importance of CEP and CCAMLR working together on MPA initiatives. On the issue of CCAMLR's scrutiny of management plans with a marine component, CCAMLR noted that the Commission had at its last meeting agreed to maintain the current practice where all such plans are sent to CCAMLR for assessment in accordance with Decision 9 (2005). However, it is expected that the current practice will require review in due course. In the

meantime CCAMLR offered to work with the CEP on the practical implementation of this process to ensure that the review of all such management plans can be expedited.

- 189) For practical efficiency therefore CCAMLR encouraged the CEP and ATCM to provide Management Plans for review by CCAMLR under Decision 9 (2005) as soon as possible after they had been designated for referral to CCAMLR by the ATCM.
- 190) CCAMLR introduced IP38 *Update on progress towards the CCAMLR Workshop on Bioregionalisation of the Southern Ocean (Brussels, Belgium, 13-17 August 2007)*. This workshop will be an important step towards the establishment of a system of marine protected areas as part of a harmonised regime across the Antarctic Treaty System. The workshop will focus on the technical development of methods for bioregionalisation of the Southern Ocean. Work on consideration of methods for the selection and designation of MPAs will proceed separately, in parallel. CCAMLR encouraged CEP participation in this workshop, and noted the relevance of this work to the Committee, particularly with regard to the elaboration of the 'systematic environmental geographic framework', environmental monitoring, and identification of sensitive or vulnerable areas. The importance of this work in relation to ongoing cooperation between the CEP and CCAMLR was also highlighted.
- 191) Australia strongly supported the work being undertaken towards selection and designation of marine protected areas in the Southern Ocean.
- 192) South Africa commented on its experience in developing a marine protected area around the Prince Edward Islands and looked forward to offering this as an example MPA within the CCAMLR area.
- 193) Japan stressed the importance of selecting and designating MPAs on best available scientific knowledge and thus welcomed the proposed workshop.
- 194) The Committee thanked Belgium for hosting the CCAMLR Bioregionalisation Workshop in August 2007, and looked forward to the outcomes of this work. Members were encouraged to work together with their CCAMLR colleagues on this initiative.
- 195) The UK Presented IP 53 *Criteria for the selection of Marine Protected Areas (MPAs)*, on how existing selection criteria for protected areas, might be applied in the identification of candidate marine sites for special protection and management. The UK noted the similarities and differences with respect to existing criteria, inside and outside the Antarctic Treaty System. It considered that MPAs could be selected based on a combination of tools such as bioregionalization, risk assessment, feasibility analysis and decision-support software, as well as selection criteria.
- 196) The Committee thanked the UK for its paper and recognised that further work on selection criteria would need to proceed in parallel to the bioregionalisation work being undertaken through the workshop.
- 197) ASOC presented IP 87, *Marine Protected Areas – Steps Forward for the ATCM*, identifying actions to protect the Antarctic marine environment and issues to be considered by the ATCM in developing the existing ASPA and ASMA system to achieve a better protection of the marine environment. ASOC supported the participation of the CEP in the forthcoming CCAMLR workshop on bioregionalisation, and noted that this work complemented wider international commitments to the development of MPAs.
- 198) The UK introduced WP 43 *Guidance for Working Papers on Area Protection and Management*, proposing a new template to be provided at the time of submitting new or revised management plans for protected or managed areas. The aim of the template was to streamline the processing of management plans with respect to their legal adoption.
- 199) Several Members welcomed the UK proposal and recognised the benefits of completing such a template.

- 200) One Member supported the proposal in principal but, due to time constraints, wished to adequately analyse it.
- 201) The Committee looked forward to the UK preparing a revised version of the proposal for submission at CEP XI.
- 202) Germany introduced IP 22 Rev. 1 *Progress Report on the Discussion of the International Working Group about Possibilities for Environmental Management of Fildes Peninsula and Ardley Island* (Chile and Germany). Germany reminded the meeting of previous papers on this matter and provided a report on the work of the international working group, established to discuss management approaches to the Fildes Peninsula region. The international working group intends to continue its discussions taking into account the outcomes to the workshop held in Punta Arenas in March 2007; the final report of a risk assessment for the region undertaken by Germany and the CEP's review of the management plan for ASPA 150.
- 203) The Committee welcomed this report and looked forward to further progress on the matter.
- 204) Germany introduced IP 112, *Possible Modules of a "Fildes Peninsula region" ASMA Management Plan*, noting that it had been prepared on the basis of substantial data collection on human activities in the region as well as a risk analysis evaluating the impacts on the values to be protected.
- 205) Chile introduced IP 115, *Management and further protection within ASPA 125: Current situation.*, which provided a review of the status of the two sites protected by ASPA 125.
- 206) Chile reported that the review had concluded that only one of the two sites retained paleontological values for which the areas were first designated. As a result Chile suggested that a new management scheme for ASPA 125 was now required including a code of conduct for those wishing to visit and undertake research in the area.
- 207) Chile introduced IP117, *Workshop on Coordination of Activities in the Fildes Peninsula Region*. The Workshop examined a range of approaches to a multiple use management system, including the scientific and environmental studies leading towards an ASMA. The Workshop did not produce findings and recommendations but its materials and methodology shall remain available to the International Working Group, and the different presentations, which will be published by INACH, and on the ATS Secretariat website.
- 208) ASOC introduced IP 136, *Implementing the Madrid Protocol: A Case Study of Fildes Peninsula, King Geroge Island* on an evaluation of implementation of the Protocol at Fildes Peninsula, to analyse how stations active in the area collectively implement the Protocol. ASOC noted that Fildes Peninsula is in many regards unique, and currently has a greater concentration of facilities than most other parts of Antarctica. ASOC commented that progress is still needed in matters that require international cooperation, and that use of the ASMA instrument would be beneficial.
- 209) Germany reported on a parallel meeting of the International Working Group that defined concrete steps to develop a work plan and will work to address and solve management issues for the Fildes Peninsula Region on the basis of the tabled papers.
- 210) The Chair thanked Chile and Germany for the updated information and recognised, on behalf of the CEP, the work that the Parties active in Fildes Peninsula had started developing for the protection of the area.
- 211) Spain presented IP 15 *Opening of Lago Escondido at Deception Island*, on the opening of part of a natural wall which had contained the Escondido lake in the North west area of Deception Island. What had been a distinct lake was now an embayment linked directly to Port Foster. This had resulted in a significant change to what had been a

scientifically important ASPA within the Deception Island ASMA. Spain had proposed place names for the resulting new geographic features.

- 212) On behalf of its co-authors the United Kingdom introduced IP 108 *Report of the Deception Island Antarctic Specially Managed Area (ASMA) Management Group*, (Argentina, Chile, Norway, Spain, United Kingdom and United States) giving an overview of the scientific and operational activities undertaken on Deception Island during the 2006/07 austral summer, including tourist activities and two cruise ship incidents which occurred within the ASMA.
- 213) The UK informed the Committee on the planned intersessional work that the Management Group are considering in light of concerns raised by these incidents and to identify what further actions are required to protect the important natural values of Deception Island, so as to support implementation of the ASMA Management Plan. The group will redraft the existing codes of conduct for Whalers Bay, Pendulum Cove, and Bailey Head in the format of ATCM site guidelines working closely with IAATO and ASOC. The UK has completed its two year term chairing the Management Group. Argentina will chair the Group for the next two years.
- 214) Spain expressed concern over increasing visitation to this important island and suggested that tourist activity should be better regulated given the significant environmental and scientific values that the ASMA is designed to protect. Recalling the two shipping incidents which had occurred during the 2006/07 season, Spain noted that the ASMA status of the island should demand that any incident should be treated as an emergency and Parties present in the island should be immediately informed.
- 215) Argentina fully supported Spain's view and expressed concern that the two stations active on the island had not been notified immediately that the groundings occurred. Argentina made a proposal that the two existing bases should be set up as a communications center for such cases.
- 216) India expressed its concern on the two incidents and wanted to know the number of non IAATO member vessels, including small yachts, that visited the Island during the last season. IAATO responded by stating that the figures tabled included only two non IAATO member vessels and information on others was not available.
- 217) IAATO thanked the Management Group for IP 108 and welcomed the opportunity to be included in discussions of all these issues during the intersessional period.
- 218) ASOC regretted the two recent incidents of tourist vessels grounding at Deception Island and asked Norway for an estimate of the amount of fuel spilled during the grounding of the Nordkapp.
- 219) Norway noted that WP 37 reported that an estimated spill of between 500 and 750 litres of light marine diesel oil had been reported at the time of the incident but that the maritime enquiry later established that it is not possible to make an accurate estimate of the actual amount spilled.
- 220) On behalf of its co-authors, Brazil introduced IP 62 *Admiralty Bay Antarctic Specially Managed Area (ASMA No. 1) Management Group Report* (Brazil, Ecuador, Peru, Poland and the United States). The paper reported that the first meeting of the Management Group was held at the XXIX ATCM and several management activities were identified as priorities. The second meeting was held in King George Island and the group had the possibility to visit different sites and facilities in the Area and to discuss the actions related to the Management Plan as well as the development of a Monitoring Program which was one of the activities identified as priority.
- 221) Brazil informed the Committee that it was very important that the Management Group could meet in Antarctica to visit the different sites and facilities in the Area and to discuss the actions related to the Management Plan *in situ*. There has been a good support for

planning joint actions on monitoring, waste management, emergency plans, cumulative impact, and potential scientific cooperation. Brazil noted that establishment of the ASMA has definitely contributed to improving the level of mutual assistance and co-operation among Parties operating in the Area.

- 222) The Committee welcomed these reports from two ASMA management groups which demonstrated how ASMA designation is assisting co-operation between those working in the region.

Item 8: Conservation of Antarctic Fauna and Flora

a) Quarantine and non-native species

- 223) SCAR introduced IP 37 *Hull fouling as a source of marine invasion in the Antarctic*, indicating that it is an important route for the transport of marine non-native species to the Antarctic region. SCAR drew attention to the research required to fully understand the sources of and species contributing to hull fouling and the extent to which hull fouling could be reduced as a risk of introducing non-native species.
- 224) New Zealand introduced IP 43, *The Invasive Species Database* on the potential utility of the Global Invasive Species Database (GISD) (managed by IUCN's Invasive Species Specialist Group) for recording Antarctic alien species.
- 225) New Zealand noted that the GISD focuses only on invasive alien species and does not include information on simply alien species. Nevertheless, New Zealand suggested that a centralised database would assist in managing Antarctic non-native species, and in this regard drew attention to IP 126 *Prevention and Management of Harmful Non-native Species in the Antarctic and the sub-Antarctic* (IUCN), which contained other non-native species databases and information sources.
- 226) SCAR welcomed New Zealand's and IUCN's papers, and noted that SCAR scientists hold a substantial database on both indigenous and non-indigenous terrestrial species found in the Antarctic region.
- 227) SCAR introduced IP 49, *Aliens in Antarctica*, (Australia and SCAR), recalling that impacts produced by alien species on Antarctic ecosystems will be exacerbated with rapid climate change now being experienced in parts of Antarctica. SCAR explained that *Aliens in Antarctica* is an international project sponsored by SCAR to assess the pathways for transfer of propagules (seeds, spores, eggs), and the extent to which people from many nations unintentionally carry propagules of alien species into the Antarctic region.
- 228) The project will help inform the Antarctic Treaty Parties of the size and nature of the threat and possible mitigation methods. Results are expected to be generated within 8 to 12 months, and recommendations should be available for consideration by the ATCM / CEP in 2009.
- 229) Australia noted that this project would also provide the centralised database suggested by New Zealand.
- 230) Sweden recalled that the issue of non-native species had been identified as one of the high priority issues in the CEP's provisional five-year work plan, and proposed that preventative measure should be considered by Parties when preparing environmental impact assessments. Sweden also suggested that guidelines should be developed to reduce the risk of introduction.
- 231) Sweden also encouraged all Parties to ratify the IMO's Ballast Water Convention at the earliest opportunity, and the UK noted that the adopted ATCM Ballast Water Guidelines (Resolution 3 (2006)) would be considered by IMO next July.

- 232) Responding to a question from France, SCAR reported that their work on developing a code of conduct for minimising the introduction of alien species would be the subject of a workshop in May 2007.
- 233) The Committee looked forward to the product of this work at CEP XI.
- 234) Also submitted under this agenda item was IP 36 *Non-native species: Pathways and Vectors between New Zealand and Scott Base, Antarctica*.

b) Specially Protected Species

- 235) SCAR provided an explanation on the withdrawal of its working paper on the issue of designating Southern Giant Petrels as specially protected species. Subsequent to the submission, SCAR's attention was drawn to the fact that new, unpublished data on the species at the South Orkney islands had been collected, and that these data suggested that the designation of the species as 'critically endangered' might require revision.
- 236) Given that the large majority of the regional, that is Antarctic, population of the Southern Giant Petrel is found on the South Orkney and South Shetland islands, SCAR immediately requested additional, unpublished information and advice from a range of scientists working in these areas, and from other organizations which have an interest in this species. SCAR also re-reviewed all available information in the public domain concerning this species in light of these data and the opinions expressed.
- 237) Based on careful consideration of all of the available data and opinions, it was SCAR's view that the status of the regional population of the species can not now be convincingly determined. The scarcity of data, the lack of review of data that are available, and the inability of experts to reach consensus, means that the picture is much more complex than SCAR's Working Paper originally suggested. This complexity meant that SCAR could not offer the CEP a clear, scientifically defensible statement about the status of the regional population of the Southern Giant Petrel.
- 238) Given the current situation, and Resolution 4 (2006), SCAR agreed to facilitate a meeting of experts to review thoroughly the available information and to report back to the CEP on the outcome of that review meeting.
- 239) Many Members and ASOC expressed their regret at the withdrawal of the SCAR working paper and suggested that the CEP could still recommend listing of the species as specially protected as a precautionary measure, whilst SCAR conducted a review of all the available data. These Members recognised the importance of scientific advice on which the Committee's decisions should be based. However, in the absence of reliable information at this stage, some of these Members considered that listing the species would be the least risky approach.
- 240) Many Members were unable to support listing of the species until SCAR was able to provide unambiguous scientific advice. In the view of these Members, listing any species in the absence of clear scientific information would risk undermining the objective approach that needed to be taken, and would establish an unfortunate precedent.
- 241) In this respect, Argentina pointed out that this kind of unfortunate precedent regrettably had already been established during debate on the Annex II review.
- 242) If the species were listed on a precautionary basis, several Members commented that they would be prepared to delist the species should SCAR's reassessment of the data suggested that the southern giant petrel did not require special protection.
- 243) Some Members commented that without a thorough assessment of the status and trends of the species it would be difficult to complete an adequate action plan including receipt of advice from relevant bodies such as CCAMLR.

- 244) ASOC noted that SCAR would not be in a position to report on its reassessment until the CEP meeting in 2009. ASOC expressed its view that the protection of Southern Giant Petrels was a critical issue and encouraged Members to reflect on the possibility of CEP failing to protect this species if adequate action was not taken. However, the Committee urged SCAR to consider bringing forward its planned workshop so as to provide the CEP with the necessary information before CEP XI.
- 245) SCAR responded that the uncertainties associated with unpublished data made it difficult to predict how quickly its advice could be available. However, SCAR undertook to consider changing the time of the workshop. SCAR also urged Parties to ensure that their respective experts provided all relevant data at the earliest opportunity.
- 246) The Committee agreed that this would be essential and several Members suggested they would consider undertaking additional surveys to assist in re-evaluating the status of the species.
- 247) On the suggestion of Norway, and recognising importance of the issue, the Committee agreed to prepare a new resolution based on Resolution 4 (2006) for consideration by the ATCM.
- 248) In the meantime, and as a means of continuing to test the CEP's guidelines on specially protected species, New Zealand offered to work with interested Parties to compile current management practices with respect to these species so as to prepare a draft action plan as an example. This could then be put into effect should the species be listed in the future.
- 249) Several Members offered to assist New Zealand with this work.
- 250) SCAR presented WP 27 *Current Status of the Ross Seal (Ommatophoca rossii): A Specially Protected Species under Annex II*, noting that the current status was based on a thorough review of available information appended to the paper. SCAR further noted that the species could be considered data deficient, and that therefore no change should be made to the species status, but that further information should be collected to improve knowledge, recognising future risk of habitat loss, especially given the baseline information now available from the Antarctic Pack Ice Seals Programme.
- 251) The Committee agreed that the status of the Ross Seal remain as a Specially Protected Species.
- 252) SCAR introduced WP 26 *The Application of IUCN Endangerment Criteria at the Regional Level of the Antarctic Treaty Area*, noting the several important differences between regional and global listing procedures, the potential utility of the regional criteria for designation of Specially Protected Species under Annex II to the Protocol, and the information required to undertake such a regional listing.
- 253) New Zealand welcomed SCAR's paper which provided a workable response to an issue that has been discussed at length by the CEP. New Zealand suggested the Committee may, in due course, consider adding the guidelines contained in the paper to the CEP's own guidelines for managing specially protected species.
- 254) ASOC drew the Committee's attention to the importance of information on the potential impact of krill harvesting on populations of Antarctic fur seals, including the development and effectiveness of mitigation methods in reducing incidental mortality noted in Measure 4 (2006). XXIV CCAMLR Commission received advice from its Scientific Committee that the provision of such information would require observer coverage from all vessels engaged in the krill fishery. ASOC urged Parties who were Members of the Commission to give high priority to the provision of such information.

c) *Marine acoustics*

- 255) The CEP Chair, presented IP 42 *Marine Acoustics in Antarctic Waters: Report of an International Whaling Commission Workshop*, recalling that at CEP IX the Committee had agreed to invite a representative from the IWC to provide a presentation on this workshop. The IWC had not been able to provide a representative, however, the Secretary to the IWC Commission, Dr Nicola Grandy had kindly provided copies of the IWC workshop report as well as the report of the Scientific Committee response to its recommendations.
- 256) The Committee welcomed the information contained in the reports.
- 257) Russia presented WP 18 *Russian studies of acoustic influence on marine biota*, noting that acoustic influence on Antarctic marine biota had been the focus of attention of the CEP since 2003. Russia considered that some similarity could be established in ice and hydrological regimes and biodiversity between the Barents Sea and Antarctic seas, and therefore offered the results of its experience of studies carried out by Russian specialists in the Arctic since the 1970's.
- 258) Russia concluded that marine seismic activities could not create a threat for Arctic marine organisms, since their action is very restricted in space and does not produce a significant influence at a distance of more than 3-10 m. The risks connected with the use of all scientific hydroacoustic instruments including seismic transmitters, are less or comparable with the risks connected with shipping noise *per se*.
- 259) SCAR welcomed this information and expressed interest in consulting with Russia further on this matter.
- 260) Germany introduced IP 4 *International Workshop "Impacts of seismic survey activities on whales and other marine biota"*. The workshop, organised by the Umweltbundesamt (UBA), was held in Dessau, Germany in September 2006. Sixty-five experts from ten countries had participated. The workshop focused on the impact of airguns on marine species, which significantly contribute to anthropogenic noise in the marine environment in some world regions. Considerable gaps in our knowledge on the impact of seismic surveys on marine taxa were identified, but at the same time new and substantial information was provided which helps to assess seismic activities. Accordingly marine seismic surveys have the potential to significantly alter the behaviour of marine mammals, fish and cephalopods. Atypical strandings of giant squids with multiple internal lesions took place in spatio-temporal correlation with seismic surveys.
- 261) Germany noted that the full report of the workshop is available at www.umweltbundesamt.de/ius/index.htm and offered to provide the results of a risk assessment it planned to undertake at CEP XI.
- 262) ASOC introduced IP 80, *Taking Action on Marine Noise in the Southern Ocean*, describing recent scientific events addressing the matter as well as forthcoming conferences on marine pollution. ASOC made recommendations to the Committee related to:
- the need to assess potential marine acoustic impacts in IEE and CEE processes;
 - the need for seismic mitigation guidelines for all vessels conducting seismic research in Antarctica;
 - the potential for establishing a working group between the CEP and SCAR to deal with this issue.
- 263) New Zealand supported the proposal to ensure that all marine acoustic activities were adequately addressed by EIAs, and encouraged further CEP attention on the issue of developing appropriate guidelines.

- 264) Germany notified the Committee that there will be an International Conference on the Effects of Noise on Aquatic Life taking place in Nyborg, Denmark 13-17 August 2007. Further information can be found at www.NoiseEffects.umd.edu

d) Other matters relating to the conservation of Antarctic fauna and flora

- 265) On behalf of Australia and SCAR, Australia introduced IP 32 *Census of Antarctic Marine Life (CAML)*, noting that the CAML was both a major IPY initiative and a key SCAR activity. The objective of the census is to develop a benchmark of the distribution and abundance of marine biodiversity in Antarctic waters, and to leave a legacy of observation sites against which future change in the marine environment can be assessed.
- 266) Australia noted that the fieldwork started in November 2006 in areas previously covered by the Larsen A and B ice shelves. The Larsen region has proved to be a unique site for understanding how marine ecosystems in Antarctica respond to global warming. The first CAML voyage reported some 15 potentially new species of crustacean, and four new species related to the corals, sea anemones and jellyfish. The majority of CAML's field surveys will be completed in the 2007/08 Antarctic season. CAML is scheduled to end in 2010 with a major contribution on the distribution and abundance of Southern Ocean biodiversity to the Census of Marine Life. Australia indicated that a summary of early results from CAML will be presented at a future meeting.
- 267) SCAR presented IP 15, *Subglacial Antarctic Lake Environments (SALE) in the International Polar Year 2007-2008*, explaining that subglacial environments are important continental-scale interconnected phenomena under thick ice sheets and include a spectrum of geologic settings, ages, evolutions, and limnological conditions. SCAR therefore noted that subglacial environments provided an opportunity to advance understanding of how life, the environment, climate, and planetary history combine to produce the world as we know it today.
- 268) Russia commented that satellite data provide information only on surface changes of ice over the lake rather than movement of water within the subglacial lakes and streams.

Item 9: Environmental Monitoring and Reporting

- 269) Norway presented WP 28, *Climate Change*, highlighting the unequivocal warming of the climate system, remarking on the important role that the Arctic and the Antarctic have in regulating the global climate system and describing the grave consequences that those changes may have for the Antarctic environment, as well as on earth systems and inhabitants.
- 270) Norway recalled that, when signing the Protocol, the Antarctic Treaty Parties committed themselves to the comprehensive protection of the Antarctic environment and that an extensive knowledge on the consequences of climate change on the Antarctic environment was a prerequisite for the Parties to fulfil these commitments.
- 271) Norway, therefore recommended that the CEP and the ATCM, expressing their concern over the projected adverse effects of climate change on the Antarctic environment, include the issue as a new item on their respective agendas.
- 272) There was wide recognition by the Committee of the importance and significance of climate change in Antarctica and the implications for the CEP's and the ATCM's environmental management responsibilities in the continent.
- 273) The Committee also agreed on the importance of supporting and undertaking climate change research in Antarctic that is of global significance including abrupt change that might be related, for example, to threshold limits of ice sheet decay.

- 274) Some delegations expressed concern over ensuring that CEP and ATCM attention on the issue of climate change should be restricted to the Antarctic context, and to avoid duplicating work done by other organisations such as the IPCC.
- 275) The Committee therefore agreed to add climate change as a sub-item under its agenda item on Environmental Monitoring and Reporting.
- 276) SCAR introduced IP 5 *State of the Antarctic and Southern Ocean Climate System (SASOCS)*, which was complementary to the SCAR lecture (IP 124) that had been presented to ATCM XXX by the SCAR President, Professor Chris Rapley. IP 5 represents phase one of the review of Antarctic climate that SCAR had introduced at XXIX ATCM, and addresses what is known of the physics of the climate system of Antarctica and the Southern Ocean. The review will not be known as an 'assessment', but as the Review of Antarctic Climate and Environment. Phase II, which SCAR hopes to present to XXXI ATCM, will include a review of the response of the biota to climate change.
- 277) SCAR urged Parties to (i) improve, enhance and sustain observations of the climate system in the region, so as to detect, understand and underpin forecasts of climate change; and (ii) as a matter of some urgency to work together with SCAR to improve models of ice sheet dynamics in relation to sea level rise, owing to the inadequacy of present understanding.
- 278) ASOC presented IP 82 *The Antarctic and Climate Change* which provided an overview of recent Antarctic climate change research. ASOC made several recommendations to the meeting and encouraged CEP and ATCM to discuss climate change as a separate agenda item each year at their meetings.
- 279) Norway presented WP 29 *Environmental Monitoring in Antarctica – lessons learned from the Arctic*, recalling that at CEP IX it had offered to bring forward information on the monitoring work under the Arctic Council. Monitoring activities are undertaken both by the Arctic Monitoring and Assessment Program Working Group (AMAP) and the Circumpolar Biodiversity Monitoring Program (CBMP) under development by the Arctic Council Working Group Conservation of Arctic Fauna and Flora (CAFF).
- 280) Norway explained both Arctic programs and described the differences and similarities between the Antarctic and the Arctic for designing monitoring programs. It recognized that there are still many of the same challenges to be tackled in both regions, in order to develop scientifically sound, robust and long lasting coordinated monitoring.
- 281) Among the lessons that can be learned from the Arctic Norway mentioned:
- The need of a clear organizational structure behind the process;
 - The monitoring framework should be built based on already existing monitoring activities;
 - The need to undertake a selection process for indicators or parameters;
 - Funding for long-term monitoring programmes;
 - The design of an strategy for regular assessment of the process;
 - The need to maintain contact with the Arctic monitoring programs for regular updates and discussions.
- 282) Norway noted that a clear organisational structure supporting coordinated monitoring seems to be necessary, and therefore suggested the CEP consider establishing a permanent group with the mandate to develop and implement a coordinated monitoring program for Antarctica.

- 283) The Committee thanked Norway for its excellent paper and noted that the issue of environmental monitoring had been the subject of much attention by the CEP over several meetings and ICGs, though with limited progress.
- 284) Several Members welcomed the suggestion for establishing a group to develop a more coordinated pan-Antarctic approach to monitoring and reporting.
- 285) Other Members agreed this might be useful, but emphasised the importance of synthesising the significant amount of information that currently existed on the issue in an Antarctic context, including CEP deliberations and work undertaken by COMNAP, including for example, COMNAPs' own survey of monitoring activity and the Practical Guidelines for Developing and Designing Environmental Monitoring Programmes in Antarctica (Resolution 2 (2005)).
- 286) Following a request from the CEP, SCAR agreed to provide available information on current long-term environmental and observational monitoring research programmes. However, SCAR noted that environmental monitoring activities were often not a major focus of research programmes.
- 287) The Committee agreed to spend time on this issue at its next meeting and encouraged all Members to submit information on their current monitoring activities.
- 288) CCAMLR offered to contribute to this synthesis noting its 23 year old marine ecosystem monitoring programme.
- 289) Brazil introduced IP 111 rev 1 on *A Monitoring Programme for the Admiralty Bay Antarctic Specially Managed Area (ASMA N° 1)*, (Brazil, Ecuador, Peru and Poland) reporting on the considerable success in developing a co-ordinated monitoring programme within the ASMA framework. Brazil reported that the ASMA Management Group met in Antarctica in January 2007 to consolidate the work undertaken in previous meetings. Monitoring parameters were divided into the two broad categories of environmental monitoring proposed at CEP IX, operational monitoring and state of the environment monitoring. The next phase will be to elaborate a system of long-term monitoring, with detailed information, resources and timetable of activities, and prepare the implementation of the monitoring programme. Discussions will progress through the forum in the ASMA website and workshops.
- 290) Ecuador and Peru expressed strong support for the work being undertaken.
- 291) New Zealand congratulated the countries involved and commented that this provided an excellent example of coordinated monitoring within the framework of an ASMA.
- 292) Uruguay presented IP 26 *Fluxgate and Proton Precession technology for fixed monitoring station in BCAA*, on a fixed station to be placed at Artigas station, in the framework of the IPY which included a triaxial fluxgate sensor, a scalar proton precession sensor, and associated data acquisition and storage electronics.

Item 10 Inspection Reports

- 293) On behalf of its co-authors Sweden introduced WP 16 *Antarctic Treaty Inspections undertaken jointly by Sweden, France and New Zealand in accordance with Article VII of the Antarctic Treaty and Article 14 of the Protocol on Environmental Protection to the Antarctic Treaty*, (Sweden, France and New Zealand). Sweden informed that two stations were inspected: Amundsen-Scott South Pole (United States) and Concordia (France and Italy) in January 2007 as a joint venture between Sweden, France and New Zealand.
- 294) Amundsen-Scott South Pole Station was last inspected in 1988, before construction of the new station building, and Concordia Station had never been inspected. Both stations had several features in common. They were remote central locations of Antarctica, situated high on the polar plateau in extremely hostile environments. They were science driven and science support was the dominating operational issue.

- 295) Sweden informed the meeting that the Inspection Team had concluded that both Amundsen-Scott South Pole and Concordia stations were complying to a high standard with the provisions and spirit of the Antarctic Treaty and the Protocol on Environmental Protection.
- 296) Sweden concluded that in both stations scientific activities were of a remarkably high standard and also noted that Concordia Station is an excellent example of Antarctic cooperation.
- 297) Italy and the US thanked the inspection team for their positive and supportive comments.
- 298) The United States introduced IP 10 *United States Report of Inspections* on their inspection program conducted from November 12 to December 1, 2006, as part of its long-term program of inspections. The US inspected six Stations and three tour vessels. A review of tour operations was undertaken because of the considerable attention that has recently been devoted by Treaty Parties to issues related to tourism and the increasing number of tourists visiting Antarctica.
- 299) The US expressed their appreciation for the cooperation shown by all stations and ships inspected.
- 300) Among the main issues noted by the inspection team at stations inspected were a high level of understanding of the Treaty and the Environmental Protocol and good cooperation among stations. However, in some visits it was noted that environmental practices were not as high as might be expected, including for example, lack of secondary containment on fuel tanks, and limited waste management procedures. Regarding tourism vessels the inspection team was impressed by the high standard of compliance with Protocol provisions.
- 301) The UK thanked the US for the very positive report in respect of the Rothera research station which noted the very high level of compliance.
- 302) Argentina made additional comments to those specifically related to the Argentine station that had been inspected. These were intended to offer clarifications on the current situation of two refuges and two summer stations, references of which had been included in the US inspection report.
- 303) Whilst thanking the awareness and recommendations of the US inspection to China's Antarctic Great Wall Station, China offered some corrections with regard to certain issues in the inspection report such as waste heat and the fuel tanks, and also clarified the EIA process in China.
- 304) Chile thanked the US for their Inspection Report for O'Higgins Station and the inclusion in the document of the Chilean comments. Chile also corrected that the scientific laboratory mentioned was built during the modification of the station in 1999-2000 and that it was equipped during the past season, to support scientific research in the area.
- 305) The US thanked these Members for their feedback and welcomed the additional information provided by Argentina.
- 306) Russia welcomed the US report and suggested that inspection teams should ensure they have a good understanding of the stations and facilities to be inspected in advance. Russia proposed to the Parties conducting inspections to obtain initial information about aspects of legal and organisational structure of the corresponding entities.
- 307) COMNAP noted that their website would soon be used to compile information on Antarctic stations and bases in the form of the Treaty inspection checklists. COMNAP also noted that communication is an essential component of undertaking inspections therefore urged inspection teams to have appropriate translation available.

- 308) Many Members and observers commended Sweden, France, New Zealand and the US for their inspections, which showed a broad range of Protocol implementation practices and standards.
- 309) 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. New Zealand noted that it had consulted with a number of countries on the checklist and would bring a revised version for the consideration of CEP XI.

Item 11 Emergency Response and Contingency Planning

- 310) Norway presented WP 37, *The M/S Nordkapp incident*, on the grounding of a Norwegian tourist vessel during passage of Neptune's Bellows, Deception Island, Antarctica, in January 2007. The incident had no serious consequences for passengers and crew and the environmental consequences were limited. Norway informed the Committee that during transfer of fuel from damaged tanks, oil contaminated water was released into the waters of Port Foster at Deception Island. Observations made by personnel at the Spanish Station Gabriel de Castilla and the Argentine station Decepcion as well as IAATO members indicated that the spill of light marine diesel disintegrated after a few days.
- 311) Norway noted that the main environmental lessons learned from the incident were related to types and use of response equipments and type of fuel used in Antarctic waters to reduce the consequences of an oil spill.
- 312) IAATO informed the meeting that the incident will be assessed in detail by the association's marine committee at the next general meeting taking into consideration such factors as oil spill response equipment to ensure that lessons can be learned in responding to such incidents in the future.
- 313) In response to ASOC's question Norway noted that the need for and type of follow-up monitoring was still under consideration.
- 314) Chile recalled the importance of the combined Antarctic Naval Patrol of Argentina and Chile to assist in such emergencies, underscoring the support given to the vessel during its stay in Maxwell Bay.
- 315) France noted that this incident illustrated the necessity to pursue efforts in order to find appropriate collective responses to face up to this type of critical situation.
- 316) India expressed its concern on the two incidents and wanted to know the number of non-IAATO member vessels, including small yachts that visited the island during the last season.
- 317) IAATO responded by stating that the figures tabled in IAATO's annual report included only two non-IAATO members vessels and that other information was not available.
- 318) Argentina stressed the importance of compliance with Measure 4 (2004) and Resolution 4 (2004) with the objective of minimising the occurrence of such incidents.
- 319) The Committee thanked Norway for this information and looked forward to further reports in respect of actions taken to minimise the risk of such incidents in the future as well as measures taken with respect to managing increasing human activity in Deception Island.
- 320) COMNAP introduced IP 99, *Contingency Planning and Emergency Response*, on the importance of safety as a priority matter for National Antarctic Programs and the ATCM. COMNAP noted that safety is a relevant part of the current as well as the planned exchange of information system in which COMANP is working closely with the Antarctic Treaty Secretariat, and recalled the importance of advance exchange of information on

planned activities, support plans and available response infrastructure. Among the current practice to promote safety in Antarctica, COMANP recalled the work of its *ad hoc* working groups.

- 321) COMNAP highlighted that systems in place were essentially structured around, and supported by, a range of international agreements in place. Safety in Antarctica is actively supported by the five Rescue Coordination Centres (RCCs) in South Africa, Australia, New Zealand, Chile and Argentina, which under international agreements cover the Antarctic region. These RCCs function very well and the most effective way of supporting safety is to collaborate with and support these RCCs. COMNAP also highlighted the unique presence in the Antarctic Peninsula region every summer of the Combined Antarctic Naval Patrol of Argentina and Chile that provides dedicated rescue assets.
- 322) COMNAP expressed that through good planning, sound use of risk management processes, effective contingency planning and strong cooperative relationships, individual members of the COMNAP community, have proven their ability to respond effectively to emergency events and search and rescue incidents.
- 323) Uruguay presented IP 25 *Monitoreo Ambiental Biológico para el Plan de Contingencia de la descarga de combustible en la Base Científica Antártica Artigas*. The objective of this monitoring activity is to evaluate biological integrity of the area between Collins Bay and Ardley Cove before, during and after the process of offloading fuel in order to verify that there are no alterations in the biota as a result of such activities.

Item 12: Waste Management

- 324) Australia presented IP 33 *Australian Research on the Assessment and Remediation of Contaminated Sites in Antarctica*, reporting on continuing Australian research to develop a range of techniques to clean up Antarctic and subantarctic contaminated sites. Australia noted that it would welcome collaboration with researchers working on similar problems in Antarctic ecosystems, and that it would report back to future CEP meetings on further advances in this work.
- 325) Australia also presented IP 34 *On-site Assessment of Metal Contamination During Remediation of a Waste Disposal Site in Antarctica*, which reported on the on-site assessment techniques used during the remediation of the Thala Valley waste disposal site near Australia's Casey station. A detailed report is available from a website listed in the paper.
- 326) The Committee commended Australia on the significant monitoring work it was undertaking in respect of this clean up programme.
- 327) COMNAP introduced IP 98, *COMNAP's 2006 Workshop on Waste Management in Antarctica*, on the results of the workshop held by the Antarctic Environmental Officers Network (AEON) in conjunction with the 2006 COMNAP Annual General Meeting. It was the first workshop on this issue since the Madrid Protocol was signed in 1991 and was focused on current waste management practices and clean up of old wastes, and offered an invaluable opportunity to bring waste management officers together. The full workshop report is available on request.
- 328) Ukraine provided information on biotechnology for solid food waste processing that was developed and introduced at Vernadsky Station. It allows a 20-fold reduction of waste weight within 5-7 days and may be efficient at stations with a large number of personnel.
- 329) Ukraine isolated metal-resistant microorganisms making it possible to treat wastewaters with high heavy metal concentrations. It allows both obtaining technically clean water and ensuring energy efficiency, which is also essential nowadays.

- 330) The US submitted IP 21 *Borehole Remediation and Closure Activities at Lake Vida in the McMurdo Dry Valleys Antarctic Specially Managed Area* under this agenda item.

Item 13: Prevention of Marine Pollution

- 331) Sweden commented on its support of a proposal from the organisation Intertanco according to which the global limit for sulphur content in marine fuels should be reduced from 4.5% to 1%. Sweden encouraged other countries to support this in IMO and the MARPOL negotiations of Annex VI.
- 332) CCAMLR noted its recent adoption of Conservation Measure (CM 26-01) "General Environmental Protection During Fishing". The measure deals with disposal of plastic packaging bands, translocation of poultry and the prohibition of discharges in high latitude fisheries. In respect of the latter, vessels fishing south of 60° South are prohibited from dumping or discharging such substances as oil or fuel products (except as permitted under MARPOL Annex 1), garbage, food waste, poultry, sewage within 12 miles of land or ice shelves, or sewage (while the ship is travelling at less than 4 knots), offal or incineration ash.
- 333) The Committee welcomed this amalgamation and strengthening of CCAMLR's environmental conservation measures.

Item 14: Cooperation with Other Organisations

- 334) The Chair in his capacity as CEP Observer to CCAMLR's Scientific Committee WP 7 *Report of the CEP Observer to the Twenty-fifth meeting of the Scientific Committee to CCAMLR, 23 to 27 October 2006, (New Zealand)*. The Chair recalled the Committee's request at CEP IX that such reports should be provided in the form of working papers and include background information on CCAMLR and its various working groups.
- 335) The Chair drew the attention of the meeting to a number of issues of interest to the CEP, including:
- The work being undertaken towards a Bioregionalisation Workshop in Belgium
 - The Scientific Committee's intention to conduct work on the potential effects of climate change on Antarctic marine ecosystems;
 - The significant reductions in by-catch of seals and seabirds in the legal fishery;
 - CCAMLR's marine debris database.
- 336) Argentina raised some issues included in this report which were associated to krill fisheries. This was mainly focused on estimated tripling of krill captures and took into account some uncertainties on the establishment of capture limits expressed in WP 7.
- 337) In response, CCAMLR indicated that the issues associated with the designation of precautionary catch limits, collection of data necessary to inform decision-making on such limits and their allocation, and modelling of relationships between predators, the natural environment, fisheries and krill were all work in progress within the CCAMLR Scientific committee. More detailed information is available from the CCAMLR Secretariat.
- 338) Australia, as host of the ACAP Interim Secretariat, introduced IP 69 *Progress with the implementation of the Agreement on the Conservation of Albatrosses and Petrels (ACAP)* on the development and activities of this multilateral agreement aimed to conservation of albatrosses and petrels. Australia drew the Committee's attention to ACAP's priorities for action, namely: fisheries by catch of Albatrosses and petrels; and management and protection of breeding sites.
- 339) Australia also noted that the paper outlines ACAP's desire to work with the Antarctic Treaty Parties and lists some areas by which this cooperation can occur.

- 340) New Zealand noted that, with respect to southern giant petrels, ACAP would welcome any measures taken by the Antarctic Treaty Parties to protect breeding sites for this species, including any designation of the species as an Antarctic Specially Protected Species.

Item 15: General Matters

- 341) COMNAP introduced WP 35, *Best Practice for Energy Management – Guidance and Recommendations*, highlighting the importance of ensuring that energy management is considered on Antarctic facilities and presenting to the Committee a set of guidance principles on best practice for use of energy.
- 342) COMNAP noted that these principles, developed by the COMNAP energy management group, related to measurements and identification of use of energy, introduction of educational programs, replacement of inefficient facilities, use of energy efficient equipments, analysis of possibilities of alternative energies and reduction of operational needs where possible.
- 343) The Committee endorsed and adopted the following guiding principles set out in the paper for use by all in Antarctica:
- Measure and clearly identify where energy and power is being used.
 - Introduce an education programme to recognise the need for energy saving and encourage personnel to implement and maintain energy saving measures.
 - Replace inefficient buildings or install enhanced insulation to ensure that heat loss is reduced.
 - Replace power and lighting systems with energy efficient equipment and controllers that ensure that equipment is only using power when there is an operational need.
 - Install energy efficient generator systems and make use of heat recovery systems where feasible.
 - Investigate and where feasible install renewable energy systems to reduce the dependence on fossil based fuel.
 - Reduce where possible operational activities. Particular attention to be paid to the routing of ships and the operation of engines to ensure lower fuel burn.
- 344) On behalf of its co-authors Germany presented IP 18 *International Workshop of Antarctic Competent Authorities* (Belgium, France, Germany, Netherlands, Peru, Russian Federation, Ukraine and the United Kingdom). Germany informed the meeting that experts from 8 Antarctic Treaty Parties as well as ASOC participated in the workshop. It was a very constructive meeting and the discussions emphasised clearly the usefulness of the informal exchange of views and experiences in respect of various issues regarding the implementation of the Protocol. Detailed information about the workshop can be found in the website of the Discussion Forum of Competent Authorities (DFCA) at <http://forum.cep.aq>. In order to enable as many Contracting Parties as possible to contribute to this information exchange Germany proposed that it should be checked whether a half day or a one day meeting could take place in the margins of or prior or subsequent to the next CEP/ATCM meeting in 2008.
- 345) The Netherlands welcomed the report and invited representatives from all Antarctic competent authorities to join the forum.
- 346) Australia introduced IP 48 *Mawson Station Wind Farm – Four Years of Operational Experience*, which provides a practical example of the guiding principles for energy

management presented in COMNAP's Working Paper 35. On average over the four years since their installation in 2003, the two wind turbines have met approximately 34 percent of the station's combined electricity and heating energy load, and have produced an average annual fuel saving of approximately 29 percent. That fuel savings directly equates a savings of over 1700 tonnes of carbon dioxide, and reduced risks in the transport, storage and handling of fuel.

- 347) A number of delegations congratulated Australia on this significant achievement and noted this as a model example of implementation of the energy management guiding principles that had been adopted by the Committee.
- 348) In response to an inquiry from Japan, Australia noted that the frequency of bird strike had been very infrequent as had been estimated in the IEE prepared for the construction and operation of turbines.
- 349) China Introduced IP 57 *Chinese Antarctic Environmental Report (2006-2007)* describing the scientific, logistic and environmental protection activities during the 23rd Chinese Antarctic Research Expedition.

Item 16: Election of Officers

- 350) The meeting re-elected Dr Yves Frenot (France) for a second term as First Vice Chair of the CEP by acclamation. The Committee congratulated Dr Frenot and the CEP Chair thanked Dr Frenot for his hard work and assistance.

Item 17: Preparation for CEP X

- 351) The Committee adopted the agenda for CEP XI in Appendix 5.

Item 18: Adoption of the Report

- 352) The Committee adopted the draft Report.

Item 19: Closing of the Meeting

- 353) The Chair closed the meeting on Friday 4 May 2007.

ANNEX 1

CEP X 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 10	Intersessional CEP Consideration of Draft Management Plans	Australia
WP 15	A Five-Year Work plan for the CEP: Report of the Intersessional Contact Group	New Zealand

Item 4: Operation of the CEP

SP 2	Secretariat Report 2006/07	ATS
SP 11 rev 1	Electronic Information Exchange System	ATS
IP 8	Annual Report of Spain Pursuant to Article 17 of the Protocol on Environmental Protection to the Antarctic Treaty	Spain
IP 14	Annual Report submitted by France on the Protocol on Environmental Protection to the Antarctic Treaty as required by Article 17 of the Protocol 2007	France
IP 17	Annual Report of China Pursuant to Article 17 of the Protocol on Environmental Protection to the Antarctic Treaty	China
IP 27	Informe Anual de Acuerdo al Artículo 17 del Protocolo al Tratado Antártico sobre la Protección del Medio Ambiente Periodo 2006 - 2007	Uruguay
IP 31	Annual Report Pursuant to Article 17 of the Protocol on Environmental Protection to the Antarctic Treaty	Ukraine
IP 39	Annual Report of New Zealand pursuant to Article 17 of the Protocol on Environmental Protection to the Antarctic Treaty 2006/2007	New Zealand
IP 47	Annual Report of the Republic of Korea Pursuant to Article 17 of the Protocol on Environmental Protection to the Antarctic Treaty	Korea, Republic
IP 55	Report on the Implementation of the Protocol on Environmental Protection as Required by Article 17 of the Protocol	United Kingdom
IP 70	Annual Report Pursuant to Article 17 of the Protocol on Environmental Protection to the Antarctic Treaty 2006-2007	Italy
IP 89	Annual Report Pursuant to the Protocol on Environmental protection to the Antarctic Treaty	Romania
IP 93	Informe Anual del Perú de acuerdo con el Artículo 17 del Protocolo al Tratado Antártico sobre Protección del Medio	Peru

	Ambiente	
IP 96	Informe Anual del Ecuador de acuerdo con el Artículo 17 del Protocolo al Tratado Antártico sobre Protección del Medio Ambiente	Ecuador
IP 129	Annual Report Pursuant to the Article 17 of the Protocol on Environmental Protection to the Antarctic Treaty	Japan

Item 5: International Polar Year

IP 49	Aliens in Antarctica	Australia & SCAR
IP 59	IPY - Indian Contribution	India
IP 73	IPY Report for ATCM XXX	IPY-IPO SCAR
IP 86 rev 1	The Human Footprint of the IPY 2007-2008 in Antarctica	ASOC

Item 6: Environmental Impact Assessment

6a) Draft Comprehensive Environmental Evaluations

WP 4	Draft Comprehensive Environmental Evaluation of New Indian Research Base at Larsemann Hills, Antarctica	India
IP 7	Draft Comprehensive Environmental Evaluation of New Indian Research Base at Larsemann Hills, Antarctica	India
IP 139	Additional Information on draft CEE on proposed new Indian research base at Larsemann Hills, East Antarctica	India

6b) Other EIA Matters

SP 8	Annual list of Initial Environmental Evaluations (IEE) and Comprehensive Environmental Evaluations (CEE) prepared between April 1st 2006 and March 31st 2007	ATS
IP 2	Initial Environmental Evaluation for Placement of Shelter Huts at the proposed site of new Indian Research Base, Larsemann Hills, East Antarctica	India
IP 19	Future perspectives for Kohnen Station (Dronning Maud Land)	Germany
IP 30	The Replacement of Fuel Tanks at Vernadsky Station	Ukraine
IP 51	Construction and Operation of the new Belgian Research Station, Dronning Maud Land, Antarctica. Final Comprehensive Environmental Evaluation (CEE)	Belgium
IP 63	Preliminary results of Russian expedition studies of the subglacial Lake Vostok in 2006-2007	Russian Federation
IP 71	Initial Environmental Evaluation. Construction and Operation of Nansen Ice Runway (Terra Nova Bay, Ross Sea, Antarctica)	Italy
IP 72	Initial Environmental Evaluation. Restructuring works of the pier at the Mario Zucchelli Italian Scientific Station (Terra Nova Bay, Ross Sea, Antarctica)	Italy
IP 79	The Case Against Tourism Landings from Ships Carrying More than 500 Passengers	ASOC
IP 80	Taking Action on Marine Noise in the Southern Ocean	ASOC

IP 84	Strengthening the CEE Process	ASOC
IP 88	Initial Environmental Evaluation law-Racovita Base	Romania
IP 102	Final Comprehensive Environmental Evaluation (CEE) for the Proposed Construction and Operation of Halley VI Research Station, and the Demolition and Removal of Halley V Research Station, Brunt Ice Shelf, Caird Coast, Antarctica	United Kingdom
IP 132	Initial Environmental Evaluation. Replacement of Fuel tanks at the Comandante Ferraz Antarctic Station	Brazil

Item 7: Area Protection and management Plans

7a) Management Plans

WP 3	Draft Management Plan for ASMA No. X: Amundsen-Scott South Pole Station, South Pole	United States
WP 5	Draft Management Plan for ASMA No. X: Southwest Anvers Island and Palmer Basin	United States
WP 8	Larsemann Hills, East Antarctica. Antarctic Specially Managed Area Management Plan	Australia, China, India, Romania & Russian Federation
WP 9	Draft Antarctic Specially Protected Area (ASPA) Management Plan for Amanda Bay, Ingrid Christensen Coast, Princess Elizabeth Land, East Antarctica	Australia & China
WP 11	Review of Antarctic Specially Protected Area (ASPA) No. 130	New Zealand
WP 21	Area Protection and Management. Proposal for a new Antarctic Specially Protected Area at Marion Nunataks, Charcot Island, Antarctic Peninsula	United Kingdom
WP 25	Revised Management Plan for Antarctic Specially Protected Area No. 150 ARDLEY ISLAND, MAXWELL BAY, KING GEORGE ISLAND	Chile
WP 30	Revised Management Plan for Antarctic Specially Protected Area No. 129, Rothera Point, Adelaide Island	United Kingdom
WP 31	Revised Management Plan for Antarctic Specially Protected Area No. 109 Moe Island, South Orkney Islands	United Kingdom
WP 32 rev 1	Draft Management Plan for the Antarctic Special Protected Area Mount Harding, Grove Mountains, East Antarctica	China

7b) Historic Sites and Monuments

WP 38	Antarctic Protected Areas System: Revised List of Historic Sites and Monuments (Measure 3 (2003) Draft Guidelines for its Application)	Chile
WP 39	“Trinity Peninsula/Louis Philippe Land” (Translation of place-name)	Chile
WP 41	Monument to the Antarctic Treaty	Chile
IP 94 rev 1	Avances al plan de gestión territorial, manejo ambiental y conservación del patrimonio histórico de la base Gabriel González Videla. Verano 2007	Chile
IP 123	Historical Sites of Byers Peninsula, Livingston Island, South Shetland Islands, Antarctica	Chile

IP 127	Historic Sites of the Northern Coast of Fildes Peninsula, King George Island (South Shetland Group)	Chile
--------	---	-------

7c) Site Guidelines

WP 22	Site Guidelines for Brown Bluff, Tabarin Peninsula	United kingdom & United States
WP 40	Guidelines for Visitors to Snow Hill	Argentina & Sweden
IP 11	Antarctic Site Inventory: 1994-2007	United States
IP 83	A Commentary on Policy Issues Arising from On-Site Review of Guidelines for Visitor Sites in the Antarctic Peninsula	ASOC
IP 114	Brief Update on the Antarctic Peninsula Landing Site Visits and Site Guidelines	IAATO

7d) Systematic Environmental Geographic Framework

WP 12	Systematic Environmental Protection in Antarctica: Final progress report on Environmental Domains Analysis for the Antarctic continent	New Zealand
IP 41	Systematic Environmental Protection in Antarctica: local and regional scale application of Environmental Domains Analysis for the Antarctic continent	New Zealand

7e) Other Annex V Matters

WP 10	Intersessional CEP consideration of Draft Management Plans	Australia
WP 17	On the concept of the Antarctic Marine Protected Areas	Russian Federation
WP 43	Guidance for Working Papers on Area Protection and Management	United Kingdom
SP 7	Register of the Status of Antarctic Specially Protected Area and Antarctic Specially Managed Area Management Plans. Updated March 2007	ATS
IP 9	Opening of Lago Escondido at Deception Island	Spain
IP 22 rev 1	Progress Report on the Discussion of the International Working Group about Possibilities for Environmental Management of Fildes Peninsula and Ardley Island	Germany & Chile
IP 38	Update on progress towards the CCAMLR Workshop on Bioregionalisation of the Southern Ocean (Brussels, Belgium, 13-17 August 2007)	CCAMLR
IP 53	Criteria for the selection of Marine Protected Areas (MPAs)	United Kingdom
IP 62	Admiralty Bay Antarctic Specially Managed Area (ASMA No. 1) Management Group Report	Brazil, Ecuador, Peru, Poland & United States
IP 87	Marine Protected Areas – Steps Forward for the ATCM	ASOC
IP 108	Report of the Deception Island Antarctic Specially Managed Area (ASMA) Management Group	Argentina, Chile, Norway, Spain, United Kingdom & United States.
IP 112	Possible Modules of a “Fildes Peninsula region” ASMA	Germany

	Management Plan	
IP 115	Management and further protection within ASPA 125: Current situation	Chile
IP 117	Workshop on Coordination of Activities in the Fildes Peninsula Region	Chile
IP136	Implementing the Madrid Protocol: A case study of Fildes Peninsula, King George Island	ASOC

Item 8: Conservation of Antarctic Flora and Fauna

8a) Quarantine and non-native species

IP 36	Non-native species: Pathways and Vectors between New Zealand and Scott Base, Antarctica	New Zealand
IP 37	Hull fouling as a source of marine invasion in the Antarctic	SCAR
IP 43	The Global Invasive Species Database	New Zealand
IP 49	Aliens in Antarctica	Australia & Scar
IP 126	Prevention and Management of Harmful Non-Native Species in the Antarctic and the Sub Antarctic	IUCN

8b) Specially Protected Species

WP 26	The Application of IUCN Endangerment Criteria at the Regional Level of the Antarctic Treaty Area	SCAR
WP 27	Current Status of the Ross Seal (<i>Ommatophoca rossii</i>): A Specially Protected Species under Annex II	SCAR

8c) Marine Acoustics

WP 18	Russian studies of acoustic influence on marine biota	Russian Federation
IP 4	International Workshop “Impacts of seismic survey activities on whales and other marine biota”	Germany
IP 42	Marine Acoustics in Antarctic Waters: Report of an International Whaling Commission Workshop	New Zealand

8d) Other Annex II Matters

IP 15	Subglacial Antarctic Lake Environments (SALE) in the International Polar Year 2007-2008	SCAR
IP 32	Census of Antarctic Marine Life (CAML)	Australia & SCAR

Item 9: Environmental Monitoring and Reporting

WP 28	Climate Changes	Norway
WP 29	Environmental Monitoring in Antarctica – lessons learned from the Arctic	Norway
IP 5	State of the Antarctic and Southern Ocean Climate System (SASOCS)	SCAR
IP 26	Fluxgate and Proton Precession technology for fixed monitoring station in BCAA	Uruguay
IP 82 rev 1	The Antarctic and Climate Change	ASOC

IP 111	A Monitoring Programme for the Admiralty Bay Antarctic Specially Managed Area (ASMA N° 1)	Brazil, Ecuador & Peru
IP 138	Antarctica and climate change – implications for governance	United Kingdom

Item 10: Inspection Reports

WP 16	Report of the Antarctic Treaty inspections undertaken jointly by Sweden, France and New Zealand in accordance with Article VII of the Antarctic Treaty and Article 14 of the Protocol on Environmental Protection to the Antarctic Treaty	Sweden, France & New Zealand
WP 33	A Proposed Checklist for Inspecting Protected Areas in Antarctica	New Zealand, United Kingdom & United States
IP 10	United States Report of Inspections	United States

Item 11: Emergency Response and Contingency Planning

WP 37 rev 1	The M/S Nordkapp incident	Norway
IP 25	Monitoreo Ambiental Biológico para el Plan de Contingencia de la descarga de combustible en la Base Científica Antártica Artigas (BCAA)	Uruguay
IP 99	Contingency Planning and Emergency Response	COMNAP

Item 12: Waste Management

IP 21	Borehole Remediation and Closure Activities at Lake Vida in the McMurdo Dry Valleys Antarctic Specially Managed Area	United States
IP 33	Australian Research on the Assessment and Remediation of Contaminated Sites in Antarctica	Australia
IP 34	On-site Assessment of Metal Contamination During Remediation of a Waste Disposal Site in Antarctica	Australia
IP 98	COMNAP's 2006 Workshop on Waste Management in Antarctica	COMNAP

Item 13: Prevention of Marine Pollution

Item 14: Cooperation with Other Organisations

WP 7	Report of the CEP Observer to the Twenty-fifth meeting of the Scientific Committee to CCAMLR, 23 to 27 October 2006	New Zealand
IP 69	Progress with the Implementation of the Agreement on the Conservation of Albatrosses and Petrels (ACAP)	ACAP
IP 133	COMNAP Report to ATCM XXX	COMNAP

Item 15: General Matters

WP 35	Best Practice for Energy Management – Guidance and Recommendations	COMNAP
IP 18	International Workshop of Antarctic Competent Authorities	Belgium, France, Germany, Netherlands, Peru, Russian Federation, Ukraine & United

		Kingdom
IP 48	Mawson Station wind farm – Four years of operational experience	Australia
IP 57 rev 1	Chinese Antarctic Environmental Report (2006-2007)	China

Item 16: Election of Officers

Item 17: Preparation for CEP XI

Item 18: Adoption of the Report

Item 19: Closing of the Meeting

ANNEX 2

CEP Contact Points

Member Country	Contact Person	Email address
Argentina	Memolli Mariano Rodolfo Sánchez	<i>mmemolli@dna.gov.ar</i> <i>rsanchez@dna.gov.ar</i>
Australia	Ewan McIvor Michael Stoddart	<i>ewan.mcivor@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@cgu.cz</i>
Ecuador	Hernán Moreano Andrade	<i>inae@gye.satnet.net</i>
Finland	Outi Mähönen Mika Kalakoski	<i>outi.mahonen@ymparisto.fi</i> <i>mika.kalakoski@fimr.fi</i>
France	Yves Frenot Laurence Petitguillaume	<i>yves.frenot@ipev.fr</i> <i>Laurence.petitguillaume@ecologie.gouv.fr</i>
Germany	Heike Herata	<i>Heike.herata@uba.de</i>
Greece	Gounaris, Emmanouil	<i>giorgom1@otenet.gr</i>
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	Yusuke Saito	<i>YUSUKE_SAITO@env.go.jp</i>
Korea, Republic of	In-Young Ahn Jaeyong Choi	<i>iahn@kopri.re.kr</i> <i>jaychoi@cnu.ac.kr</i>
Netherlands	Gerie Jonk	<i>gerie.jonk@minvrom.nl</i>

New Zealand	Neil Gilbert Harry Keys	<i>n.gilbert@antarcticanz.govt.nz</i> <i>hkeys@doc.govt.nz</i>
Norway	Birgit Njaastad	<i>njaastad@npolar.no</i>
Peru	Fortunato Isasi-Cayo Patricia Gagliuffi	<i>fisasi@rree.gob.pe</i> <i>pgagliuffi@rree.gob.pe</i>
Poland	Andrzej Tatur Jakub Wolski	<i>tatura@interia.pl</i> <i>jakub.wolski@msz.gov.pl</i>
Romania	Teodor Gheroghe-Negoita	<i>negoita_antarctic@yahoo.com</i>
Russian Federation	Valery Lukin Anna Bystramovich	<i>lukin@raexp.spb.su/lukin@aari.nw.ru</i> <i>antarct@mcc.mecom.ru</i>
South Africa	Henry Valentine Richard Skinner Carol Jacobs	<i>hvalentine@deat.gov.za</i> <i>rskinner@deat.gov.za</i> <i>cjacobs@deat.gov.za</i>
Spain	Manuel Catalan	<i>cpe@mec.es / manuel.catalan@uca.es</i>
Sweden	Olle Melander	<i>Olle.melander@polar.se</i>
Ukraine	Dr Valerie Lytvynov Oleksandr Tashyrev	<i>uac@uac.gov.ua</i> <i>tach@i.com.ua</i>
United Kingdom	Rob Bowman Rachel Clark	<i>rob.bowman@fco.gov.uk</i> <i>racl@bas.ac.uk</i>
United States of America	Polly Penhale	<i>ppenhale@nsf.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 / 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> <i>slchown@sun.ac.za</i>
------	--	--

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> <i>kimcrosbie@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	Alexandre Karpov	<i>AKarpov@wmo.int</i>

Appendix 1: Provisional Five Year Work plan for the CEP

Issue / Environmental Pressure	Provi - sional Priority for CEP	Suggested Actions	Provisional Timetable for actions to be addressed at CEP meetings and during the Intersessional periods (subject to further review)											
			CEP X	Interses. period	CEP XI	Inters. period	CEP XII	Interses. period	CEP XIII	Interses. period	CEP XIV	Interses. period	CEP XV	
Introduction of non-native species	High	1. Review Workshop recommendations. 2. Develop practical guidelines for all Antarctic operators. 3. Establish a database of non-native species occurrences in Antarctica. 4. Review / endorse SCAR's RiSCC guidelines.		<i>Workshop with SCAR and COMNAP</i>		Dedicated time for discussion								
Tourism and NGO activities	High	1. Provide advice to ATCM as requested.	<i>ICG established as required</i>											
Global Pressure: Climate change	High	1. SCAR currently undertaking an Antarctic Climate Impact Assessment (ACIA).			SCAR ACIA presented to CEP - dedicated time for discussion									
Global Pressure: Pollution	High	1. Maintain a watching brief on pollution monitoring			SCAR report requested		SCAR report on Antarctic pollution presented to CEP - dedicated discussion time							

Issue / Environmental Pressure	Provi - sional Priority for CEP	Suggested Actions	Provisional Timetable for actions to be addressed at CEP meetings and during the Intersessional periods (subject to further review)										
			CEP X	<i>Interes. period</i>	CEP XI	<i>Interes. period</i>	CEP XII	<i>Interes. period</i>	CEP XIII	<i>Interes. period</i>	CEP XIV	<i>Interes. period</i>	CEP XV
Processing new and revised protected / managed area management plans	High	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Refine the process for reviewing new and revised management plans. 2. Update existing guidelines. 3. Develop an agreed understanding of "wilderness". 	Standing Group established to deal with area protection matters	<i>Standing Group conducts work as required</i>	SG Report	<i>Standing Group conducts work as required</i>	SG Report	<i>Standing Group conducts work as required</i>	SG Report and review of effectiveness of Standing Group				
Marine protected areas	High	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Cooperate with CCAMLR on Southern Ocean bioregionalisation. 2. Identify processes for MPA designation. 		<i>Southern Ocean Bioregionalisation Workshop, Belgium (August 2007)</i>	Review workshop outcomes and consider further CEP action								
Operation of the CEP and Strategic Planning	High	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Keep the 5 year plan up to date based on changing circumstances and ATCM requirements. 2. Identify opportunities for improving the effectiveness of the CEP. 	Standing item		Standing item		Standing item		Standing item		Standing item		Standing item

Issue / Environmental Pressure	Provi - sional Priority for CEP	Suggested Actions	Provisional Timetable for actions to be addressed at CEP meetings and during the intersessional periods (subject to further review)										
			CEP X	<i>Interse s. period</i>	CEP XI	<i>Inters. period</i>	CEP XII	<i>Interses. period</i>	CEP XIII	<i>Interses. period</i>	CEP XIV	<i>Interses. period</i>	CEP XV
Human footprint / wilderness management	Medium / high	1. Develop an agreed understanding of the terms "footprint" and "wilderness".					Dedicated time for discussion			<i>Workshop</i>	Dedicated time for discussion		
Maintain the list of Historic Sites and Monuments	Medium / high	1. Maintain the list and consider new proposals as they arise.	Assign to the area protection Standing Group; OR Assign to the Treaty Secretariat; OR Maintain as a standing item on the CEP agenda.		SG report OR Secretariat report OR Standing item		SG report OR Secretariat report OR Standing item		SG report OR Secret. report OR Standing item		SG report OR Secretariat report OR Standing item		SG report OR Secret. report OR Standing item
Monitoring and state of the environment reporting	Medium / high	1. Identify key indicators of human impacts. 2. Establish a process for reporting to the ATCM					Standing Group established				Dedicated time for discussion and possible establishment of an Expert Group		
Exchange of Information	Medium / high	Assign to the Secretariat	Secretariat Report		Secretariat Report		Secretariat Report		Secret. Report		Secretariat Report		Secret. Report
Biodiversity loss	Medium / high	1. Maintain awareness of threats to existing biodiversity											

Issue / Environmental Pressure	Provi - sional Priority for CEP	Suggested Actions	Provisional Timetable for actions to be addressed at CEP meetings and during the Intersessional periods (subject to further review)										
			CEP X	Interses. period	CEP XI	Inters. period	CEP XII	Interses. period	CEP XIII	Interses. period	CEP XIV	Interses. period	CEP XV
Site specific guidelines for tourist-visited sites	Medium	1. Review site specific guidelines as required. 2. Provide advice to ATCM as required.	Assign to the area protection Standing Group	Standing Group conducts work as required	SG report	Standing Group conducts work as required	SG report	Standing Group conducts work as required	SG report	Standing Group conducts work as required	SG report	Standing Group conducts work as required	SG report
Implementing and improving the EIA provisions of Annex I	Medium	1. Refine the process for considering CEEs and advising the ATCM accordingly. 2. Develop guidelines for assessing cumulative impacts. 3. Keep the EIA Guidelines under review. 4. Consider application of strategic environmental assessment in Antarctica.			Standing Group established to handle draft CEEs (and other EIA matters) OR Dedicated discussion time to strengthen existing ICG process			SG report OR ICG report		SG report OR ICG report		SG report OR ICG report	SG report OR ICG report
Specially protected species	Medium	1. Consider listing / delisting proposals as they come forward.	SCAR reports presented to CEP - dedicated discussion time										

Issue / Environmental Pressure	Provi - sional Priority for CEP	Suggested Actions	Provisional Timetable for actions to be addressed at CEP meetings and during the intersessional periods (subject to further review)										
			CEP X	Inters. period	CEP XI	Inters. period	CEP XII	Interses. period	CEP XIII	Interse s. period	CEP XIV	Interses. period	CEP XV
Overview of the protected areas system / SEGF	Medium	1. Apply the domains analysis (SEGF) to the existing system – undertake a gap analysis.			Assign to the area protection Standing Group								
Emergency response action and contingency planning	Medium	To be determined			COMNAP advice on ERA and CP requested		COMNAP report presented to CEP – dedicated time for discussion						
Updating the Protocol and reviewing Annexes	Medium	1. Complete review of Annex II (currently with the ATCM). 2. Prepare a rioritized timetable for the review of the remaining annexes.	Requires CEP discussion on the need and aims for reviewing Protocol annexes.										
Inspections (Article 14 of the Protocol)	Medium	1. Review inspection reports as required. 2. Review environmental component of inspection checklists as required.	Standing item		Standing item		Standing item		Standing item		Standing item		Standing item
Shipping Guidelines	Low / medium				Review status of guidelines within IMO				Establish Expert Group to review guidelines				

Issue / Environmental Pressure	Provi - sional Priority for CEP	Suggested Actions	Provisional Timetable for actions to be addressed at CEP meetings and during the Intersessional periods (subject to further review)											
			CEP X	Inters. period	CEP XI	Inters. period	CEP XII	Inters. period	CEP XIII	Inters. s. period	CEP XIV	Inters. s. period	CEP XV	
Ballast water guidelines	Low / medium	1. Guidelines already approved by the ATCM. May need reviewing in due course.			Review status of guidelines within IMO					Establish Expert Group to review guidelines				
Energy management	Low / medium	1. Develop best-practice guidelines for energy management at stations and bases.					COMNAP report requested			COMNAP report presented to CEP – dedicated time for discussion				
Outreach and education	Low / medium	1. Review current examples and identify opportunities for greater education and outreach.								Dedicated time for discussion				
Marine acoustics	Low	1. Develop guidelines for use of noise-emitting devices. 2. Maintain a watching brief on the issue.	IWC and German Workshops reviewed											
Waste	Low	1. Develop guidelines for best practice disposal of waste including human waste.								COMNAP report requested		COMNAP report presented to CEP – dedicated time for discussion		

Issue / Environmental Pressure	Provi - sional Priority for CEP	Suggested Actions	Provisional Timetable for actions to be addressed at CEP meetings and during the Intersessional periods (subject to further review)										
			CEP X	<i>Inters. period</i>	CEP XI	<i>Inters. period</i>	CEP XII	<i>Interses. period</i>	CEP XIII	<i>Interse s. period</i>	CEP XIV	<i>Interse s. period</i>	CEP XV
Clean up of sites of past activity	Low	1. Establish Antarctic-wide inventory of sites of past activity. 2. Develop guidelines for best practice approach to clean up.									Secretariat requested to develop and maintain an inventory COMNAP report on best practice requested		Secretariat report COMNAP report presented to CEP - dedicated time for discussion

Appendix 2

Proposed Terms of Reference for a trial informal group to review draft Management Plans

The group shall:

1. In consultation with relevant experts, examine each draft Management Plan referred for intersessional review by CEP X to consider:
 - whether it is consistent with the provisions of Annex V to the Protocol, particularly Articles 3, 4 and 5, and with relevant CEP guidelines;
 - its content, clarity, consistency and likely effectiveness;
 - whether it clearly states the primary reason for designation; and
 - whether it clearly states how the proposed Area complements the Antarctic protected areas system as a whole.
2. Advise proponents, through the Discussion Forum, of suggested amendments to the draft Management Plan to address issues in relation to 1) above.
3. Prior to the Working Paper deadline, consider any revised Management Plan or comments provided by the proponent in response to the group’s suggested amendments;
4. Submit a Working Paper to CEP XI with recommendations to the CEP on the adoption or otherwise of each new or revised draft Management Plan.
5. Report to CEP XI on the effectiveness of the trial.

Possible timeline for informal group to review draft Management Plans

Period	Action	Timing*
Intersessional period	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Secretariat posts all draft Management Plans referred for intersessional discussion to the online Discussion Forum. 	As soon as possible following CEP meeting
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Interested CEP Members and Observers post comments on draft Management Plans via online Discussion Forum. • The “group” considers draft Management Plans in accordance with Terms of Reference and prepares a report with recommendations for proponents. “Group” report translated and posted to online Discussion Forum. 	3-6 months following CEP meeting
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Draft Management Plans revised by proponents in response to comments provided by Members, Observers and the “group”, and posted to the discussion forum. 	As early as possible prior to Working Paper deadline
Working Paper deadline	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Proponents submit revised draft Management Plans as Working Papers. • “Group” convenor submits Working Paper with recommendations for the adoption or otherwise of draft Management Plans. 	45 days prior to CEP meeting
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Consideration by CEP of Working Paper containing “group’s” recommendations. • Discussion of Working Papers containing individual Management Plans only if there is not consensus agreement on the “group’s” recommendations. 	
CEP meeting		

*Note: Indicative timing only. Actual timing may vary due to the length of the intersessional period.

Appendix 3

CEP Advice to ATCM XXX on the draft CEE for the “New Indian Research Base at Larsemann Hills, Antarctica”

The Committee had extensive discussions on the draft CEE presented by India for the “New Indian Research Base at Larsemann Hills, Antarctica” contained in WP 4 and IP 7, and on additional information provided by India during the meeting in IP 139. This additional information took into account comments received from Members during the intersessional period.

Members raised several questions, reflecting concerns related to the following issues:

1. Justification for the location of the new station;
2. Use of water from pristine lakes of high scientific value and the need for consideration of alternative methods to produce fresh water;
3. The need for consideration of possible cumulative impacts of human activities in the area;
4. The need for a description of procedures to minimise the risk of introduction of non-native species.

India responded to these questions and advised that all of them, as well as other questions received directly from some Members, will be addressed in the final CEE.

The CEP advises that, on the basis of the information provided by India:

- The document is well structured and meets the requirements of Annex I, Article 3, of the Protocol; and
- The proposed location of India’s new facility is not inconsistent with the provisions of the draft “Larsemann Hills, East Antarctica, Antarctic Specially Managed Area, Management Plan” (WP 8).

The CEP recommends that the ATCM endorse this view.

Appendix 4

Procedures for intersessional CEP consideration of draft CEEs

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

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

6. The CEP Chair shall immediately notify the CEP contact points of the availability of each draft CEE, and provide details of the web site at which such documents can be accessed.#
7. The Chair shall suggest a convenor for an open-ended intersessional contact group to consider the draft CEE. The convenor should preferably not be from the proponent Party.#
8. The Chair shall allow a period of 15 days for Members to object or offer comments, suggestions or proposals concerning:
 - i. the proposed convenor.
 - ii. additional terms of reference beyond the following generic issues:
 - o the extent to which the CEE conforms to the requirements of Article 3 of Annex I of the Environmental Protocol.
 - o whether the conclusions of the draft CEE are adequately supported by the information contained within the document.
 - o the clarity, format and presentation of the draft CEE.#
9. If the Chair does not receive a reply within 15 days it will be considered that the Members agree with the proposed convenor and the generic terms of reference. If the Chair receives comments on i) or ii) listed above within the 15 day limit the Chair shall, as appropriate, circulate a revised suggestion for one or both items. A further 15 day limit applies for Members to respond.#
10. All correspondence shall be available to all representatives via the CEP Discussion Forum.*

The right of a Party to raise an issue on a draft CEE at the CEP or ATCM is not affected by its action in relation to the establishment – or non-establishment – of an open-ended intersessional contact group.#

12. The outcome of the contact group's deliberations, indicating areas of agreement and areas where differing views are expressed, shall be reported in a Working Paper submitted by the convenor to the next CEP meeting.*

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

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

Appendix 5

CEP XI 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
 - a. Climate Change
 - b. Other Environmental Monitoring and Reporting Matters
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