

Report of the Committee for Environmental Protection

Report from the Committee's fourth meeting (CEP IV)
July 9-13, 2001
St.Petersburg, Russian Federation

Table of Contents

Report	
Item 1: Opening of the Meeting	3
Item 2: Adoption of the Agenda	3
Item 3: Operation of the CEP	3
Item 4: Compliance with the Protocol on Environmental Protection	3
4a) General Matters	3
4b) Consideration of Draft CEEs forwarded to the CEP in accordance with paragraph 4 of Article 3 of Annex I of the Protocol	6
4c) Other Matters covered by Annex I (Environmental Impact Assessments)	6
4d) Matters covered by Annex II (Conservation of Antarctic Flora and Fauna)	8
4e) Matters covered by Annex III (Waste Disposal and Waste Management)	9
4f) Matters covered by Annex IV (Prevention of Marine Pollution)	9
4g) Matters covered by Annex V (Area Protection and Management)	9
Item 5: Environmental Monitoring	14
Item 6: State of the Antarctic Environment Report	14
Item 7: Emergency Response and Contingency Planning	15
Item 8: Data and Exchange of Information	15
8a) General Matters	15
8b) Co-operation with other organizations in accordance with Article 11 of the Protocol	16
Item 9: Election of Officers	16
Item 10: Preparation of CEP IV	17
Item 11: Adoption of the Report	17
Item 12: Closing of the Meeting	17
Annexes	
Annex 1: Final list of documents	18
Annex 2: Addresses of the national contact points	23
Annex 3: Websites of CEP members where Annual Reports are or will be posted	25
Appendices	
Appendix 1: Guidelines on Circulation and Handling of CEP Documents (Decision 1)	26
Appendix 2: Collection of meteorites in Antarctica (Resolution 3)	28
Appendix 3: Historic Sites and Monuments (Resolution 4)	29
Appendix 4: Guidelines for handling of pre-1958 historic remains whose existence or present location is not known (Resolution 5)	31
Appendix 5: Antarctic Protected Area System Historic Sites and Monuments: “A Hut”, Scott Base, Ross Sea Region, Antarctica (Measure 1)	33
Appendix 6: Antarctic Protected Area System Historic Sites and Monuments: Ruins of the Base Pedro Aguirre Cerda, Pendulum Cove, Deception Island, Antarctica (Measure 2)	34
Appendix 7: Antarctic Protected Areas System: Extension of Expiry Dates for Certain Sites of Special Scientific Interest (Measure 3)	35
Appendix 8: Agenda for CEP V	36

Item 1: Opening of the Meeting

(1) The CEP Chair, Dr. Olav Orheim (Norway), opened the meeting on Monday, 9 July, 2001.

Item 2: Adoption of Agenda

(2) The provisional agenda, as agreed at CEP III and circulated by Russia, was adopted. Altogether 24 Working Papers and 47 Information Papers were considered under the various agenda items (**Annex 1** of the CEP Report).

Item 3: Operation of the CEP

(3) Argentina presented Working Paper (XXIV ATCM/WP4) concerning the submission and distribution of CEP documents and proposing amendments to the Guidelines on Circulation and Handling of CEP documents (Annex 3 to the Final Report of CEP I). In its Working Paper Argentina suggested changing the deadlines for submission of CEP documents to accord with those contained in Annex D to the Final Report of XX ATCM. This means that the Host Government should receive CEP documents that require translation 45 days before the CEP meeting and that these should be circulated in translation no later than 30 days before the meeting. Those Information Papers that do not require translation should be submitted within 30 days as described in Annex D of XX ATCM. The Committee agreed to this proposal and recommended that Decision 2(2001) be adopted by XXIV ATCM. At the same time Parties were urged to comply with the Guidelines. The revised Guidelines are appended as **Appendix 1**.

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

Item 4: Compliance with the Protocol on Environmental Protection

4a) General Matters

(5) The USA, as Depository Government for the Antarctic Treaty and its Protocol, reported that Ukraine had ratified the Protocol on 25 May 2001. Canada informed the Committee that it hoped to report positive progress regarding its ratification of the Environmental Protocol by CEP V. The Committee welcomed this information.

(6) The CEP noted that its work, most recently the intersessional considerations of Specially Protected Species, had shown that improvements could be made to the Annexes of the Protocol. The Committee therefore decided to conduct a rolling review of the Annexes, starting at CEP V with Annex II.

(7) New Zealand introduced Working Paper (XXIV ATCM/WP9) on the collection of Antarctic meteorites by private expeditions. At CEP III, SCAR had expressed concern that private expeditions were being planned for the collection and possible sale of Antarctic meteorites, which could lead to loss of meteorites from the scientific community and degradation of areas of great scientific value. The paper reviewed current scientific procedures and documented known recent private expeditions that had collected meteorites as well as the sale of an Antarctic meteorite fragment by electronic auction. New Zealand concluded that the concerns were real, that ATCM should be advised, and that an approach for addressing this serious issue should be put forward by the CEP.

(8) The discussion revealed significant differences in how countries provide protection for scientifically valuable material through legislation giving effect to the Environmental Protocol. One issue relates to different definitions of the term “mineral resources” in national legislation. Some Members expressed the view that collection and sale of Antarctic meteorites is a violation of Article 7 of the Protocol.

(9) The CEP agreed to offer the draft Resolution 3(2001) for the consideration of the ATCM (**Appendix 2**).

(10) Peru tabled Working Paper (XXIV ATCM/WP13) on enhanced co-operation between Parties in relation to Article 6 of the Protocol. The meeting welcomed the paper and agreed that increased co-operation between stations and programmes in close proximity in Antarctica should be encouraged. It was noted that COMNAP provides a very effective way of promoting co-operation on operational and logistic matters. Scientific co-operation should be promoted through SCAR. Peru was invited to further explore areas of co-operation not yet covered by COMNAP or SCAR and report on their findings at a future meeting of the CEP.

(11) Norway introduced Working Paper (XXIV ATCM/WP 25) reporting on the environmental aspects of an Antarctic Treaty inspection conducted in Dronning Maud Land in January 2001. The United States also distributed copies of its report of the inspection carried out in February 2001 on the Antarctic Peninsula (XXIV ATCM/IP17). Both inspections noted that there was high awareness of the provisions of the Environmental Protocol at the stations inspected. Norway also noted that station practices had been significantly altered as a result of the Protocol entering into force. Some stations had reviewed and completed the inspection checklist developed at ATCM XVIII. This was found to be very helpful for both the inspection teams and the stations. The checklist provides a comprehensive review of Protocol requirements, and its completion by the stations allows them to monitor their own compliance.

(12) While environmental protection at stations is generally good, the inspection teams noted areas for improvement:

- a) Some stations lacked basic fuel containment, spill response equipment and adequate spill contingency planning.
- b) Some stations did not have adequate sewage treatment systems. In addition, all four inland stations visited discharged grey water onto ice-free ground, even though the provisions of Annex III of the Protocol state that such disposal should be avoided.
- c) Various houseplants were found at some stations, highlighting the need to consider issues related to non-indigenous species in Antarctica.
- d) Some stations were not familiar with the Protocol’s requirements regarding EIA processes and reporting of emergency situations.

(13) The CEP welcomed the inspection reports and noted that the issues raised would merit further consideration by the Committee.

(14) It was noted that the inspection reports highlighted practical challenges in meeting the requirements of the Protocol. The discharge of wastewater at inland stations was one example. Such issues may be matters on which COMNAP might wish to provide advice on best practice. COMNAP drew the Committee's attention to guidelines for fuel handling and oil spill contingency planning which are available on the COMNAP website (www.comnap.aq).

(15) The Committee agreed that in accordance with previous practice the Information Papers containing annual reports by Parties regarding compliance with the Protocol would not be discussed unless there were specific questions about any of these.

(16) The following Information Papers giving annual reports were submitted to the Committee, in accordance with Article 17 of the Protocol: (XXIV ATCM/IP1), (United Kingdom); (XXIV ATCM/IP3), (Uruguay); (XXIV ATCM/IP8), (Netherlands); (XXIV ATCM/IP14), (Japan); (XXIV ATCM/IP15), (Sweden); (XXIV ATCM/IP32), (Spain); (XXIV ATCM/IP35), (Argentina); (XXIV ATCM/IP36), (South Africa); (XXIV ATCM/IP37), (Italy); (XXIV ATCM/IP41), (Australia); (XXIV ATCM/IP42), (Norway); (XXIV ATCM/IP44), (Finland); (XXIV ATCM/IP45), (China); (XXIV ATCM/IP46), (Russian Federation); (XXIV ATCM/IP51), (New Zealand); (XXIV ATCM/IP56), (Bulgaria); (XXIV ATCM/IP58), (Chile); (XXIV ATCM/IP60), (Peru); (XXIV ATCM/IP65), (Belgium); (XXIV ATCM/IP66), (India). USA and Australia noted that they had posted the information under this agenda item on their websites and had informed other Parties about this through diplomatic channels.

(17) Sweden submitted Information Paper (XXIV ATCM/IP16) on an environmental exchange program between Sweden and Australia in November and December 2000. The Committee noted this as a good example of bilateral co-operation.

(18) ASOC introduced Information Paper (XXIV ATCM/IP55) on the legal implementation of the five Annexes of the Protocol. It was recognised by the Committee that this information provided a useful benchmark of progress on the implementation of the Protocol.

(19) The Czech Republic introduced Information Paper (XXIV ATCM/IP24) on its proposal to establish a scientific station on King George Island, Antarctica.

(20) The Committee thanked the Czech Republic for its paper and recognised the initiative taken to bring the information before the CEP. The Committee also welcomed the Czech Republic's interest in developing a scientific research program in Antarctica and interest in the work of the Committee.

(21) However several Members of the Committee expressed concern over this proposal from an environmental perspective. The large number of bases already at King George Island was noted. A number of Members also commented on the sensitivities of the island with regard to its wildlife. Such matters would require full consideration by the Czech Republic through an environmental impact assessment.

(22) Several Members also expressed their preference for undertaking scientific research through co-operation with those Parties that already had established bases in Antarctica.

(23) The Committee also noted that the Czech Republic was not currently a Party to the Environmental Protocol. In this regard the Czech Republic noted that it would provide information to XXIV ATCM on the steps it was taking towards ratification.

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

(24) In the period between CEP III and CEP IV no draft CEEs had been forwarded to the Committee.

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

(25) COMNAP presented Working Paper (XXIV ATCM/WP20) outlining the progress on analysis of IEEs prepared for Antarctic operations. The CEP considered this to be an important initiative and looked forward to receiving the report from COMNAP at the next CEP meeting. The Committee agreed that the three chosen activities of scientific ice core drilling, station living facilities and fuel storage facilities, were appropriate. The Committee noted that SCAR was planning a workshop in 2001 to consider the potential impacts on the marine environment of scientific acoustic techniques.

(26) The Russian Federation presented Working Paper (XXIV ATCM/WP29) containing a preliminary expert conclusion from the Russian State Ecological Expert Committee for proposed ecologically clean technology for penetrating the subglacial Lake Vostok. The Committee thanked Russia for this comprehensive information on a project of very high scientific and public interest and noted that a draft CEE would be submitted for the project at a later stage. Various comments were made on that project including: the need for an analysis of the levels of contamination that are acceptable to safeguard the scientific and environmental values of the Lake; the issue of field trials, including at locations other than Lake Vostok; and the planned timetable. On the latter Russia noted that there were still some uncertainties, in part related to funding. Russia requested comments from Parties on their Working Paper by the end of the year, and several Parties offered to provide them.

(27) SCAR confirmed the significant interest among the international scientific community on this initiative. SCAR noted its intention to hold a workshop on the issue in August 2001 as part of the SCAR Biology Symposium in Amsterdam. The meeting of the SCAR Group of Specialists on Subglacial Antarctic Lake Exploration in Bologna in September 2001 would also address the Lake Vostok project. Further information is available at www.scar.org and <http://salegos-scar.montana.edu>.

(28) The Russian Federation introduced Working Paper (XXIV ATCM/WP32) containing a preliminary environmental impact assessment for the Russian Antarctic Expedition. It was agreed that this paper should be deferred for more detailed consideration to CEP V.

(29) Germany introduced Information Paper (XXIV ATCM/IP18) on the exchange of information between Parties on the application of Articles 3 and 8 as well as Annex I of the Protocol. The Committee agreed that Germany should carry out an e-mail survey of the CEP contact points on legal implementation of these provisions.

(30) IAATO presented Information Paper (XXIV ATCM/IP52) reporting on various aspects of cumulative impacts in relation to tourism.

(31) Australia noted the advantage of a co-ordinated approach to monitoring cumulative impacts. The Committee agreed that this was an important issue and a key element of the EIA provisions of the Protocol. The Committee therefore decided to set up an intersessional contact group (ICG) to be led by Dr. Joyce Jatko (JJatko@nsf.gov) to encourage co-ordination of research and monitoring in relation to cumulative impacts of activities in Antarctica. The Terms of Reference for the ICG are:

- present an annotated summary of past and continuing studies and reports that are examining cumulative environmental impacts pertinent to the Protocol, including, for example, those examining tourism, national programmes, and non-governmental expeditions;
- consider and advise on how future studies on human impacts could be co-ordinated and conducted, including the roles that SCAR, COMNAP, CCAMLR and IAATO, ASOC and other non-governmental organisations might play in this work;
- identify priorities for future studies on cumulative environmental impacts of human activity in Antarctica;
- provide a progress report to CEP V and a final report to CEP VI.

(32) Japan presented Information Paper (XXIV ATCM/IP53), which was an IEE for deep ice core drilling activity at Dome Fuji Station.

(33) Several delegations commended Japan on a comprehensive IEE. There were different views amongst the Members about whether an IEE or a CEE is the appropriate level of environmental impact assessment for this activity.

(34) Japan responded to various questions on specific aspects of the IEE. They explained that the drill hole would only reach the bottom ice layer above the basement rock; wilderness values had been considered in general, although there was no specific mention of this in the IEE; although no specific fuel spill contingency plan had been prepared, precautions had been taken to prevent spills by using strengthened and small fuel containment, and general emergency plans had also been put in place; consideration of alternative drilling techniques had been made; and procedures for the disposal of waste water/human waste would follow Annex III of the Protocol.

(35) ASOC presented Information Paper (XXIV ATCM/IP54) on strategic needs and decision making in Antarctica and its possible application to Strategic Environmental Assessment. Several delegations commended ASOC on an interesting and useful paper.

(36) Norway, on behalf of the host country, presented Information Paper (XXIV ATCM/IP10), which contained the list of IEEs and CEEs submitted to the host country as required by Resolution 6(1995).

(37) With respect to the list of IEEs and CEEs circulated by the host country, the UK was of the opinion that inclusion of EIAs which addressed the activities of fishing vessels was not appropriate.

Such activities are addressed by other components of the Antarctic Treaty System, or other treaties. The compliance of fishing vessels was therefore best dealt with through normal port inspection provisions rather than EIAs under the Protocol.

(38) New Zealand advised the Committee that it had reviewed the IEEs covering fishing vessels with respect to the Protocol for activities not regulated by CCAMLR.

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

(39) Argentina introduced Working Paper (XXIV ATCM/WP5) containing the progress report of the intersessional contact group on Specially Protected Species. The Committee congratulated Argentina on its co-ordination of the intersessional work and agreed that this should continue with the following Terms of Reference:

- consider further how the IUCN “Red List” criteria could be used to assist in the identification of species which might be designated as Antarctic Specially Protected Species;
- recommend legal and practical mechanisms that could be implemented to provide the special protection for those species proposed for designation as Specially Protected Species; and
- consider if the status of Specially Protected Species should be applicable to Antarctic species other than native mammals, birds and plants.

(40) The Committee welcomed Argentina’s offer to continue to lead this issue. The intersessional contact group will continue to be led by José M. Acero (jmacero@abaconet.com.ar).

(41) Australia presented Working Papers (XXIV ATCM/WP10) and (XXIV ATCM/WP11) containing the report of the intersessional contact group on diseases of Antarctic wildlife. The Committee thanked Australia for the comprehensive and thorough document, which would be useful for Parties when developing or improving national procedures to avoid the introduction of diseases. It was noted that the risk that human activities in Antarctica might introduce diseases was currently assessed to be very low. The Committee agreed that the work of the intersessional contact group was now complete. However, Australia offered to conduct an e-mail survey through the CEP contact points to compile best practice for prevention of diseases, particularly simple, effective, practical and low-cost measures, and to report back to a future CEP.

(42) The UK introduced Information Paper (XXIV ATCM/IP39) which provided the interim results of an ongoing review of guidelines for the operation of aircraft near concentrations of birds in Antarctica.

(43) The Committee welcomed this comprehensive review and stressed the importance of developing further consistent and effective guidelines for aircraft operations over Specially Protected Areas, as well as more generally. Several Members offered to provide the UK with further information on guidelines currently in use. The UK advised that they intend to complete the review for presentation to CEP V. The Committee welcomed this proposal.

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

(44) Uruguay introduced Information Paper (XXIV ATCM/IP4) containing information on clean-up of their own and several other unattributed work sites on Collins Glacier Ice Cap. The Committee welcomed this information.

(45) Russia presented Information Paper (XXIV ATCM/IP48) on nature protection measures at the Russian Antarctic stations, and Information Paper (XXIV ATCM/IP50) on planning of waste disposal at the Russian Antarctic stations and ships. The Committee welcomed these reports and stressed the importance of this work.

(46) Chile introduced Information Paper (XXIV ATCM/IP 57) on new environmental practices to be applied to the installation of a portable summer station in Patriot Hills. The Committee thanked Chile for this information.

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

(47) Chile presented Information Paper (XXIV ATCM/IP62) containing a report of the accident involving the Chilean vessel “Patriarche”. Chile agreed to make a full report available.

(48) The UK introduced a joint German/UK Information Paper (XXIV ATCM/IP64) on a successful oil spill exercise undertaken at the UK’s Rothera Research Station in conjunction with Germany’s research vessel “Polarstern”.

(49) Spain asked for further detail on key elements of the exercise and the equipment used, which the UK promised to provide.

(50) The Committee encouraged all Members to continue to co-operate on such exercises.

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

(51) The USA, as Depository Government for the Antarctic Treaty and its Protocol, reported that Ecuador and the Russian Federation had deposited instruments of ratification of Annex V. Poland informed the CEP that they also had approved Recommendation XVI-10, but that for technical reasons, this had not yet been registered by the Depository Government. India informed the meeting that they had now started the process of approving Recommendation XVI-10, and hoped to report positive progress at CEP V.

(52) The CEP congratulated Ecuador and Russia and looked forward to the speedy approval of Annex V. It was encouraging that it now seemed realistic that Annex V would be in force by CEP V.

(53) The UK introduced Working Paper (XXIV ATCM/WP 2) on a revision of the status of Specially Protected Area Number 18, North Coronation Island. The UK noted that very little information was available on this protected area, and that no site visits had been made for 25 years due to severe practical restrictions on access. As a result, the UK had not felt able to revise adequately the management plan for SPA 18.

(54) The UK's Working Paper set out three possible options for the future of this protected area. These were: To continue with the protection of the site recognising the severe limitations in knowledge; to continue with protection of the site but amend the values to be protected to include, for example, the importance of the site as a reference area; or to terminate designation of this protected area.

(55) The Committee thanked the UK for its paper and considered that it raised a number of important issues, including the extent of information that is required for maintaining and managing protected sites and the mechanisms for de-designating protected areas. Some Members considered that there was a case for de-designating the site given the limitations of knowledge on, and access to the site. Some Member suggested that it may be appropriate to retain the site as a designated protected area with modification of the values to be protected as appropriate. It was also raised by some Members that the application of a precautionary approach would mean that a designated site would only be de-designated if it could be shown that its values had been lost, damaged or destroyed.

(56) The CEP therefore asked the UK to further evaluate the site and to prepare a draft Management Plan that could be considered at CEP V. At the same time the Committee also recognised that the Antarctic Protected Areas System needed to be both flexible and responsive and that the principle of de-designating sites should not be dismissed.

(57) The United Kingdom presented Working Paper (XXIV ATCM/WP8) containing revised Management Plans for Specially Protected Areas No 8 – Dion Islands; Marguerite Bay; Specially Protected Area No 9 – Green Island, Berthelot Islands; Site of Special Scientific Interest No 29 – Ablation Point/Ganymede Heights, Alexander Island; and Site of Special Scientific Interest No 31 – Mount Flora, Hope Bay.

(58) The USA introduced Working Paper (XXIV ATCM/WP19) containing revised Management Plans for: Specially Protected Areas No 7 – Cape Hallett, Northern Victoria Land, Ross Sea; Site of Special Scientific Interest No 1 – Cape Royds, Ross Island; Site of Special Scientific Interest No 3 – Barwick and Balham Valleys, South Victoria Land; Site of Special Scientific Interest No 4 – Cape Crozier, Ross Island; Site of Special Scientific Interest No 18 – Northwest White Island, McMurdo Sound.

(59) The United Kingdom introduced Working Paper (XXIV ATCM/WP21) containing a revised Management Plan for Specially Protected Area No 21– Avian Island, Marguerite Bay.

(60) The United Kingdom presented Working Paper (XXIV ATCM/WP22) containing a revised Management Plan for Site of Special Scientific Interest No 6 – Byers Peninsula, Livingston Island prepared jointly by Chile and the United Kingdom.

(61) An open-ended contact group was established, under the chairmanship of the UK, to consider the submitted draft Management Plans and related issues.

(62) The contact group was asked to consider the extent to which the draft Management Plans required further scrutiny and whether they needed to be referred to an intersessional contact group, or groups, under the terms of the Guidelines for CEP Consideration of New and Revised draft Management Plans for Protected Areas (Annex 4 of the Final Report of CEP III).

(63) On the advice of the contact group the Committee noted that there were differing interpretations of the Guidelines agreed at CEP III. Several Members of the Committee considered that there should now be an automatic requirement to establish intersessional contact groups for submitted draft Plans. However, others were of the view that the option to approve Plans at the same meeting to which the draft Plans were submitted, should be retained. It was suggested that there may be genuine environmental or operational reasons for adopting a Management Plan for a protected area at the ATCM at which it was presented.

(64) The issue of SCAR's participation in the review of draft Management Plans was also discussed. Several Members of the Committee considered that the need to forward draft Management Plans to SCAR in advance of the CEP meeting had now been overtaken by the new Guidelines. It was considered that SCAR's participation in the intersessional review process would satisfy the need for SCAR to have the possibility to comment on all draft Management Plans.

(65) On the advice of the contact group the Committee also considered the number of intersessional groups that might need to be established to review those draft Plans submitted to CEP IV. The Committee noted that paragraph 85 of the Final Report of CEP III recorded the CEP's agreement to establish a separate intersessional contact group for each submitted draft Plan. However, the Committee agreed at this meeting to establish only two intersessional contact groups. One will be chaired by the USA (Dr. Joyce Jatko, JJatko@nsf.gov) to consider further all those draft Plans submitted by the US. The second contact group will be chaired by the UK (Dr. Neil Gilbert, Neil.Gilbert@fco.gov.uk) to consider further all those draft Plans submitted by the UK as well as the draft Plan submitted jointly by Chile and the UK.

(66) The CEP agreed that the two intersessional contact groups should use the following Terms of Reference:

- ensure that each of the draft Management Plans are consistent with the Guide to the Preparation of Management Plans for Antarctic Specially Protected Areas;
- ensure consistency of approach of management measures, as appropriate, across the Management Plans being reviewed;
- report back to CEP V on the results of the contact group's assessment and provide recommendations on how the CEP should proceed with respect to these Management Plans.

(67) The Committee did not examine in detail any of the submitted draft Plans. However, Australia raised the need for consistency of Management Plans on key issues. The example given was variations of prohibitions on the use of poultry products at sites with significant avifauna. The Committee agreed that this was important, and considered that one way to address this issue might be, in due course, to revise or amend the Guide to the Preparation of Management Plans.

(68) The Committee also noted that the issue of overflight restrictions would need to form part of the wider review of these Management Plans and that consistency with the Antarctic Flight Information Manual (AFIM) would be important.

(69) New Zealand introduced Working Paper (XXIV ATCM/WP12) concerning the Systematic Environmental Geographic Framework (SEGF) for protected areas under Annex V of the Protocol. This paper followed on the paper presented by New Zealand at CEP III, which in turn resulted from the intersessional group on protected areas that worked between CEP II and CEP III.

(70) The paper noted reasons why a SEGF would be useful. In a large diverse region such as Antarctica this framework would allow more systematic risk assessments in relation to proposed protected areas and overall protected area planning.

(71) The Committee welcomed the New Zealand paper. It was pointed out that an elaborated SEGF could also be useful for the implementation of other aspects of the Protocol, such as designation of Antarctic Specially Protected Species and definition of the concept of dependent and associated ecosystems. New Zealand offered to continue work on this issue along with other interested Parties. It was recognised that SCAR would also need to continue to have input. The Committee agreed that this was a useful initiative and asked New Zealand to report back on progress to CEP V.

(72) The UK introduced Working Paper (XXIV ATCM/WP 16) proposing a thorough review of the list of Historic Sites and Monuments established under Recommendation VII-9, the first since the list was established in 1972. The UK identified several issues that should be addressed through such a review, including whether the sites were still in existence; whether the sites continued to match the criteria agreed under Resolution 8 (1995); the need to improve descriptions of the sites; the possibility of defining site boundaries and the option for also designating Historic Sites and Monuments as either an ASMA or an ASPA.

(73) The UK suggested that such a review might initially be undertaken by the Party which originally proposed the site. The UK paper included a table allocating the list of Historic Sites and Monuments among the original proposing Parties, and a draft Resolution to give effect to the review.

(74) The Committee thanked the UK for its paper and agreed to review the list of Historic Sites and Monuments. Several Parties agreed that sites no longer in existence should be de-listed. However, Norway noted the importance of retaining some record of those sites that have been lost or destroyed through natural processes. Such a record might be achieved by means of an Annex of lost or destroyed sites attached to the list of Historic Sites and Monuments.

(75) The Committee also noted that the proposing Party may no longer be the primary interested Party. This is because of Parties acceding to the Antarctic Treaty after the list of Historic Sites and Monuments had been agreed in 1972. Other Parties may therefore want to be included in, or to assume responsibility for the review of any one site. Based on comments received, the list of proposing Parties appended to the draft Resolution was amended.

(76) The UK offered to liaise with the Parties intersessionally in order to assist with the review.

(77) The Committee recommended that draft Resolution 4(2001) be approved by the ATCM (**Appendix 3**).

(78) Norway tabled Working Paper (ATCM XXIV/WP 23) proposing guidelines for handling of pre-1958 historic remains in Antarctica that had yet to be recorded or discovered. The Committee noted the importance of having available sufficient protection measures to apply to such unrecorded and undiscovered historic remains, and adopted on this basis the guidelines for handling of pre-1958 historic remains set out in Resolution 5(2001) (**Appendix 4**).

(79) The discussions of the paper also raised issues related to the process of designating historic sites generally, which may require further discussion in the future, in particular the distinction between historic artefacts and waste.

(80) New Zealand presented Working Paper (XXIV ATCM/WP15) on a proposed Historic Site “A Hut”, Scott Base on Ross Island. The Committee agreed that this building should be designated as an Historic Site and Monument and recommended that Measure 1(2001) be approved by XXIV ATCM (**Appendix 5**).

(81) Chile presented Working Paper (XXIV ATCM/WP34) proposing inclusion of the ruins of Base Pedro Aguirre Cerda on the list of Historic Sites and Monuments. Chile agreed to further clarify the description of the site, with a view to indicating the extent of debris to be removed. This revised description will be part of the review of the list of Historic Sites and Monuments to be conducted intersessionally. The Committee recommended that Measure 2(2001) be approved by XXIV ATCM (**Appendix 6**).

(82) India introduced Information Paper (XXIV ATCM/IP20) on the possible inclusion on the list of Historic Sites and Monuments of the memorial plaque at Indian-Point, Humbolt Mountains, Central Dronning Maud Land. The Members agreed to discuss this issue at CEP V.

(83) The USA presented Working Paper (XXIV ATCM/WP33) which proposed extension of the expiry dates for a number of Sites of Special Scientific Interest.

(84) The Committee agreed with this proposal and recommended that Measure 3(2001) be approved by XXIV ATCM (**Appendix 7**).

(85) Germany noted that regular extension of expiry dates had implications for updating national law and is therefore unsatisfactory. However, the Committee recognised the need to extend the expiry dates of the sites in question in order to allow review of the Management Plans without a lapse in their protection. It was also noted that expiry dates for ASPAs, designated under Annex V when it comes into force, may have an indefinite duration. However, Management Plans will still need periodic review at least every five years.

(86) Norway introduced Information Paper (XXIV ATCM/IP 38) informing the Committee about the establishment of the International Polar Committee (IPC) under the International Council on Monuments and Sites (ICOMOS). The Committee noted the possibility of establishing links with the IPC so that matters of mutual interest concerning Antarctic Historic Sites and Monuments might be exchanged.

(87) Australia presented Information Paper (XXIV ATCM/IP59) describing the development of a Management Plan for a proposed Antarctic Specially Managed Area in the Larsemann Hills, in conjunction with China and Russia.

(88) Australia also presented Information Paper (XXIV ATCM/IP30) on management activities at SSSI No 25 and Information Paper (XXIV ATCM/IP31) on Mawson's Hut at Commonwealth Bay Historic Site and Monument No 13.

(89) Information Paper (XXIV ATCM/IP63) was introduced by Chile and jointly submitted by Argentina, Chile, Norway, Spain, UK, USA, ASOC and IAATO. This paper provided information on a workshop held in Chile in March 2001 to consider a management plan for a proposed Antarctic Specially Managed Area for Deception Island. The Committee welcomed the outcome of the workshop.

(90) Poland tabled Information Paper (XXIV ATCM/IP67) suggesting the need for special consideration of any further construction developments on King George Island.

(91) Several Members shared the concerns of Poland and expressed the view that co-operation among existing bases should be explored as a preference to new construction activities. The Committee agreed that the matter will be discussed further at CEP V.

(92) New Zealand tabled Information Paper (XXIV ATCM/IP19).

Item 5: Environmental Monitoring

(93) COMNAP advised the Committee that the Antarctic Environment Officers' Network is developing guidelines for station environmental monitoring programmes. The Members welcomed this information and looked forward to COMNAP reporting back to the CEP on this issue.

Item 6: State of the Antarctic Environment Report

(94) SCAR apologised that it had been unable to provide the Scoping Study for a State of the Antarctic Environment Report. It will be provided by SCAR to CEP V.

(95) New Zealand informed the Committee that it expected to have available in November 2001 a State of the Environment Report for the Ross Sea Region.

(96) The meeting noted this information. In view of the expected new material likely to become available at CEP V, the Committee agreed to keep this item on its agenda.

Item 7: Emergency Response and Contingency Planning

(97) COMNAP and SCAR presented Working Paper (XXIV ATCM/WP14) on their response to Resolution 5 (1999). They noted that this paper had been presented as a starting point in addressing questions listed in the Resolution, and that any further work would need a clear definition of the questions to be answered.

(98) The Committee thanked COMNAP/SCAR for their work. Several delegations raised specific points and advised they would be prepared to provide further input to this work. COMNAP/SCAR said they would be happy to receive comments on the paper (j.sayers@comnap.aq or execsec@scar.demon.co.uk).

(99) The Committee suggested that those Parties interested in providing feedback should contact SCAR/COMNAP by mid-August. SCAR/COMNAP would then collect the comments and circulate them to all those who had submitted comments.

(100) The discussion focused on issues raised in the paper, as well as the way forward. Regarding the former, comments included that: the COMNAP matrix could be expanded to include more on pollutants and that the issue of tourism could be included in the next version; the assumption that all operators comply with the Protocol and COMNAP guidelines on oil spill prevention may not always be true; there was a need to consider human-caused damage in the light of natural variability, and that there was a need now to move from theoretical to practical definitions.

(101) The meeting noted other areas identified, but not addressed in the paper. Regarding the way forward the CEP felt that any intersessional work should be related to specific questions. On issues such as definitions some delegations suggested that a workshop might be a useful mechanism to assist progress, with attendance from Members of the Committee, COMNAP, SCAR and appropriate legal experts. It was also suggested that such a workshop could be held in conjunction with an ATCM. However, other delegations expressed disagreement about this way forward.

(102) The Committee thanked COMNAP/SCAR for their work. It was agreed that before any further work was undertaken the Committee Chair should consult with the Chair of the WG1.

Item 8: Data and Exchange of Information

8a) General Matters

(103) Norway introduced Working Paper (XXIV ATCM/WP24) regarding information exchange related to Article 17 of the Protocol. Australia introduced Working Paper (XXIV ATCM/WP7) which was a report from the intersessional contact group reviewing information exchange requirements. The Committee discussed those elements of the Australian paper which covered the data exchange requirements of the Protocol.

(104) The CEP thanked Norway and Australia for their useful reports, and Norway was also thanked for producing and maintaining the CEP web site. The Committee recognised the benefits of Parties moving to electronic circulation of annual reports. The Committee agreed that by posting an annual report on the CEP web site a Party had fulfilled its reporting requirements according to Article 17. Such reports should be considered publicly available, and would not be presented in paper form at a subsequent CEP meeting unless this was requested by another Party. It was also suggested that the Committee should explore ways to ensure proper consideration of Annual reports as set out in Article 17 of the Protocol. Where possible such reports should also be posted on the Party's home page, where Parties had home pages appropriate for such posting.

(105) It was agreed that a list of relevant home page addresses should be compiled at CEP IV. This is appended as **Annex 3**, and will be posted and updated as appropriate on the CEP web page.

(106) It was further agreed to await subsequent, more general discussions at the ATCM, before taking further action.

(107) CCAMLR introduced Information Paper (XXIV ATCM/IP12) on its experience with data management.

(108) The Committee thanked CCAMLR for this interesting and valuable report. It was considered a good example of how data and information can be processed through co-operation between different groups. The Committee recognised the need for appropriate resources for data management purposes.

8b) Co-operation with other organisations in accordance with Article 11 of the Protocol

(109) CCAMLR presented Information Paper (XXIV ATCM/IP13) on monitoring marine debris and its impact on marine living resources. Australia introduced Information Paper (XXIV ATCM/ IP26) which was the report of the CEP Observer to the Scientific Committee of CCAMLR.

(110) The Members welcomed these reports and emphasised their commitment to co-operation between the Scientific Committee of CCAMLR and the Committee on overlapping issues. The beach debris surveys described by CCAMLR were noted as an excellent example of how long term monitoring can be used as an effective environmental management tool.

(111) Dr. Press agreed to the Committee's request that he continue as the representative of the CEP at meetings of the Scientific Committee of CCAMLR. It was agreed to consider CEP/CCAMLR co-operation more extensively at CEP V.

Item 9: Election of Officers

(112) In accordance with Rule 16 of the Rules of Procedure of the CEP, Mr. José María Acero (Argentina) was elected as First Vice-Chair and Dr. Joyce Jatko (USA) was elected as Second Vice-Chair by acclamation. Both Vice-Chairs were elected for a period of two years.

(113) The Chair, on behalf of the Committee, expressed sincere thanks to the outgoing Vice-Chairs, Amb. Jorge Berguño and Ms. Gillian Wratt, for their hard work and support over the last three years.

Item 10: Preparation for CEP V

(114) The Committee agreed that the agenda for CEP V should be the same as the agenda for CEP IV. In further agreed to a minor modification, which was to renumber item 8a and 8b to 8 and 9 respectively, and change the numbers of subsequent agenda items accordingly. The ATCM was asked to approve the provisional Draft Agenda for CEP V reproduced as **Appendix 8**.

Item 11: Adoption of the Report

(115) The Draft Report was adopted.

Item 12: Closing of the Meeting

(116) The Chair Dr. Olav Orheim closed the Meeting, at the same time expressing the Committee's great gratitude to the work of the rapporteurs, the secretariat and the interpreters.

Annex 1

CEP IV

Final List of Documents

(allocation of documents in accordance with agenda items)

Item 3: Operation of the CEP

Paper No.	Title	Submitted by
WP 4	Submission and distribution of the CEP documents	Argentina

Item 4: Compliance with the Protocol on Environmental Protection

4 a) General matters

Paper No.	Title	Submitted by
WP 9	Report to CEP IV on the question of collection of Antarctic meteorites by private expeditions	New Zealand
WP 13	Cooperation between the Parties in Relation to Article 6 of the Protocol on Environmental Protection to the Antarctic Treaty	Peru
WP 25	Report of the 2001 Norwegian Antarctic Inspection under Article VII of the Antarctic Treaty and Article 14 of the Protocol on Environmental Protection to the Antarctic Treaty	Norway
IP 1	Report on the implementation of the Environmental Protocol to the Antarctic Treaty	United Kingdom
IP 3	Annual Report pursuant to Article 17 of the Protocol on Environmental Protection to the Antarctic Treaty. Years 2000-2001.	Uruguay
IP 8	Annual Report according to Article 17 of the Environmental Protocol to the Antarctic Treaty for the period 2000-2001	Netherlands
IP 14	Annual Report according to Article 17 of the Environmental Protocol to the Antarctic Treaty for the period 2000-2001	Japan
IP 15	Annual Report according to Article 17 of the Environmental Protocol to the Antarctic Treaty for the period 2000-2001	Sweden
IP 16	Environmental Exchange program between Sweden and Australia, November – December 2000	Sweden
IP 17	Report of the United States Antarctic Inspection Team. February 2-16 2001	USA
IP 24	Czech Scientific Station in the Antarctica	Czech Republic
IP 32	Informe al Comité de Protección Ambiental sobre las Medidas Adoptadas Para Cumplir el Protocolo de Madrid	Spain
IP 35	Implementación del Protocolo al Tratado Antártico sobre Protección del Medio Ambiente por parte del Programa Antártico Argentino. Período 2000-2001	Argentina

Paper No.	Title	Submitted by
IP 36	Annual Report pursuant to the Protocol on Environmental Protection to the Antarctic Treaty	South Africa
IP 37	Annual Report Pursuant to the Protocol on Environmental Protection to the Antarctic Treaty	Italy
IP 41	Australian Annual Report to the CEP	Australia
IP 42	Annual Report: 2000/2001 – Protocol on Environmental Protection to the Antarctic Treaty	Norway
IP 44	Annual Report pursuant to the Protocol on Environmental Protection to the Antarctic Treaty, Season 2000-2001	Finland
IP 45	2000/2001 Chinese Antarctic Environmental Report	China
IP 46	Report of the Russian Federation on implementing the Protocol on Environmental Protection to the Antarctic Treaty (in compliance with Article 17)	Russia
IP 51	Annual Report pursuant to the Article 17 of the Protocol on Environmental Protection to the Antarctic Treaty	New Zealand
IP 55	Legal Implementation of the Five Annexes of the Protocol on Environmental Protection to the Antarctic Treaty	ASOC
IP 56	Annual Report pursuant to the Protocol on Environmental Protection to the Antarctic Treaty	Bulgaria
IP 58	Annual Report of the Republic of Chile pursuant to Article 17 of the Protocol on Environmental Protection to the Antarctic Treaty	Chile
IP 60	Informe anual de acuerdo al artículo 17 del Protocolo al Tratado Antártico sobre la Protección del Medio Ambiente. Período 2000-2001	Peru
IP 65	Annual Report Pursuant to the Protocol on Environmental Protection to the Antarctic Treaty	Belgium
IP 66	Exchange of information under the Antarctic Treaty Article VII(5). 2000-2001	India

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

Paper No.	Title	Submitted by
WP 20	Analysis of IEEs prepared for Antarctic operations – an update on progress	COMNAP
WP 29	Expert conclusion for the Project “Justification and development of the ecologically clean technology for penetrating the subglacial Lake Vostok (Antarctica)”	Russia
WP 32	Russian Antarctic Expedition. Environmental Impact Assessment (preliminary stage)	Russia
IP 18	Exchange of information on the application of Articles 3 and 8 as well as Annex I of the Protocol	Germany
IP 52	Issues relating to Cumulative Environmental Impacts of Tourist Activities	IAATO
IP 53	Initial Environmental Evaluation (IEE) for Deep Ice Core Drilling Activity at Dome Fuji Station, Antarctica	Japan
IP 54	Strategic Needs and Decision-Making in Antarctica	ASOC

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

Paper No.	Title	Submitted by
WP 5	Progress report of the intersessional contact group on Specially Protected Species in Antarctica	Argentina
WP 10	Report on the open-ended intersessional contact group on Diseases of Antarctic Wildlife: Report 1 – Review and Risk Assessment	Australia
WP 11	Report on the open-ended intersessional contact group on Diseases of Antarctic Wildlife: Report 2 – Practical Measures to Diminish Risk	Australia
IP 39	Review of Guidelines for the operation of aircraft near concentrations of birds in Antarctica	United Kingdom

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

Paper No.	Title	Submitted by
IP 4	Limpieza de Sitios de trabajo de actividades Antárticas en el casquete glaciar Collins, en conformidad con el Anexo III, Artículo 1, párrafo 5, del Protocolo sobre Protección del Medio Ambiente. Período 2000-2001	Uruguay
IP 48	Nature Protection Measures at the Russian Antarctic stations	Russia
IP 50	Planning of waste disposal at the Russian Antarctic stations and ships	Russia
IP 57	New Environmental Practice for the Installation of a Portable Summer Station, Patriot Hills, West Antarctica	Chile

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

Paper No.	Title	Submitted by
IP 62	Report of the Chilean vessel “Patriarche” accident	Chile
IP 64	Report on an oil spill response exercise	UK/ Germany

4g) Matters covered by Annex V (Area protection and management)

Paper No.	Title	Submitted by
WP 2	Antarctic Protected Areas System – Revision of the Status of Specially Protected Area No. 18: North Coronation Island, South Orkney Islands	United Kingdom
WP 8	Antarctic Protected Areas System: Revised Management Plans for: Specially Protected Area No 8 – Dion Islands, Marguerite Bay, Specially Protected Area No 9 – Green Island, Berthelot Islands, Site of Special Scientific Interest No 29 – Ablation Point / Ganymede Heights, Alexander Island and Site of Special Scientific Interest No 31 – Mount Flora, Hope Bay	United Kingdom
WP 12	Systematic Environmental-Geographic Framework for Protected Areas under Annex V of the Environmental Protocol	New Zealand
WP 15	Proposed Historic Monument “A Hut”, Scott Base, Ross Island, Ross Sea Region, Antarctic	New Zealand
WP 16	Review of the List of Historic Sites and Monuments	United Kingdom

Paper No.	Title	Submitted by
WP 19	Antarctic Protected Area System: Revised Management Plans for: Specially Protected Area No. 7 – Cape Hallett, Northern Victoria Land, Ross Sea; Site of Special Scientific Interest No. 1 – Cape Royds, Ross Island; Site of Special Scientific Interest No. 3 – Barwich and Balham Valleys, South Victoria Land; Site of Special Scientific Interest No. 4 – Cape Crozier, Ross Island; Site of Special Scientific Interest No. 18 – Northwest White Island, McMurdo Sound.	United States
WP 21	Antarctic Protected Areas System: Revised Management Plan – Specially Protected Area No. 21 – Avian Island, Marguerite Bay	United Kingdom
WP 22	Antarctic Protected Areas System: Revised Management Plan for Site of Special Scientific Interest No. 6 – Byers Peninsula, Livingston Island	United Kingdom/ Chile
WP 23	Proposal: Guidelines for handling of pre-1958 historic remains in Antarctica	Norway
WP 33	Measure X(2001): Antarctic Protected Areas System: Extension of Expiry Dates for Certain Sites of Special Scientific Interest	United States
WP 34	Proposal to include the Ruins of BSE Pedro Aguirra Cerda on the Historical Sites and Monuments List	Chile
IP 10	Annual List of Initial Environmental Evaluations and Comprehensive Environmental Evaluations 2000/2001	Russia
IP 19	The Balleny Islands – Aide Memoire	New Zealand
IP 20	Site recommended for inclusion in the list of Historic Sites and Monuments in Antarctica	India
IP 30	Report on management activities at SSSI No. 25	Australia
IP 31	Report on Mawson’s Hut Historic Site	Australia
IP 38	Antarctic Historic Resources	Norway
IP 59	Report on development of a Larseman Hills Antarctic Specially Managed Area Management Plan	Australia
IP 63	Workshop on a management plan for Deception Island (issued jointly by Argentina, Chile, Norway, Spain, United Kingdom, USA, ASOC and IAATO)	<i>joint</i>
IP 67	Importance of South-Eastern shores of King George Island for the biodiversity of this region	Poland

Item 7: Emergency Response and Contingency Planning

Paper No.	Title	Submitted by
WP 14	Response to XXIII ATCM Resolution 5 (1999)	SCAR/ COMNAP

Item 8: Data and Exchange of Information

8a) General Matters

Paper No.	Title	Submitted by
WP 7	Report from the intersessional contact group reviewing information exchange requirements	Australia
WP 24	CEP and information exchange	Norway
IP 12	CCAMLR’s experience with data management	CCAMLR

8b) Co-operation with other organisations in accordance with Article 11 of the Protocol

	Title	Submitted by
IP 13	Monitoring marine debris and its impact on marine living resources	CCAMLR
IP 26	Report of the CEP Observer to CCAMLR XIX and SC-CAMLR XIX, 23 October to 3 November 2000	Australia

Annex 2

Addresses of the national contact points

CEP Members

Country	Name	Telephone	Fax	E-mail
Argentina	José Acero	+54-11-4816-2352	+54-11-4813-7807	jmacero@abaconet.com.ar
Australia	Tom Maggs	+61-36-2323506	+61-36-2323215	tom.maggs@antdiv.gov.au
Belgium	Hugo Declair	+32-2-629-3383	+32-2-629-3378	hdeclair@vub.ac.be
Brazil	Inah Simonetti Guatura			inah.guatura@mma.gov.br
Bulgaria	Hristo Pimpirev	+359-2-9308-531	+359-2-446-487	polar@gea.uni-sofia.bg
Chile	José Valencia	+56-2-232-2617	+56-2-232-0440	j.valenci@inach.cl
China	Liqi Chen	+86-10-6801-7625	+86-10-6801-2776	Chinare@public.btn.net.cn
Ecuador	Fernando Zurita Fabre			inocar@inocar.mil.ec
Finland	Outi Mähönen	+358-16-329-4444	+358-16-310-340	Outi.mahonen@vyh.fi
France	Laurence Pehtguillaume	+33(1)-4219-17-23	+33-1-42-19-17-72	Laurence.pehtguillaume@environment.gouv.fr
Germany	Wiebke Schwarzbach	+49-30-8203-2516	+49-30-8903-2906	Wiebke.schwarzbach@uba.de
India	Prem C. Pandey	+91-832-520-876	+91-832-520-877	Ncaov@goatelecom.com
Italy	Pietro Giuliani	+39-6-3048-4215	+39-6-3048-4893	internazio@enea.pnra.it
Japan	Jun Tanaka	+81-3-5521-8245	+81-3-3581-3348	Antarctic@env.go.jp
Korea, Republic of	In-Young Ahn	+82-31-400-6421	+82-31-400-5825	iahn@kordi.re.kr
Netherlands	Dick de Bruijn	+3170-3394-652	+3170-339-1306	Dick.De.Bruijn@minvrom.nl
New Zealand	Emma Waterhouse	+6433-580-200	+6433-580-211	e.waterhouse@antarcticanz.govt.nz
Norway	Birgit Njaastad	+4777-7505-00	+4777-7505-01	Njaastad@npolar.no
Peru	Fernando Jiménez	+51-1-460-2870	+51-1-461-82 53	ojimene@pucep.edu.pe
Poland	Stanislaw Rakusa-Suszczewski	+48-22-846-3383	+48-22-846-1912	profesor@dab.waw.pl
Russia	Valery Lukin	+7-812-352-1541	+7-812-352-2827	Lukin@raexp.spb.su
South Africa	Henry Valentine	+27-21-405-9404	+27-21-405-9424	henryv@antarc.wcape.gov.za
Spain	Jerónimo Lopez	+34-91-594-8632	+34-91-594-8643	jeronimo.lopez@mcyt.es
Sweden	Anders Kalin	+46-8405-1000		Anders.kalin@environment.ministry.se
United Kingdom	Neil Gilbert	+44-207-270-2610	+44-207-270-2086	Neil.Gilbert@fco.gov.uk
United States of America	Harlan Cohen			cohenhk@state.gov
Uruguay	Aldo Felici	5982+487-8341/44	5982+487-6004	antartic@iau.gub.uy

Observers 4a

Country	Name	Telephone	Fax	E-mail
Canada	Fred Roots	1-819-997-2393	1-819-997-5813	Fred.roots@ec.gc.ca
Cuba	Abelardo Moreno Fernandez			Dam@minrex.dob.cu
Columbia	Edgard Cabrera			Ecabrera1@colciencias.gov.co Difem@armada.mil.co
Czech Republic	Zdenek Venera	+420-2-6712-2051	420-2-736525	Venera@env.cz
Romania	Teodor Gheorghe- Negoita		+401-337-2989	
Estonia	Mart Saarso	+372-522-8513	+372-6317-099	Mart.Saarso@mfa.ee
Ukraine	Lytvynov Valery	+38-044-	+38-044-	antartic@carrier.kiev.ua

Observers 4b

Organization	Name	Telephone	Fax	E-mail
CCAMLR	Rennie Holt	+858-546-5601	+858-546-5608	Rholt@ucso.edu
COMNAP	Jack Sayers			Jsayers@comnap.aq
SCAR	Peter Clarkson	+44-1223-362061	+44-1223-336550	Execsec@scar.demon.co.uk

Observers 4c

Organization	Name	Telephone	Fax	E-mail
ASOC	James Barnes			James.barnes@wanadoo.fr
IUCN				m.depoorter@aucland.ac.nz
IAATO	Denise Landau			laato@iaato.org
UNEP	Christian Lambrechts	+254-2-623470	+254-2-623846	Christian.lambrechts@unep.org
WMO				h.hutchinson@bom.gov.au

Annex 3

Websites of CEP members where Annual Reports are or will be posted

Country	Web site
Argentina	http://www.dna.gov.ar
Australia	http://www.aad.gov.au/information/treaty/exchange
Brazil	http://www.mar.mil.br/~secirm/proantar.htm
Chile	http://www.inach.cl
China	
Finland	http://www.fimr.fi
France	
Germany	http://www.umweltbundesamt.de/uba-info-daten/daten/antarktis.htm
Italy	http://www.pnra.it
Japan	
New Zealand	http://antarcticanz.govt.nz
Norway	http://npolar.no/Antarctic/Treaty System
Peru	http://www.dhn.mil.pe
Poland	http://www.dab.waw.pl
Republic of Korea	http://sejong.re.kr
Russian Federation	
South Africa	
Spain	http://www.cicyt.es/comitepolar
Sweden	http://www.polar.se
The Netherlands	
United States	http://www.nsf.gov/od/opp/antarct/treaty/index.htm
Uruguay	

Appendix 1

DECISION 2(2001)

Guidelines on Circulation and Handling of CEP Documents

The Representatives,

Recalling Decision 2(1998) setting out the Rules of Procedure for the Committee for Environmental Protection to which Guidelines for the Circulation and Handling of CEP Documents were appended;

Decide:

To amend the Guidelines on Circulation and Handling of CEP Documents as set out in the Appendix to this Decision.

Appendix to DECISION 2(2001)

**GUIDELINES
on Circulation and Handling of CEP Documents**

1. All Working Papers prepared by Parties and Observers referred to in Rule 4-a and 4-b of the CEP Rules of Procedure and Information Papers which a Representative of a Party requests be translated, should be received by the Host Government no later than 45 days before the meeting. The Host Government should circulate these papers in translation no later than 30 days before the meeting. It is suggested that Information Papers for which translation has been requested by a Party be limited to 30 pages. Those Information Papers for which translation has not been requested should be submitted to the Host Government no later than 30 days before the meeting for pre-sessional circulation by the Host Government. Observers referred to in Rule 4-c may submit documents for distribution to the meeting as Information Papers.
2. Working Papers received before the Meeting but after the 45 day deadline will, where practicable, be circulated pre-sessionally in the language in which they are submitted and, if possible, in translation by the Host Government. If pre-sessional circulation and translation have not been possible, such Papers will be available in translation during the Meeting.
3. When a revised version of a Paper made after its initial submission is resubmitted to the Host Government for translation, the revised text should indicate clearly the amendments that have been incorporated.
4. When Working Papers and Information Papers are generated during the course of the CEP meeting, Working Papers will be translated and circulated and Information Papers will be circulated at that meeting.
5. Parties may request translation of any Information Paper either pre-sessionally or during the CEP-meeting.
6. The Report referred to in Rule 23 should be presented to the ATCM in the official languages with a comprehensive list of that CEP meeting's officially circulated Working and Information Papers.
7. The submission and circulation of all documents should be done by electronic means whenever feasible.

Appendix 2

RESOLUTION 3(2001)

Collection of meteorites in Antarctica

The Representatives,

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

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

Appendix 3

RESOLUTION 4(2001)

Historic Sites and Monuments

The Representatives,

Recalling Recommendations I-IX, VI-14, VII-9, XII-7, XIII-16 and XIV-8;

Noting the desirability of reviewing the List and Historic Sites or Monuments to ensure that it remains accurate and up-to-date;

Noting also that on entry into force of Annex V to the Protocol on Environmental Protection to the Antarctic Treaty, Historic Sites and Monuments may be also designated as Antarctic Specially Protected Areas or Antarctic Specially Managed Areas;

Recommend that:

Parties assume responsibility for reviewing Historic Sites and Monuments according to the list appended to this resolution.

In conducting a review of a listed Historic Site or Monument those Consultative Parties should assess whether:

- the site still exists either in whole or in part;
- the site continues to meet the guidelines for Historic Sites or Monuments set out in Resolution 8 (1995);
- the description of the site should be amended, and updated
- boundaries need to be identified for the site. If so, suitable maps should be produced;
- the site requires special protection or management and, if so, whether it should be also designated as, or included in, an Antarctic Specially Protected Area or as an Antarctic Specially Managed Area;
- in the light of this review, the site should be de-listed.

The Consultative Parties identified in the Appendix to the Resolution report on the outcome of their review to the UK CEP contact in order to allow a report to be compiled for CEP V.

Those Consultative Parties with relevant information on the status of any Historic Sites and Monuments should ensure that such information is made available to those Parties responsible for the site.

Appendix to Resolution 4(2001)

Proposing Party	Historic Site and Monument
Note: Figures in bold represent joint proposal	
Argentina	1, 26, 27 , 28, 29, 36, 38, 39 , 40, 41 , 42, 43, 60
Australia	3,5, 6, 12, 13, 72
Belgium	45
Chile	30, 31, 32, 33, 34, 35, 37,53, 56, 57, 58, 59 , 71
China	52
France	27 , 46, 47, 48
India	44
Japan	2
New Zealand	14, 15, 16, 17, 18, 19, 20, 21, 22, 23, 65,66, 67, 68, 69, 70, 73
Norway	24, 25, 58, 65, 66, 67, 68, 69, 70, 72
Peru	59
Poland	49, 50, 51
Russia	4,7, 8, 9, 10, 11
Spain	59
Sweden	38, 39, 41
UK	15, 16, 17, 18, 19, 20, 22, 23, 27, 36, 38, 39, 41, 56, 57, 61, 62, 63, 64, 65, 66, 67, 68, 69, 70, 74
USA	54, 55

Appendix 4

RESOLUTION 5 (2001)

Guidelines for handling of pre-1958 historic remains whose existence or present location is not known

The Representatives,

Recalling Recommendation VII-9 which provides for Consultative Parties to adopt all adequate measures to preserve and protect from damage the historic monuments situated in the Antarctic Treaty area, and the provisions of Annex V to the Environmental Protocol,

Recalling also Resolution 8 (1995), which sets out criteria by which types of sites and artefacts that could be designated as historic sites and monuments,

Aware of the prohibition in Article 8 (4) of Annex V on the removal of listed historic monuments,

Recognizing the unique value of all the historic remains of early exploration of the Antarctic continent, and

Noting that increased activity in Antarctica has increased the pressure on historic sites and artefacts not protected by current measures,

Recommend that:

The Guidelines, appended to this Resolution, for handling of pre-1958 historic remains whose existence or present location is not known, be used by Parties as guidance on questions relating to protection of such historic remains in Antarctica.

Appendix to RESOLUTION 5 (2001)

GUIDELINES for handling of pre-1958 historic remains whose existence or present location is not known.

1. These guidelines apply to pre-1958 historic artefacts/sites whose existence or location is not known.
2. These guidelines should be applied, as far as possible, to provide interim protection of pre-1958 historic artefacts/sites until the Parties have had due time to consider their inclusion into the protection system under Annex V to the Protocol on Environmental Protection. This interim protection should not extend beyond three years after the discovery of a new historic artefact/site has been brought to the attention of the Parties.
3. Historic artefacts/sites for the purpose of these Guidelines, include but are not necessarily limited to:
 - Artefacts with a particular association with a person who played an important role in the history of science or exploration of Antarctica;
 - Artefacts with a particular association with a notable feat of endurance achievement;
 - Artefacts representative of, or which form part of, some wide-ranging activity that has been important in the development of knowledge of Antarctica;
 - Artefacts with particular technical or architectural value in its materials, design or method of construction;
 - Artefacts with the potential, through study, to reveal information or which have the potential to educate people about significant human activities in Antarctica;
 - Artefacts with symbolic or commemorative value for people of many nations.
4. Any person/expedition who discovers pre-1958 historic remains should notify the appropriate authorities in their home country. The consequences of removing such remains should be duly considered. If items nonetheless are removed from Antarctica, they should be delivered to the appropriate authorities in the home country of the discoverer.
5. If historic artefacts/sites are discovered during construction activities, all construction should be discontinued to the greatest extent practical until the artefacts have been appropriately recorded and evaluated.
6. The Party whose nationals have discovered pre-1958 historic artefacts/sites should notify the other Treaty Parties about the discovery, indicating what remains have been found, and where and when.
7. If there is uncertainty as to the age of a newly discovered historic artefact/site it should be treated as a pre-1958 artefact/site until its age has been established.

Appendix 5

MEASURE 1(2001)

Antarctic Protected Area System Historic Sites And Monuments: “A Hut”, Scott Base, Ross Sea Region, Antarctica

The Representatives,

Recalling Recommendations I – IX, VI-14, VII-9, XII-7, XIII-16, XIV-8;

Acknowledging the significance of “A Hut”, Scott Base to:

- New Zealand Antarctic history
- the establishment of Scott Base
- early scientific investigation in the Ross Sea Region
- the involvement of New Zealand in the International Geophysical Year 1957
- connections between Antarctica and New Zealand
- the Commonwealth Trans Antarctic Expedition 1956/1957

Recommend to their Governments the following Measure for approval in accordance with paragraph 4 of Article IX of the Antarctic Treaty:

The following building be added to the “List of Historic Monuments Identified and described by the Proposing Government or Governments” annexed to Recommendation VII-9 and that thereafter it be accorded the respect and protection required by the Recommendations recalled above:

The A Hut of Scott Base, being the only existing Trans Antarctic Expedition 1956/1957 building in Antarctica sited at Pram Point, Ross Island, Ross Sea Region, Antarctica.

Appendix 6

MEASURE 2(2001)

Antarctic Protected Area System Historic Sites And Monuments: Ruins of the Base Pedro Aguirre Cerda, Pendulum Cove, Deception Island, Antarctica

The Representatives,

Recalling Recommendations I-IX, VI-14, VII-9, XII-7, XIII-16, XIV-8;

Acknowledging the significance of the ruins of the base Pedro Aguirre Cerda, Deception Island:

- to Chilean Antarctic history;
- to early meteorological and volcanological recordings in Antarctica;
- as an example of historic damage to a base by a natural phenomena,

Recommend to their Governments the following Measure for approval in accordance with paragraph 4 of Article IX of the Antarctic Treaty:

The following site be added to the “List of Historic Monuments identified and described by the Proposing Government or Governments” annexed to Recommendation VII-9 and thereafter it be accorded the respect and protection required by the Recommendations recalled above:

The ruins of the base Pedro Aguirre Cerda, being a Chilean meteorological and volcanological center situated at Pendulum Cove, Deception Island, Antarctica, that was destroyed by volcanic eruptions in 1967 and 1969.

Appendix 7

MEASURE 3(2001)

Antarctic Protected Areas System: Extension of Expiry Dates for Certain Sites of Special Scientific Interest

The Representatives,

Recalling Recommendations VIII-4, XIII-8, XII-8, XVI-2, and XVI-3 adopting the Management Plans for Sites of Special Scientific Interest numbers 4, 5, 6, 7, 18, 33, 35, and 36;

Noting that the expiry date for these sites is 31 December 2001, but wishing to continue to protect these sites until such time their respective management plans have been revised in accordance with Annex V to the Environmental Protocol;

Recommend to their Governments the following Measure for approval in accordance with paragraph 4 of Article IX of the Antarctic Treaty:

That the date of expiry of the management plans in the list annexed to this Measure be extended until 31 December 2005, and that this Measure be applied provisionally, to the fullest extent possible consistent with their Governments' domestic laws and regulations, pending such approval.

Annex to Measure 3(2001)

SSSI Number 4	Cape Crozier, Ross Island
SSSI Number 5	Fildes Peninsula, King George Island, South Shetland Islands
SSSI Number 6	Byers Peninsula, Livingston Island, South Shetland Islands
SSSI Number 7	Haswell Island
SSSI Number 18	North-west White Island, McMurdo Sound
SSSI Number 33	Ardley Island, Maxwell Bay, King George Island
SSSI Number 35	Western Bransfield Strait, off Low Island, South Shetland Islands
SSSI Number 36	East Dallman Bay, off Brabant Island

Appendix 8

Agenda for CEP V

Item 1: Opening of the meeting

Item 2: Adoption of the Agenda

Item 3: Operation of the CEP

Item 4: Compliance with the Protocol on Environmental Protection

4 a) General matters

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

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

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

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

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

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

Item 5: Environmental Monitoring

Item 6: State of the Antarctic Environment Report

Item 7: Emergency Response and Contingency Planning

Item 8: Data and Exchange of Information

Item 9: Co-operation with other organisations in accordance with Article 11 of the Protocol

Item 10: Election of Officers

Item 11: Preparation for CEP VI

Item 12: Adoption of the Report

Item 13: Closing of the Meeting