

**REPORT OF THE COMMITTEE FOR ENVIRONMENTAL
PROTECTION (CEP V)
Warsaw, Poland, 10-20 September 2002**

Item 1: Opening of the Meeting

(1) The CEP Chair, Dr. Olav Orheim (Norway), opened the meeting on Tuesday, 10 September 2002.

Item 2: Adoption of the Agenda

(2) The provisional agenda, as agreed at CEP IV and circulated by Poland, was adopted. Altogether 28 Working Papers and 58 Information Papers were considered under the various agenda items (**Annex 1** of the CEP Report).

Item 3: Operation of the CEP

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

Item 4: Compliance with the Protocol on Environmental Protection

4a) General matters

(4) Romania introduced Information Paper (XXV ATCM/IP37) reporting that the Romanian Parliament had passed the necessary legislation to implement the Protocol in early September 2002. The Committee welcomed this information and congratulated Romania on the steps it had taken towards ratification. Romania indicated that a formal notification would be sent to the Depository Government shortly.

(5) The Czech Republic presented Information Paper (XXV ATCM/IP70) noting that the Czech Parliament is expected to ratify the Protocol in January 2003. The Committee welcomed this information.

(6) The United Kingdom presented Information Paper (XXV ATCM/IP20) regarding the legal and administrative steps it had taken to control the collection and curation of meteorites with reference to Resolution 3 (2001). China submitted Information Paper (XXV ATCM/IP42) on the study and management of Antarctic meteorites. The United States reported that they had reviewed their legal and administrative arrangements with respect to meteorites collected by American scientists in Antarctica.

(7) The Meeting welcomed these developments made concerning the management of meteorites collected in Antarctica. It was agreed that members should provide further information on this issue to CEP VI.

(8) The following Information Papers giving annual reports were submitted to the Committee, in accordance with Article 17 of the Protocol: (XXV ATCM/IP6), (Uruguay); (XXV ATCM/IP8), (France); (XXV ATCM/IP19), (Ukraine); (XXV ATCM/IP23), (United Kingdom); (XXV

ATCM/IP31), (New Zealand); (XXV ATCM/IP43), (China); (XXV ATCM/IP59), (Spain); (XXV ATCM/IP64), (Italy); (XXV ATCM/IP65), (South Africa); (XXV ATCM/IP66), (Japan); (XXV ATCM/IP80), (the Netherlands); (XXV ATCM/IP96), (Peru) and (XXV ATCM/IP104), (India). It was noted that many Parties now posted their annual reports on their websites.

(9) Spain noted that the annual reports differed in the time period they covered and sometimes did not indicate which year they referred to. It was suggested that harmonization might be useful and that this could be discussed at the CEP VI meeting after an appropriate analysis.

(10) Australia introduced Information Paper (XXV ATCM/IP56) on the Australian Antarctic Division's Environmental Management System and informed the Committee that it had received ISO 14001 certification.

(11) With reference to Article 6 of the Protocol, Australia presented Information Paper (XXV ATCM/IP50) on their participation in the SWEDARP Expedition to Dronning Maud Land in 2001-2002.

(12) ASOC presented Information Paper (XXV ATCM/IP52) regarding tourism and non-governmental activities in Antarctica.

(13) ASOC further introduced Information Paper (XXV ATCM/IP78) regarding the submission of annual reports under Article 17 of the Madrid Protocol, which draws on reports filed by Parties, inspection reports and direct contact with a number of Parties. The analysis shows that some countries still have not fully implemented the Protocol through legislation or regulations, and that there are gaps in the practical implementation of the Protocol.

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

(14) The Russian Federation presented Working Paper (XXV ATCM/WP19) dealing with water sampling of the subglacial Lake Vostok. This was listed by the Russian Federation as a draft Comprehensive Environmental Evaluation (CEE), but not submitted in accordance with Article 3 of Annex I to the Protocol. The Committee agreed that the draft CEE would be formally considered at CEP VI.

(15) SCAR presented Information Paper (XXV ATCM/IP55) giving a progress report on their consideration of exploring subglacial Antarctic lakes. SCAR pointed out that there is as yet no international consensus among the scientific community on appropriate lake sampling or on drilling methods to penetrate into the lake. SCAR recommended that additional studies should be carried out before further drilling towards Lake Vostok is undertaken using the existing Russian drill hole. A SCAR group of experts will discuss the risks of deeper drilling at Lake Vostok, and SCAR will provide a report to CEP VI.

(16) Several delegations expressed their concern about the possibility of accidental penetration and contamination of Lake Vostok as a consequence of deeper drilling by the Russian Antarctic programme.

(17) The Russian Federation emphasized the potential benefits of further drilling activities for scientific research.

(18) Following discussion the Russian Federation advised that it would postpone drilling an additional 50 m of ice until the 2003/2004 season, and that it intends to produce an Initial

Environmental Evaluation (IEE) for this drilling. The Russian Federation further advised that it intends to revise the Draft CEE concerning the drilling from 3673 m to 3753 m (the ice-water interface). This drilling is intended to start in the 2004/2005 season and will continue until contact is made with the lake surface in the season of 2006/07.

(19) The CEP established an intersessional contact group convened by Jean Jacques Reyser from France (jjreyser@ifrtp.ifremer.fr) to consider and advise on the draft CEE at CEP VI with the following terms of reference:

- The ICG will address the generic terms of reference set out in Annex 3 of the CEP III Final Report:
 - The extent to which the CEE conforms to the requirements of Article 3 of Annex I of the Environmental Protocol.
 - Whether the conclusions of the draft CEE are adequately supported by the information contained within the document.
 - The clarity, format and presentation of the draft CEE
 - The ICG should also examine the extent to which the draft CEE addresses the following issues:
 - the likelihood of accidental contamination of the lake (for example due to rapid diffusion of drill fluid through the ice, failure of the ice below the drill bit, uncertainties such as ice properties or thickness below 3673m or transfer of non in-situ micro-organisms down the drill hole);
 - the ability to manage emergency situations such as accidental penetration of the lake or sudden change in drill-hole fluid pressure when the ice-lake interface is being approached;
 - the likelihood and consequences of deformation of the drill hole when it encounters the east edge of the lake basin, and methods of preventing consequent possible contamination of the lake by drilling fluid;

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

(20) The Russian Federation reintroduced Working Paper (XXIV ATCM/WP32) containing an IEE for their Antarctic programme. The paper presents strategic issues relating to assessment procedures, which the CEP agreed would be of interest to consider at a later meeting.

(21) The Russian Federation presented Working Paper (XXV ATCM/WP15) on the IEE for the reconstruction of the ice runway at Novolazarevskaya Station. The Meeting thanked the Russian Federation for this comprehensive IEE.

(22) ASOC questioned whether establishment of the ice runway should in fact warrant a CEE. The Russian Federation explained that they were only re-establishing a runway on snow and ice, which had no more than a minor or transitory environmental impact.

(23) Some Members asked the Russian Federation what actions were being taken with regard to clean-up and prevention of fuel spills, and whether it was envisaged that the runway would be used for tourism.

(24) The Russian Federation noted that procedures and equipment would be put in place for

handling of accidental fuel spills and that Russian Federation aviation standards would apply. On the issue of tourism, the Russian Federation stated that it had not been contacted by tour companies about using the runway to date. Nevertheless, the Russian Federation did not exclude the possibility of the runway being used for tourism purposes in the future.

(25) SCAR presented Working Paper (XXV ATCM/WP23) and Information Paper (XXV ATCM/IP24) regarding marine acoustic technology and the Antarctic environment. SCAR reported that, after surveying all relevant literature, it concluded that there is no evidence of negative impacts on the Antarctic marine organisms from the appropriate use of acoustic technology equipment. SCAR proposed a number of mitigation measures to be used to minimize potential impacts on marine species from the use of acoustic technologies in Antarctica.

(26) Germany stated that in their view the SCAR report was not in all instances balanced and that some findings in the SCAR report were potentially misleading. Germany informed the CEP that a report from a meeting in Berlin on this subject would be published shortly.

(27) Delegations welcomed SCAR's initiative to produce this extensive report on this complex scientific issue and asked Germany to provide SCAR with comments for consideration by SCAR before final publication of the SCAR workshop report.

(28) The meeting asked SCAR to bring forward a final report on the environmental impacts of acoustic technology at CEP VI. This paper should address any issues raised by Germany and take into account the results from the Berlin meeting.

(29) COMNAP introduced Information Paper (XXV ATCM/IP26) containing its final report on an analysis of IEEs. The aim of the analysis was to achieve a better understanding of how the environmental impact assessment process is being used by national Antarctic programmes, and the strengths and weaknesses of past IEEs. To achieve this 13 IEEs from nine countries were examined.

(30) COMNAP concluded that:

The CEP *Guidelines for Environmental Impact Assessment in Antarctica* (1999) provide an excellent benchmark for best practice in Antarctic EIA, and authors of EIAs should be further encouraged to consult the guidelines throughout the IEE process;

As the number of IEEs increases, authors, when initiating an IEE process, should make use of accepted methodologies laid out in past IEEs completed for similar types of activities and in similar environments. To aid this, Parties should be encouraged to make IEE documents available through appropriate websites.

(31) The Committee thanked COMNAP for this useful work. Several Members requested that a more detailed analysis of the IEEs be provided which clearly identifies strengths and weaknesses and gaps in past IEEs. It was noted that the identification of impacts was often a weakness in many IEEs. COMNAP noted its continuing interest in this topic and confirmed that it would provide additional details of its analysis to CEP VI.

(32) New Zealand presented Information Paper (XXV ATCM/IP33) on the ANDRILL research programme – a nine year stratigraphic drilling programme in the McMurdo Sound area to investigate Antarctica's role in global environmental change over the last 65 million years. The CEP thanked New Zealand for the information and noted that a draft CEE for the programme would be prepared in advance of the next CEP meeting.

(33) New Zealand introduced Information Paper (XXV ATCM/IP34) concerning the utility of

environmental impact assessment for fishing vessels. The CEP noted that New Zealand intended to pursue this issue in the context of CCAMLR.

(34) The Czech Republic submitted Information Paper (XXV ATCM/IP93) on the proposed Czech Summer Research Station, which is now planned for Brandy Bay, James Ross Island. A draft CEE is intended to be completed in October, for consideration at CEP VI and ATCM XXVI. The Committee welcomed the information and looked forward to seeing the revised plans for the Czech station.

(35) The United States introduced Information Paper (XXV ATCM/IP48) giving a progress report from the intersessional work on cumulative environmental impacts. The United States noted that several countries and ASOC were contributing to this work and that the results from the group will be presented at CEP VI.

(36) ASOC presented Information Paper (XXV ATCM/IP82) on how Strategic Environmental Assessment might be a useful tool for activities carried out in Antarctica. The Committee thanked ASOC for the information. Some Members questioned the complexity of strategic environmental assessment and asked to see a model example. ASOC noted that such an approach could take many forms, as a model example was not readily available. Some Members saw merit in using a strategic approach to EIA in Antarctica particularly for multi-activity or multi-year projects.

(37) Norway, on behalf of the host country, presented Information Paper (XXV ATCM/IP97), which contained the list of IEEs and CEEs submitted to the host country as required by Resolution 6 (1995).

(38) New Zealand introduced Information Paper (XXV ATCM/IP99) giving a final environmental report on the Cape Roberts Project for which a CEE was prepared. New Zealand noted that the results of the monitoring work indicated that the environmental impact of the project was less than predicted in the CEE. The Meeting congratulated New Zealand on this comprehensive report.

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

(39) Argentina introduced Working Paper (XXV ATCM/WP8) on the final report of the intersessional contact group that had been established to address the issue of specially protected species in Antarctica. The paper reviewed the findings of the contact group that considered how to improve the application of the category of specially protected species on the basis of IUCN's Red List criteria, and included ten recommendations for the CEP to consider. Argentina thanked all those who had participated in the contact group over the last two years.

(40) The Committee thanked the intersessional group and in particular Mr José Maria Acero for his excellent co-ordination of the intersessional work and agreed that the findings of the group provided a sound basis for resolving the matter.

(41) SCAR introduced Working Paper (XXV ATCM/WP38) on specially protected species. In parallel with the findings of the intersessional contact group, SCAR noted that Annex II to the Protocol currently does not provide adequate guidance on how special protection should be applied. SCAR agreed that the IUCN Red List criteria provided a sound basis for assessing the conservation status of Antarctic species.

(42) SCAR offered to undertake, in conjunction with IUCN, an assessment of the status of well documented species using the IUCN criteria, beginning with birds and seals. SCAR will provide advice to the CEP on the conservation status of such species and what management actions might be

appropriate to protect or improve the status of the species concerned. SCAR noted that before undertaking assessments on any other groups it would wish to consider the implications of attempting this exercise on data deficient species.

(43) The Committee noted the broad agreement between the two papers on this issue. It was agreed that the IUCN Red List criteria should be used as the basis for SCAR's assessment of the status of species in Antarctica.

(44) The Committee thanked SCAR for their offer of assistance in assessing the conservation status of Antarctic species consistent with the approach submitted by the intersessional open-ended contact group (XXV ATCM/WP8 refers). This includes placing the IUCN category of conservation status (for example "vulnerable") in parentheses when recommending a species for special protection.

(45) The representative of the Scientific Committee of CCAMLR welcomed the recognition in both Working Papers that a dialogue with CCAMLR was needed on how the category of specially protected species under the Protocol might be applied to marine species that are under the purview of CCAMLR. CCAMLR looked forward to participating in further work on this matter. The representative of the CCAMLR Scientific Committee further noted that CCAMLR's ecosystem monitoring programme provides useful information on how targeted monitoring activities might be applied to species designated as specially protected.

(46) IUCN also welcomed the work that the Committee was undertaking on this matter and offered to assist the Committee in advising on the designation and management of specially protected species as required.

(47) Germany noted that the recent work of SCAR's Bird-biology Subcommittee and Bird Life International on the identification of important bird areas in Antarctica and trends in populations would be a useful source of information in assessing the status of all Antarctic bird species.

(48) The Committee's advice to the ATCM on Specially Protected Species is contained in **Appendix 1**.

(49) The CEP further agreed that the issue of Specially Protected Species should continue to be on the agenda of the CEP.

(50) The CEP agreed to recommend draft Resolution 1 (2002) for consideration of the ATCM (**Appendix 2**).

(51) Argentina presented Working Paper (XXV ATCM/WP7) on a review of Annex II. SCAR introduced Working Paper (XXV ATCM/WP37) presenting comments on the revision of Annex II.

(52) The Committee expressed its gratitude for these two papers, and noted SCAR's scientific comments. In addition to the issues brought out by these papers, it was noted that the review of Annex II should aim at improving the Annex and its consistency with the other Annexes. The revision should give priority to harmonizing the text.

(53) The Committee agreed also that in its review of Annex II it would take into account the final report and recommendations in (XXV ATCM/WP8) of the intersessional contact group on Specially Protected Species.

(54) ASOC introduced Information Paper (XXV ATCM/IP60) on the capture of Antarctic wildlife for the purpose of exhibition. There were varying views on this issue but the CEP agreed that common

criteria regarding collection of Antarctic wildlife for animal exhibits would be relevant. It was agreed that this issue would be considered further by the intersessional contact group working on revision of Annex II. SCAR noted that there is an agreed set of international rules for zoos on the collection of birds that might be useful for this discussion.

(55) The Committee decided to establish an Intersessional Contact Group (ICG) to be convened by José Maria Acero (Argentina), *jmacero@dna.gov.ar*, in order to advance the review of Annex II by the Committee in accordance with Article 12(1)(b) of the Environmental Protocol.

- The agreed Terms of Reference for the ICG are to:
- examine the text of Annex II;
- identify those articles of Annex II requiring deletion, amendment or modification and to prepare an amended draft text of Annex II as appropriate ensuring consistency with the Protocol and its annexes;
- explore options for developing criteria that Parties could use in making their decisions on permit requests to collect specimens for educational or cultural purposes as provided for under Article 3 of Annex II.

present a progress report to CEP VI to which would be attached an amended draft text of Annex II. This should indicate the changes proposed to the existing Annex as clearly as possible.

(56) The United Kingdom introduced Working Paper (XXV ATCM/WP26) containing proposed guidelines for the operation of aircraft near concentrations of birds in Antarctica. The Committee welcomed these guidelines and noted that they had been submitted as a draft. It was also noted that these general guidelines would be useful to aircrew operating aircraft in areas where site-specific plans or guidelines did not apply. The Committee therefore invited COMNAP, in consultation with SCAR, to review the guidelines, and to report back to the CEP.

(57) COMNAP told the Committee that they are interested in this issue, and would provide an interim report on the review of the guidelines at CEP VI and a final report to CEP VII.

(58) The United Kingdom presented Working Paper (XXV ATCM/WP43) on biological prospecting in Antarctica. The Meeting congratulated the United Kingdom on their paper, which raised a series of important questions resulting from advances in biotechnology.

(59) Several delegates pointed out that the subject of biological prospecting is complex, and includes legal and political issues. Comments from members covered items such as commercial confidentiality, cross-convention aspects, the legal basis for biological prospecting, intellectual property and patents etc., as well as consistency with Article III of the Antarctic Treaty.

(60) ASOC stated that biological prospecting would represent a further penetration of commercial and economic interest into Antarctica, and argued against accepting biological prospecting as a fait accompli.

(61) The CEP concluded that the complexities and rapid developments in this field were strong reasons for the Antarctic community to be preemptive on this issue and that biological prospecting needed to be discussed during the next CEP meeting. The CEP, however, is not in a position to address all the problems. It was suggested that many issues require consideration by the ATCM. Members were encouraged to submit papers on biological prospecting for consideration at CEP VI.

(62) Australia introduced Information Paper (XXV ATCM/IP62) on an emergency response plan in the event of unusual animal deaths, developed by the Australian Antarctic Division. A central element is the provision of a response kit at each Australian research station. The CEP found this to be valuable operational information. The full response plan can be found at the Australian Antarctic Division's website: http://www.aad.gov.au/response_plan.

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

(63) COMNAP presented Information Paper (XXV ATCM/IP51) on best practice for waste water disposal on ice-free ground at inland stations. The COMNAP survey indicated that Parties generally work diligently to meet the requirements of Annex III to the Protocol with respect to the disposal of waste. COMNAP indicated that it would continue to provide information to the CEP on developments and capabilities of waste disposal technologies at appropriate times.

(64) The following papers were presented with regard to waste management and clean-up. The Russian Federation introduced Information Paper (XXV ATCM/IP16) on waste removal from the Bellingshausen station. The United Kingdom presented Information Paper (XXV ATCM/IP22) regarding the clean-up and removal of waste at abandoned British stations. Australia presented Information Paper (XXV ATCM/IP57) concerning the clean-up of a former research station at Heard Island, which showed the challenges of clean-up of derelict buildings which have historical value. The CEP welcomed these three papers and noted that they presented a wide variety of clean-up activities organized and undertaken in number of different ways.

(65) New Zealand submitted Information Paper (XXV ATCM/IP32) on a new waste water treatment system for New Zealand's Scott Base. The CEP thanked New Zealand for this valuable information.

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

(66) There were no papers received and no discussion under this agenda item.

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

(67) The United Kingdom presented Working Paper (XXV ATCM/WP9) on the implications of the entry into force on 24th May 2002 of Annex V of the Environmental Protocol. The CEP thanked the United Kingdom for this very useful work and agreed with the specific implications outlined by the United Kingdom. These are reproduced as **Annex 3**.

(68) The United Kingdom Working Paper also proposed a renumbering system for Antarctic Specially Protected Areas updating the system agreed by means of Resolution V (1996). The Committee agreed with the proposed renumbering system and recommended draft Decision 1 (2002) for consideration by the ATCM (**Appendix 3**).

(69) Germany suggested that members should present at CEP VI a timetable for revising and updating management plans for Antarctic Specially Protected Areas to be in the format required by Annex V. In this connection reference was made to the Appendix to Resolution 1 (1998). The Committee agreed to the importance of early revision of protected area management plans and recommended draft Resolution 2 (2002) for consideration by the ATCM (**Appendix 4**).

(70) For those protected areas containing a significant marine component the Committee agreed that it would be appropriate for the proponent to send the relevant draft management plan(s) directly to CCAMLR for its review. New Zealand offered to revise the applicable guidelines in Annex 4 of the Final Report of the CEP III so as to take account of the necessary consultation procedures with CCAMLR (see **Appendix 6**). The Committee thanked New Zealand for its offer and looked forward to seeing New Zealand's report at CEP VI.

(71) The following papers on Antarctic protected areas presented the results from intersessional

working groups:

- (a) the United Kingdom introduced Working Paper (XXV ATCM/WP10) on the review of six draft Protected Area Management Plans for ASPA No. 107 (SPA No. 8), Dion Islands; ASPA No. 108 (SPA No.9) Green Island; ASPA No. 117 (SPA No. 21) Avian Island; ASPA No. 126 (Site of Special Scientific Interest- SSSI No.6) Byers Peninsula; ASPA No. 147 (SSSI No.29) Ablation Point – Ganymede Heights and ASPA No. 148 (SSSI No.31) Mount Flora;

(b) The United States presented Working Paper (XXV ATCM/WP21) on the review of five draft Protected Area Management Plans for ASPA No. 106 (SPA No.7) Cape Hallett; ASPA No. 121 (SSSI No.1) Cape Royds; ASPA No. 123 (SSSI No.3) Barwick and Balham Valleys; ASPA No. 124 (SSSI No.4) Cape Crozier; ASPA No.137 (SSSI No. 18) NW White Island.

(72) New Zealand introduced Working Paper (XXV ATCM/WP17) containing a five-year review of the Management Plan for ASPA No. 130 (SSSI No.11), Tramway Ridge, Mt Erebus, Ross Island. The Contracting Parties congratulated New Zealand on this work and noted that this was the first five-year review in accordance with Annex V Article 6(3) of the Protocol.

(73) New Zealand presented Working Paper (XXV ATCM/WP39) regarding a proposed minor boundary change to ASPA No. 157 (SPA No.27) Backdoor Bay, Cape Royds, Ross Island. The Committee noted that the boundary change is to ensure concurrence with the change to the boundary of ASPA No. 121.

(74) Given the minor nature of these two revisions, the CEP considered that the plans for ASPAs No. 130 and 157 did not need to go to intersessional review.

(75) The Committee thanked the United Kingdom, the United States and New Zealand for carrying out these reviews and agreed to recommend to the ATCM formal adoption of these management plans by means of Measure 1 (2002) (**Appendix 5**).

(76) In this connection the Committee also agreed to advise the ATCM that ASPA No. 121 also includes marine areas requiring the consideration of CCAMLR.

(77) Members noted that different approaches were taken in these protected area management plans to the use of poultry products. SCAR advised that at present there is no evidence of a causal link between poultry products and the introduction of Newcastle disease in Antarctica. SCAR recognized, however, that on a precautionary basis, restrictions on poultry products could be considered in areas that are protected particularly because of their values as sites for breeding birds.

(78) The United Kingdom introduced Working Paper (XXV ATCM/WP3) on the revision of the Management Plan for ASPA No. 114 (SPA No. 18) North Coronation Island. This area contains a marine component and the draft management plan will therefore be forwarded to CCAMLR for consideration. An open-ended intersessional contact group led by Dr. Neil Gilbert from the United Kingdom (neil.gilbert@fco.gov.uk) was established to consider the submitted draft Management Plan and to report back to CEP VI.

(79) New Zealand introduced Working Paper (XXV ATCM/WP16) on the revision of the Management Plan for Specially Protected Areas ASPA No 118 (SPA No. 22 and SSSI No. 24) Cryptogram Ridge, Mt Melbourne, North Victoria Land and summit of Mt Melbourne, North Victoria Land. The CEP agreed to refer the revised Management Plans to an intersessional contact group, led by Rebecca Roper-Gee from New Zealand (r.ropergee@antarcticanz.govt.nz), which would report back to CEP VI.

(80) The United States presented Working Paper (XXV ATCM/WP18) on the revision of

Management Plans for ASPA No. 152 (SSSI No.35) Western Bransfield Strait, Antarctic Peninsula and ASPA No. 153 (SSSI No.36) Eastern Dallmann Bay, Antarctic Peninsula. The CEP agreed to refer these Management Plans to an intersessional contact group, led by the United States, which would report back to CEP VI. The United States noted that it had already transmitted its proposals for consideration by CCAMLR. It was agreed that Dr. Joyce Jatko, jjatko@nsf.gov would be the contact point for intersessional review.

(81) Australia introduced Working Paper (XXV ATCM/WP29) concerning revised Management Plans for ASPA No.135 (SSSI No. 16) North-East Bailey Peninsula, Budd Coast, Wilkes Land and ASPA No.143 (SSSI No. 25) Marine Plain, Mule Peninsula, Vestfold Hills, Princess Elizabeth Land. Australia introduced Working Paper (XXV ATCM/WP 33) regarding a proposed management plan for the Frazier Islands, Wilkes Land, East Antarctica, which aimed at providing further protection for the Southern Giant Petrel.

(82) These issues will be considered further by an open-ended intersessional contact group led by Bruce Hull from Australia (bruce.hull@aad.gov.au), which will report back to CEP VI.

(83) Italy introduced Working Paper (XXV ATCM/WP36) regarding a proposal for a new Antarctic Specially Protected Area in Terra Nova Bay, Ross Sea. Italy supported their initiative by presenting the special values of the area for scientific research.

(84) Italy recalled that according to Annex V (Article 6(2)) no marine area could be designated as a Protected area without prior approval of CCAMLR. Italy noted that it had already transmitted its proposal for consideration by CCAMLR.

(85) This issue will be considered further by an open-ended intersessional contact group led by Dr. Sandro Torcini from Italy (sandro.torcini@casaccia.enea.it), which will report back to CEP VI.

(86) India introduced Working Paper (XXV ATCM/WP47) on a draft management plan for a proposed site of Special Scientific Interest for Dakshin Gangotri Glacier Snout, Schirmacher Oasis, Dronning Maud Land. The Committee noted that this should now be termed an ASPA rather than SSSI.

(87) This issue will be considered further by an open-ended intersessional contact group led by Mr. Prem C. Pandey from India (pcpandey@ncaor.org), which will report back to CEP VI.

(88) New Zealand presented Working Paper (XXV ATCM/WP13) giving a progress report on the issue of a systematic environmental-geographic framework (SEGF) for protected areas. New Zealand suggested that SEGF could serve as a tool for the Protocol, such as establishing a framework for protecting specific areas. Many delegations expressed their support for New Zealand to continue its work on SEGF.

(89) The CEP asked New Zealand to present further information on this issue to CEP VI. New Zealand agreed to this and asked interested parties to contact Dr Harry Keys (hkeys@doc.govt.nz).

(90) The United Kingdom introduced Working Paper (XXV ATCM/WP4) concerning the review of the list of Historic Sites and Monuments (HSM) identified in Resolution 4 (2001). The United Kingdom had distributed a questionnaire survey to all those Parties who were solely or jointly responsible for HSMs in Antarctica. Most Parties had replied to the questionnaire survey, but four had not yet replied. The United Kingdom offered to liaise intersessionally with these Parties and to provide an updated list of HSMs, which is as complete as possible to CEP VI.

(91) The Committee welcomed this work and asked the United Kingdom to bring a final report to

CEP VI.

(92) The United Kingdom introduced Working Paper (XXV ATCM/WP22) containing a proposal for an information archive for the Antarctic Protected Areas System. (<http://www.era.gs/resources/apa>) contains the Antarctic Protected Areas Information Archive.

(93) The CEP congratulated the United Kingdom on this very valuable initiative. Several Members offered further information and their assistance in maintaining the archive. It was suggested that documents stored on the site be translated into the official ATCM languages. A number of members suggested that the United Kingdom website be added to the CEP website and to the ATCM website when this was possible, so that it could be made easily available to all of the Antarctic community. The UK agreed to complete the information archive as far as possible and then to hand it over to the CEP Chair for incorporation into the CEP website. The UK also agreed to consider the proposal for translating the site into the four Treaty languages.

(94) Australia announced that it was planning a conservation expedition to Mawson's Huts at Cape Denison in 2002/2003. Australia will bring a proposal to CEP VI for a Protected Area Management Plan for this important historic site.

(95) Germany introduced Information Paper (XXV ATCM/IP13) giving a research report on two tourist sites in the Antarctic. Germany intends to submit a Working Paper containing a draft ASMA management plan for Hannah Point to CEP VI.

(96) The CEP congratulated Germany on this very interesting report. Those wanting more information should contact Ms. Michaela Mayer from Germany (michaela.mayer@uba.de).

(97) Argentina introduced a joint Information Paper (XXV ATCM/IP28) (submitted by Argentina, Chile, Norway, Spain, the United Kingdom, The United States, ASOC, IAATO) on an international expedition to Deception Island for the purpose of establishing an ASMA. This issue would be discussed further at CEP VI.

(98) The United States introduced Information Paper (XXV ATCM/IP38) regarding a US-New Zealand plan for a proposed Antarctic Specially Managed Area in the McMurdo Dry Valleys, Southern Victoria Land. A draft ASMA plan will be submitted at CEP VI.

(99) Brazil introduced Information Paper (XXV ATCM/IP46) on the joint coordination of the ASMA of Admiralty Bay on King George Island, South Shetlands Islands. Brazil indicated that the coordination of the activities had now been formally transferred to Poland.

(100) New Zealand introduced Information Paper (XXV ATCM/IP58) related to a major initiative by the NZ Antarctic Heritage Trust regarding restoration of the historic huts in the Ross Sea Region.

(101) Chile introduced Information Paper (XXV ATCM/IP79) on the ruins of President Pedro Aguirre Cerda Base, Pendulum Cove, Deception Island and the protection of this HSM.

(102) ASOC presented Information Paper (XXV ATCM/IP101) on Marine Protected Areas.

(103) Chile presented Information Paper (XXV ATCM/IP102), which includes a publication reporting a workshop on Deception Island. Chile highlighted various aspects of administration and management of environmental threats to the area, and thanked the other participants for their input in the project. The CEP congratulated Chile on this effort.

Item 5: Environmental Monitoring

(104) Poland introduced Information Papers (XXV ATCM/IP1 and XXV ATCM/IP2) on long term monitoring of the avifauna and deglaciation in Admiralty Bay on King George Island. Poland highlighted the importance of monitoring the sea-ice zone ecosystem in the light of global climate changes. The CEP noted these interesting results.

(105) The United States presented a joint Information Paper (XXV ATCM/IP25) prepared by the United States and the United Kingdom relating to an Antarctic Site Inventory containing biological data and site-descriptive information on the Antarctic Peninsula collected since 1994.

(106) Chile welcomed the initiative and underlined the importance of the project as a source of information on environmental impacts and historical information.

(107) The CEP suggested that this Information Paper could be further considered within the groups discussing operational issues at ATCM XXV.

(108) Italy presented Information Paper (XXV ATCM/IP68) on environmental monitoring at Terra Nova Bay station.

Item 6: State of the Antarctic Environment Report

(109) SCAR presented Working Paper (XXV ATCM/WP31-rev.1) on the State of the Antarctic Environment Report (SAER) and thanked IUCN and CCAMLR for their assistance in the preparation of this paper. SCAR indicated that extensive and relevant data already existed for many of the key environmental variables but that there were some areas that were data deficient. SCAR reported that state of the environment reporting elsewhere in the world had already proven its value for decision making in environmental management.

(110) New Zealand introduced Information Paper (XXV ATCM/IP7) reporting on the key findings of the Ross Sea Region State of the Environment report published in November 2001.

(111) New Zealand presented Working Paper (XXV ATCM/WP12) concerning the process used for developing the Ross Sea Region report, including costs and subsequent follow-up work. Options for reporting on the State of the Antarctic environment were also presented. New Zealand noted that the type of reporting system adopted, and the way in which it is managed, should stem directly from a clear statement of the reasons for reporting. New Zealand suggested that the CEP should consider how to progress with state of the Antarctic environment reporting, and that the Ross Sea Region 2001 report provides as example of what such reporting might look like in an Antarctic context.

(112) Australia introduced Information Paper (XXV ATCM/IP54) describing a low cost, simple but powerful web-based system for tracking a set of indicators for monitoring environmental change.

(113) The Committee welcomed the information contained in these papers and congratulated Australia and New Zealand on the significant work they had undertaken on state of the environment reporting in Antarctica. Several Members noted that advising on the state of the Antarctic environment is a primary responsibility of the Committee under Article 12 of the Protocol and suggested the various papers on this issue provided a sound basis for developing a continent-wide state of the environment report. Chile noted the responsibility of the Consultative Parties to report to the broader international community any significant changes in the state of the Antarctic environment.

(114) It was agreed that New Zealand and Australia (lee.belbin@aad.gov.au) jointly should lead

informal intersessional work aimed at providing clear suggestions on how to move forward on developing a continent-wide state of the Antarctic environment report for consideration at CEP VI. Several members offered to assist in this intersessional work.

Item 7: Emergency Response and Contingency Planning

(115) COMNAP presented Working Paper (XXV ATCM/WP25 rev. 1) reflecting on “worst case” and “less than worst case” scenarios of possible environmental incidents in Antarctica. COMNAP emphasized the differences between primary and secondary response actions. COMNAP noted that the paper is essentially a “work in progress” and does not yet provide information on probability or costs. COMNAP advised that the Working Paper had undergone a minor revision taking into account comments received from SCAR and ASOC (XXV ATCM/IP81) regarding introduction of non-indigenous species.

(116) ASOC presented Information Paper (XXV ATCM/IP81) and pointed to the issue of introducing non-indigenous organisms to Antarctica.

(117) ASOC noted the importance of clarity in the use of the term “incident” when the CEP provides advice to the ATCM Liability Working Group given the differing uses of the term by scientific and legal experts.

(118) COMNAP introduced Working Paper (XXV ATCM/WP27) describing its newly implemented, web based Environmental Incident Reporting System (EIRS) and providing updated data on incidents that have occurred during the last thirteen years. The data indicated that oil spills are the dominant type of environmental incident and COMNAP accordingly urged Parties to ensure that the COMNAP Guidelines on oil storage, oil transfer and oil spill contingency planning are implemented as required by Resolution 6 (1998).

(119) IAATO presented Information Papers (XXV ATCM/IP39) and (XXV ATCM/IP75) on environmental emergencies arising from tourist activities in Antarctica.

(120) The CEP noted that the operational data in these papers would be brought into the liability discussions going on elsewhere in the ATCM.

Item 8: Data and Exchange of Information

(121) China submitted Information Paper (XXV ATCM/IP41) on the Chinese Antarctic Scientific Database, and provided information on the data management system. The CEP thanked China for their efforts and emphasized the value of their Information Paper. It was suggested that other parties should provide such information to CEP VI, as this would be useful in relation to reporting on the state of the Antarctic environment.

Item 9: Cooperation with other organizations in accordance with Article 11 of the Protocol

(122) Australia introduced Information Paper (XXV ATCM/IP49-rev.1) giving the report of the CEP observer to the Scientific Committee of CCAMLR XX held in October 2001 and highlighted the

main aspects of the report, including the problem of illegal, unreported and unregulated (IUU) fishing in the Convention Area, statistical data, as well as the results of the Working Group on Ecosystem Monitoring and Management (WG-EMM).

(123) The CEP elected Dr. Tony Press to represent the CEP at the forthcoming meeting of the CCAMLR Scientific Committee.

(124) It was noted that there are several areas of joint interest to CEP and CCAMLR, including questions related to species protection and management plans for protected areas with a marine component.

(125) CCAMLR informed the Committee that it has established its procedure for handling such management plans. This involves first consideration by its Working Groups on Ecosystem Monitoring and Management (WG-EMM) and on Fish Stock Assessment (WG-FSA), then advice developed by the Scientific Committee, followed by consideration by the Commission. CCAMLR pointed out that depending upon submission of such management plans in relation to the timing of Working Group meetings the complete process could take many months.

(126) The Committee noted that it needed to establish how it should get such management plans rapidly to CCAMLR. Uruguay introduced Information Paper (XXV ATCM/IP67), which was relevant to this issue.

(127) The Committee's advice to the ATCM on the procedures for forwarding draft ASPA Management Plans to CCAMLR is attached in **Appendix 6**.

Item 10: Election of Officers

(128) The Committee warmly congratulated Dr. Tony Press from Australia on his election as the new Chair of the CEP. In accordance with the rules of procedures the new chair takes responsibility at the end of the CEP meeting in which the chair is elected. However, it was agreed that the outgoing chair should give the ATCM presentation of the CEP report.

(129) The Committee expressed its sincere gratitude to Dr. Olav Orheim for his hard work and commitment during his tenure as Chair of the CEP. The Committee warmly acknowledged Dr. Orheim's skills and enthusiasm, which have been a significant factor in the effectiveness of the Committee during its formative years.

Item 11: Preparation for CEP VI

(130) The Committee agreed that Biological Prospecting should be added to the Agenda at CEP VI as Agenda Item 7. It further agreed to include ATCM Agenda Item 7: Co-operation among Parties with respect to Article 6 of Protocol in the CEP Agenda Item 4a. The ATCM was asked to approve the provisional Draft Agenda for CEP VI reproduced as **Appendix 7**.

Item 12: Adoption of the Report

(131) The draft Report was adopted by the Committee.

- Item 13: Closing of the Meeting

(132) 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 V

Agenda and Final List of Documents Draft allocation of documents to agenda items

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

Paper No.	Title	Submitted by
IP 6	Informe anual de acuerdo al artículo 17 del Protocolo al Tratado Antártico sobre la Protección del Medio Ambiente	Uruguay
IP 8	Rapport annuel presente par la France conformément a l'article 17 du Protocole au Traite sur l'Antarctique relatif a la Protection de l'environnement 2002	France
IP 19	Annual report pursuant to Article 17 of the Protocol on Environmental Protection to the Antarctic Treaty: The Ukraine (2001)	Ukraine
IP 20	Antarctic meteorites and UK law	United Kingdom
IP 23	Report on the implementation of the Protocol on Environmental Protection to the Antarctic Treaty as required by Article 17 of the Protocol.	United Kingdom
IP 31	Annual Report of New Zealand Pursuant to Article 17 of the Protocol on Environmental Protection to the Antarctic Treaty	New Zealand
IP 37	Report of Romania on the ratification on the Protocol of Madrid	Romania
IP 42	Antarctic Meteorites Study and Management in China	China
IP 43	2001/2002 Chinese Antarctic Environmental Report	China

Paper No.	Title	Submitted by
IP 50	Report on Co-operation Among Parties with Respect to Article 6 of the Madrid Protocol - Australian Participation in the SWEDARP Expedition to Dronning Maud Land 2001-2002	Australia
IP 52	ATCM papers, discussions, & recommendations relating to tourism and non-governmental activities	ASOC
IP 56	The Australian Antarctic Division's Environmental Management System	Australia
IP 59	Informe anual de acuerdo con el Artículo 17 del Protocolo al Tratado Antártico sobre protección del Medio Ambiente	Spain
IP 64	Annual Report Pursuant to the Protocol on Environmental Protection to the Antarctic Treaty	Italy
IP 65	Annual Report pursuant to the Protocol on Environmental Protection to the Antarctic Treaty	South Africa
IP 66	Annual Report under the Protocol on Environmental Protection to the Antarctic Treaty	Japan
IP 70	Information Paper on drafting of Czech Act on the Antarctic	Czech Republic
IP 78	Reports under Article 17 and the Implementation of the Madrid Protocol	ASOC
IP 80	Annual Report under the Protocol on Environmental Protection to the Antarctic Treaty	Netherlands
IP 96	Key activities undertaken by Peru in Antarctic matters during the 2001-2002 period	Peru
IP 104	Annual Report of India pursuant to Article 17 of the Environmental Protection to the Antarctic Treaty	India

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

Paper No.	Title	Submitted by
WP 19	Water sampling of the subglacial Lake Vostok - Draft Comprehensive Environmental Evaluation	Russia
IP 55	Exploring Subglacial Antarctic Lakes: A SCAR Report on Progress	SCAR

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

Paper No.	Title	Submitted by
WP 15	Ice runway in the area of Novolazarevskaya Station: Initial Environmental Evaluation	Russia
WP 23	Marine Acoustic Technology and the Environment	SCAR
IP 24	Marine acoustic technology and the environment	SCAR
IP 26	An Analysis of Initial Environmental Evaluations (IEEs)	COMNAP
IP 33	ANDRILL - The McMurdo Sound Portfolio Environmental Impact Assessment Process	New Zealand
IP 34	Environmental Impact Assessment of Fishing Vessels	New Zealand
IP 48	Progress Report from the Intersessional Contact Group on Cumulative Impacts	United States

Paper No.	Title	Submitted by
IP 82	Strategic Environmental Assessment in Antarctica: A “stepping stone” to Madrid Protocol objectives	ASOC
IP 93	Report on project of the Czech research station in Antarctica	Czech Republic
IP 97	Annual list of Initial Environmental Evaluations (IEE) and Comprehensive Environmental Evaluations (CEE) 2001/2002	Secretariat
IP 99	Cape Roberts Project Final Environmental Report 1995-2001	New Zealand

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

Paper No.	Title	Submitted by
WP 7	Annex II: Reasons for a review	Argentina
WP 8	Final report of the inter-sessional contact group on Specially Protected Species	Argentina
WP 26	Proposed Guidelines for the operation of aircraft near concentrations of birds	United Kingdom
WP 37	Comments on the revision of Annex II	SCAR
WP 38	Specially Protected Species	SCAR
WP 43	Biological Prospecting in Antarctica	United Kingdom
IP 60	Antarctic wildlife in captivity and the Madrid Protocol	ASOC
IP 62	Draft Response Plan in the Event that Unusual Animal Deaths are Discovered	Australia

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

Paper No.	Title	Submitted by
IP 16	Results of the waste disposal project at Bellingshausen Station	Russia
IP 22	The clean-up and removal of abandoned British stations in Antarctica	United Kingdom
IP 32	A New Waste Water Treatment System for New Zealand’s Scott Base - Rationale, Selection Process and Outcome	New Zealand
IP 51	Best Practice To Avoid Waste Water Disposal Onto Ice-free Ground at Inland Stations	COMNAP
IP 57	Clean up of a Former Subantarctic Research Station at Heard Island	Australia

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

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

Paper No.	Title	Submitted by
WP 3	Antarctic Protected Areas System: Draft Management Plan for ASPA 114, North Coronation Island	United Kingdom
WP 4	Review of the List of Historic Sites and Monuments	United Kingdom

Paper No.	Title	Submitted by
WP 9	Implications of the entry into force of Annex V to the Environmental Protocol	United Kingdom
WP 10	Review of draft Protected Area Management Plans: Report of the UK-led Intersessional Contact Group	United Kingdom
WP 13	Report back on a Systematic Environmental- Geographic Framework (SEGF) for Protected Areas under Annex V of the Environmental Protocol	New Zealand
WP 16	Revision of Antarctic Specially Protected Areas (ASPA) Nos. 118a and 118b: Cryptogam Ridge, Mt Melbourne, North Victoria Land (SPA 22) and Summit of Mt Melbourne, North Victoria Land (SSSI 24)	New Zealand
WP 17	Five year review of Antarctic Specially Protected Area (ASPA) No. 130 (SSSI No. 11), Tramway Ridge, Mt Erebus, Ross Island	New Zealand
WP 18	Antarctic Protected Area System: Revised Management Plans for: Site of Special Scientific Interest No. 35 – Western Bransfield Strait, Antarctic Peninsula and Site of Special Scientific Interest No. 36 – Eastern Dallmann Bay, Antarctic Peninsula	United States
WP 21	Antarctic Protected Area System: Revised Management Plans for: SPA No. 7, SSSI No. 1, SSSI No. 3, SSSI No. 4 and SSSI No. 18.	United States
WP 22	Antarctic Protected Areas System: A Proposed Information Archive	United Kingdom
WP 29	Antarctic Protected Areas System: Revised Management Plans for North-east Bailey Peninsula, Budd Coast, Wilkes Land (Antarctic Specially Protected Area No. 135) and Marine Plain, Mule Peninsula, Vestfold Hills, Princess Elizabeth Land (Antarctic Specially Protected Area No. 143)	Australia
WP 33	Antarctic Protected Areas System: Proposed Management Plan for Frazier Islands, Wilkes Land, east Antarctica (Antarctic Specially protected Area No. xxx)	Australia
WP 36	Antarctic Protected Areas System: Proposal for a new Antarctic Specially Protected Area Terra Nova Bay, Ross Sea	Italy
WP 39	Proposed Boundary Change to Specially Protected Area (SPA No. 27) Backdoor Bay, Cape Royds, Ross Island	New Zealand
WP 47	Draft Management Plan for proposed Site of Special Scientific Interest	India
IP 13	Research Report “Survey and Management Plans for two Tourist Sites in the Antarctic – Scientific Basis and Indicators for the Development of Management Plans for Frequently Used Visitor Sites in the Antarctic”	Germany
IP 28	An International Expedition to Deception Island	Argentina, Chile, Norway, Spain, UK, USA, ASOC and IAATO
IP 38	Antarctic Protected Area System: Proposed Antarctic Specially Managed Area in the McMurdo Dry Valleys, Ross Sea Region	United States and New Zealand
IP 46	Coordination of the Antarctic Specially Managed Area (ASMA) of Admiralty Bay, King George Island, South Shetland Islands	Brazil and Poland
IP 58	Antarctic Historic Resources	New Zealand
IP 79	Instalación de monolito histórico en Isla Decepción - Ruinas de la base pdte. Pedro Aguirre Cerda	Chile
IP 101	Antarctic needs Marine Protected Areas	ASOC

Paper No.	Title	Submitted by
IP 102	Workshop on a Management Plan for Deception Island	Chile

Item 5: Environmental Monitoring

Paper No.	Title	Submitted by
IP 1	The long-term monitoring of avifauna in Admiralty Bay in light of the changes in the sea-ice zone ecosystem (South Shetland Islands, Antarctica)	Poland
IP 2	Deglaciation at Admiralty Bay, King George Island (South Shetland Islands, West Antarctica)	Poland
IP 25	Antarctic Site Inventory: 1994-2002	United Kingdom and United States
IP 68	Environmental Monitoring in the Italian Antarctic Terra Nova Bay Station after the entry into force of the Madrid Protocol in 1998	Italy

Item 6: State of the Antarctic Environment Report

Paper No.	Title	Submitted by
WP 12	Ross Sea Region 2001: A State of the Environment Report for the Ross Sea Region of Antarctica . Process, Follow-up, and Options for Future Reporting	New Zealand
WP 31 rev.1	Scoping the data for a State of the Antarctic Environment Report	SCAR
IP 7	Ross Sea Region 2001: A State of the Environment Report for the Ross Sea Region of Antarctica	New Zealand
IP 54	Antarctic State of the Environment Reporting	Australia

Item 7: Emergency Response and Contingency Planning

Paper No.	Title	Submitted by
WP 25 rev.1	“Worst Case” & “Less than Worst Case” Environmental Scenarios	COMNAP
WP 27	An Assessment of Environmental Incidents Arising from Activities in Antarctica	COMNAP
IP 39	An Assessment of Environmental Emergencies Arising from Activities in Antarctica	IAATO
IP 75	IAATO-Wide-Emergency Contingency and Search and Rescue Plan: A Brief Summary of the Work in Progress	IAATO
IP 81	On Worst Case Scenarios	ASOC

-
-
-

Item 8: Data and Exchange of Information

Paper No.	Title	Submitted by
IP 41	Information exchanging, Chinese Antarctic Scientific Database	China

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

Paper No.	Title	Submitted by
IP 49 rev. 1	Report of the CEP Observer SC-CCAMLR XX, 22 October to 2 November 2001	Australia
IP 67	Issues referred to Management Plans for Antarctic Specially Protected Areas and Antarctic Specially Managed Areas which include marine areas	Uruguay

Item 10: Election of Officers

Item 11: Preparation for CEP VI

-

Item 12: Adoption of the Report

Item 13: Closing of the Meeting

Annex 2

• Addresses of the National Contact Points

CEP Members

Country	Name	Telephone	Fax	E-mail
ARGENTINA	José María Acero	+54-11-4816-2352	+541148137807	jmacero@dna.gov.ar
AUSTRALIA	Tom Maggs	+61-362323506	+61-36-2323357	tom.maggs@aad.gov.au
BELGIUM	Hugo Decléir	+32-2-629-3383	+32-2-629-3378	hdecléir@vub.ac.be
BRAZIL	Tania Aparecida Silva Brito	+55-61-317-1086	+55-61-317-1213	tania.brito@mma.gov.br
BULGARIA	Christo 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	jvalenci@inach.cl
CHINA	Wei Wen Liang	+86-10-6801-7625	+86-10-6801-2776	chinare@public.bta.net.cn
ECUADOR	Fabre, Fernando Zurita			inocar@inocar.mil.ec
FINLAND	Outi Mähönen	+358-16-329-4444	+358-16-310-340	Outi.Mahonen@ymparisto.fi
FRANCE	Laurence Petitguillaume	+33(1)-4219-17-23	+33-1-4219-17-72	Laurence.petitguillaume@environnement.gouv.fr
GERMANY	Antje Neumann	+49-308-903-2395	+49-308-903-2906	antje.Neumann@uba.de
INDIA	Pandey, Prem C.	+91-832-520-876	+91-832-520-877	pcpandey@ncaor.org
ITALY	Pietro Giuliani	+39-6-3048-4215	+39-6-3048-4893	internazio@enea.pnra.it
JAPAN	Tsutomu Tamura	+81-3-5521-8245	+81-3-3581-3348	antarctic@env.go.jp
NEW ZEALAND	Emma Waterhouse	+6433-580-200	+6433-580-211	e.waterhouse@antarctic.govt.nz
NETHERLANDS	Dick de Bruijn	+3170-3394-652	+3170-3391-306	Dick.DeBruijn@minvrom.nl
NORWAY	Birgit Njaastad	+4777-7505-00	+4777-7505-01	njaastad@npolar.no
PERU	Fortunato Isasi	+51-1-311-2653	+51-1-311-2659	fisasi@rree.gob.pe
POLAND	Katarzyna Salwicka Stanisław Rakusa-Suszczewski	+48-22-846-33-83	+48-22-846-19-12	katsal@dab.waw.pl profesor@dab.waw.pl
REPUBLIC OF KOREA	In-Young Ahn	+82-31-400-6421	+82-31-400-5825	iahn@kordi.re.kr
ROMANIA	Teodor Gheroghe-Negoita	+401-337-2899	+401-337-2899 +4021-337-2986	negoita_antarctic@yahoo.com
RUSSIAN FEDERATION	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	Anna Carin Thomér	+46-840-55-2274	+46-821-16-90	annacarin.thomer@environment.ministry.se
UKRAINE	Gennadi Milinevsky	+38-044-235-	+38-044-246-3880	antarc@carrier.kiev.ua

Country	Name	Telephone	Fax	E-mail
		6071		
UNITED KINGDOM	Neil Gilbert	+44-207-270-2610	+44-207-270-2806	Neil.Gilbert@fco.gov.uk
UNITED STATES OF AMERICA	Fabio Saturni	+1-202-647-0237	+1-202-647-4353	SaturniFM@state.gov
URUGUAY	Aldo Felici	+5982-487-8341/44	+5982-487-6004	antartic@iau.gub.uy

CEP Members

Observers 4a

• Country	• Name	• Telephone	• Fax	• E-mail
CANADA	Fred Roots	+1-819-997-2393	+1-819-997-5813	fred.roots@ec.gc.ca
CZECH REPUBLIC	Zdenek Venera	+420-2-6712-2051	+420-2-736525	veera@env.cz
ESTONIA	Mart Saarso	+372-522-8513	+372-6317-099	Mart.Saarso@mfa.ee

Observers 4b

Organization	Name	Telephone	Fax	E-mail
CCAMLR	Rennie Holt	+858-546-5601	+858-546-5608	rennie.holt@noaa.gov ccamlr.org
COMNAP	Jack Sayers	+61-362-335-498	+61-362-335-497	jsayers@comnap.aq
	Karl Erb	+1-703-292-8030	+1-703-292-9081	kerb@nsf.gov
SCAR	Peter Clarkson	+44-1223-362061	+44-1223-336550	execsec@scar.demon.co.uk

Observers 4c

Organization	Name	Telephone	Fax	E-mail
ASOC	Beth Clark	+1-202-518-2046	+1-202-387-4823	Antarctica@igc.org
IUCN	Alan Hemmings	+64-3-337-3880	+64-3-337-3880	alan.hemmings@xtra.co.nz
UNEP	Christian Lambrechts	+254-2-623470	+254-2-623846	christian.lambrechts@unep.org
WMO	Hugh Hutchinson	+61-3-6221-2001	+61-3-6221-2003	h.Hutchinson@bom.gov.au
IAATO	Denise Landau	+970-704-1047	+970-704-9660 +970-704-1047	iaato@iaato.org

Annex 3

Specific implications of the entry into force of Annex V

• Annex V Article:	• Provisions:	• Implications:
3(3)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • SPAs and SSSIs automatically designated as ASPAs; • ASPAs must be renumbered accordingly 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Renumbering was agreed by means of Resolution V (1996), but this needs to be updated (see below); • Parties may need to give effect to renaming and renumbering in domestic legislation.
5(1)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Any Party, the CEP, SCAR or CCAMLR may propose an area for designation as an ASPA or ASMA by submitting a proposed management plan to the ATCM 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • To note those eligible to submit ASPA and ASMA proposals.
• 6(1)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Procedures for the submission and approval of management plans 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • CEP has already established guidelines for its consideration of draft management plans (paras 84 & 85 and Annex 4 of the Final Report of CEP III refer); • CEP has taken the view that SCAR's participation in intersessional review of draft management plans would satisfy the requirements of Article 6(1) (para 64 of the Final Report of CEP IV refers); • Article 6(1) introduces a fast-track mechanism for the approval of management plans, i.e. 90 days after the closure of the meeting at which they were adopted; • Many management plans still need to be revised and updated in Annex V format (Resolution 1 (1998) refers).
• 6(2)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No marine area shall be designated without prior approval of CCAMLR 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Consideration needs to be given over the means by which management plans with a marine component are referred to CCAMLR: should the proponent decide on referral or the CEP?; • Decision 4 (1998) sets out the criteria as to when such plans should be forwarded to CCAMLR.

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 6(3) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A review of management plans shall be initiated every five years 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • CEP may wish to update the national responsibilities for revising management plans appended to Resolution 1 (1998) and to prepare an agreed timetable for review of these plans.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 6(6) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Upon approval management plans shall be circulated by the Depositary which shall also maintain a record of approved plans 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • CEP may wish to consider developing a central web-based archive for storing protected area information.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 7(1) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Permitting provisions for entry into protected areas 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Parties are required to establish an appropriate authority to issue permits to enter ASPAs; this may require action to be taken in domestic law.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 7(2) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Permits may be issued to enter sites that do not have management plans, for compelling scientific purposes 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Only two ASPAs appear not to have management plans: ASPA 104, Sabrina Island, and ASPA 113, Litchfield Island. Consideration should be given to addressing these sites with some priority.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 8 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Historic Sites and Monuments can be designated as ASPAs, ASMAs or simply listed; • Procedures for adding new sites to the list of Historic Sites and Monuments; • Depositary shall maintain the list of Historic Sites and Monuments (HSMs) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Previous list of HSMs held under Recommendation VII-9 is transferred (Rec. VII-9 now obsolete); • Fast-track mechanism for the approval of new HSMs introduced, i.e. 90 days after the closure of the meeting at which they were adopted; • CEP may wish to consider developing a central web-based archive for storing HSM information (NB; HSM review currently underway)
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 9 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Principles established for making publicly available, information on ASPAs, ASMAs and HSMs; • Provides also for the marking of site boundaries where appropriate 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Parties shall make available information on the location etc of protected areas to those intending to visit Antarctica; to this end the CEP may wish to consider developing a central web-based archive for storing and making available protected area information; • Parties shall mark protected areas on maps and charts; • Parties should consider (where appropriate) marking sites with boundary markers. This may extend to, for example, establishing permanent signs.

10	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Procedures for exchanging information set out 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Parties shall, before 30 November each year, inform each other and the CEP of: the number of ASPA permits issued, measures taken to implement Annex V and any protected area inspections / visits undertaken; • Parties shall include in the annual Treaty exchange of information summary descriptions of activities undertaken in ASPAs and ASMAs.
----	---	---

Appendix 1

CEP Advice to the XXV ATCM on Specially Protected Species

With regard to Specially Protected Species (XXV ATCM/WP8), the Committee for Environmental Protection,

Noting that, there was agreement within the CEP that, from scientific and conservation perspectives, the Specially Protected Species provisions in Annex II should, in principle, be extended to all species indigenous to the Antarctic Treaty Area (or occurring there seasonally through natural migrations); and

Recognizing that other organizations have a competent interest in this matter,

Recommends that the ATCM takes early steps to seek the agreement of CCAMLR, CCAS and, where appropriate, other organizations, to establish cooperative working relationships (with those organizations) to seek a common approach for addressing proposals for designating Specially Protected Species in Antarctic marine environments.

Endorse the views of the CEP contained in its report.

Appendix 2

RESOLUTION 1 (2002)

Review of Conservation Status of Antarctic Species

The Representatives,

Noting that the provisions of Article 8 of the Annex II to the Environmental Protocol require that the Consultative Parties keep under continuing review measures for the conservation of Antarctic fauna and flora,

Recalling Resolution 2 (1999), which had charged SCAR with a review of the list of Specially Protected Species included in Appendix A to the Environmental Protocol,

Taking into account that the CEP has noted the need to assess the status of native species to justify designation as Antarctic Specially Protected Species, on the basis of IUCN criteria used to evaluate designation as (at least) “Vulnerable” in the IUCN Red List scheme,

Aware that SCAR, through its expert bodies has the necessary data and expertise to provide independent scientific advice to the ATCM in this field,

Recommend that:

SCAR be requested to:

- assist the ATCM in reviewing (in close cooperation with IUCN) of the current status of all species which occur in the Antarctic Treaty Area, included as “vulnerable”, “endangered” or “critically endangered” in the IUCN Red List; taking into consideration regional differences in status;
- conduct a similar review for those species which occur in the Antarctic Treaty Area included in the IUCN Red List as “data deficient” or “near threatened”;
- undertake, as a later step, a further assessment of all other indigenous species not included in such categories of the IUCN Red List, and
- report to the CEP on progress on these issues.

Appendix 3

DECISION 1 (2002)

Naming and numbering system for Antarctic Specially Protected Areas

The Representatives,

Noting the entry into force of Annex V to the Environmental Protocol on 24 May 2002;

Noting also the provision of Article 3(3) of Annex V that all SPAs and SSSIs designated as such by past Antarctic Treaty Consultative Meetings are hereby designated as Antarctic Specially Protected Areas (ASPAs) on the entry into force of Annex V, and shall be renamed and renumbered accordingly;

Recognising the naming and numbering system for ASPAs adopted by means of Resolution V (1996) and the need to update this system to include new protected areas adopted by subsequent ATCMs;

Decide:

1. That the naming and numbering system for ASPAs annexed to this Decision be adopted;
2. That all ASPAs adopted by the present, and any subsequent ATCM, be added to the list in consecutive order of adoption and be numbered accordingly.

Annex to the Decision 1(2002): Naming and numbering system for Antarctic Specially Protected Areas

No.	Antarctic Specially Protected Area name	Previous site number	Year adopted in Annex V format
101	Taylor Rookery, Mac. Robertson Land	SPA No. 1	1992
102	Rookery Islands, Holme Bay, Mac. Robertson Land	SPA No. 2	1992
103	Ardery Island and Odbert Island, Budd Coast	SPA No. 3	1992
104	Sabrina Island, Balleny Islands	SPA No. 4	
105	Beaufort Island, Ross Sea	SPA No. 5	1997
	Cape Crozier, Ross Island	SPA No. 6 [redesignated SSSI No. 4]	
106	Cape Hallett, Victoria Land	SPA No. 7	
107	Dion Islands, Marguerite Bay, Antarctic Peninsula	SPA No. 8	
108	Green Island, Berthelot Islands, Antarctic Peninsula	SPA No. 9	
	Byers Peninsula, Livingston Island, South Shetland Islands	SPA No. 10 [redesignated SSSI No. 6]	
	Cape Shirreff, Livingston Island, South Shetland Islands	SPA No. 11 [redesignated SSSI No. 32]	
	Fildes Peninsula, King George Island, South Shetland Islands	SPA No. 12 [redesignated SSSI No. 5]	
109	Moe Island, South Orkney Islands	SPA No. 13	1995
110	Lynch Island, South Orkney Islands	SPA No. 14	2000
111	Southern Powell Island and adjacent islands, South Orkney Islands	SPA No. 15	1995
112	Coppermine Peninsula, Robert Island, South Shetland Islands	SPA No. 16	
113	Litchfield Island, Arthur Harbour, Anvers Island, Palmer Archipelago	SPA No. 17	
114	Northern Coronation Island, South Orkney Islands	SPA No. 18	
115	Lagotellerie Island, Marguerite Bay, Antarctic Peninsula	SPA No. 19	1992 / 2000
116	New College Valley, Caughley Beach, Cape Bird, Ross Island	SPA No. 20	1992/ 2000
117	Avian Island, off Adelaide Island, Antarctic Peninsula	SPA No. 21 [formerly SSSI No. 30]	
118	'Cryptogam Ridge', Mount Melbourne, Victoria Land	SPA No. 22	
119	Forlidas Pond and Davis Valley ponds, Dufek Massif	SPA No. 23	
120	Pointe-Geologie Archipelago, Terre Adélie	SPA No. 24	1995
121	Cape Royds, Ross Island	SSSI No. 1	
122	Arrival Heights, Hut Point Peninsula, Ross Island	SSSI No. 2	
123	Barwick Valley, Victoria Land	SSSI No. 3	
124	Cape Crozier, Ross Island	SSSI No. 4 [formerly SPA No. 6]	
125	Fildes Peninsula, King George Island, South Shetland Islands	SSSI No. 5 [formerly SPA No. 12]	
126	Byers Peninsula, Livingston Island, South Shetland Islands	SSSI No. 6 [formerly SPA No. 10]	

127	Haswell Island	SSSI No. 7	
128	Western shore of Admiralty Bay, King George Island	SSSI No. 8	2000
129	Rothera Point, Adelaide Island	SSSI No. 9	1996
	Caughley Beach, Cape Bird, Ross Island	SSSI No. 10 [incorporated into SPA No. 20]	
130	'Tramway Ridge', Mount Erebus, Ross Island	SSSI No. 11	1995
131	Canada Glacier, Lake Fryxell, Taylor Valley, Victoria Land	SSSI No. 12	1997
132	Potter Peninsula, King George Island, South Shetland Islands	SSSI No. 13	1997
133	Harmony Point, Nelson Island, South Shetland Islands	SSSI No. 14	1997
134	Cierva Point and offshore islands, Danco Coast, Antarctic Peninsula	SSSI No. 15	1997
135	North-eastern Bailey Peninsula, Budd Coast, Wilkes Land	SSSI No. 16	
136	Clark Peninsula, Budd Coast, Wilkes Land	SSSI No. 17	2000
137	North-west White Island, McMurdo Sound	SSSI No. 18	
138	Linnaeus Terrace, Asgaard Range, Victoria Land	SSSI No. 19	1996
139	Biscoe Point, Anvers Island	SSSI No. 20	
140	Parts of Deception Island, South Shetland Islands	SSSI No. 21	
141	'Yukidori Valley', Langhovde, Lützow-Holmbukta	SSSI No. 22	2000
142	Svarthamaren, Mühlig-Hofmannfjella, Dronning Maud Land	SSSI No. 23	1999
118	Summit of Mount Melbourne, Victoria Land	SSSI No. 24	
143	Marine Plain, Mule Peninsula, Vestfold Hills, Princess Elizabeth Land	SSSI No. 25	
144	Chile Bay (Discovery Bay), Greenwich Island, South Shetland Islands	SSSI No. 26	
145	Port Foster, Deception Island, South Shetland Islands	SSSI No. 27	
146	South Bay, Doumer Island, Palmer Archipelago	SSSI No. 28	
147	Ablation Point-Ganymede Heights, Alexander Island	SSSI No. 29	
	Avian Island, off Adelaide Island, Antarctic Peninsula	SSSI No. 30 [redesignated SPA No. 21]	
148	Mount Flora, Hope Bay, Antarctic Peninsula	SSSI No. 31	
149	Cape Shirreff, Livingston Island, South Shetland Islands	SSSI No. 32 [formerly SPA No. 11]	
150	Ardley Island, Maxwell Bay, King George Island	SSSI No. 33	
151	Lions Rump, King George Island, South Shetland Islands	SSSI No. 34	2000
152	Western Bransfield Strait off Low Island, South Shetland Islands	SSSI No. 35	
153	Eastern Dallmann Bay off Brabant Island, Palmer Archipelago	SSSI No. 36	
154	Botany Bay, Cape Geology, Victoria Land	SSSI No. 37 [includes HSM No. 67]	1997
155	Cape Evans, Ross Island	SPA No. 25 [includes HSM Nos. 16 & 17]	1997
156	Lewis Bay, Mount Erebus, Ross Island	SPA No. 26 [designated a Tomb in 1981]	1997
157	Backdoor Bay, Cape Royds, Ross Island	SPA No. 27 [includes HSM No.	1998

		15]	
158	Hut Point, Ross Island	SPA No. 28 [includes HSM No. 18]	1998
159	Cape Adare, Borchgrevink Coast	SPA No. 29 [includes HSM No. 22]	1998

Appendix 4

RESOLUTION 2 (2002)

Revision of Antarctic Specially Protected Area Management Plans

The Representatives,

Welcoming the entry into force of Annex V to the Environmental Protocol on 24 May 2002;

Recalling Resolution 1 (1998) on the allocation of responsibilities for revision of protected area management plans;

Noting that the management plans for many ASPAs have yet to be revised in the format required by Annex V;

Urge:

Those Parties that have yet to revise management plans in the format of Annex V take steps to do so at the earliest opportunity, with a view to their submission at CEP VII.

Appendix 5

MEASURE 1 (2002)

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

The Representatives,

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

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

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

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

That the Management Plans for the following sites:

- Antarctic Specially Protected Area No 106, Cape Hallett, Northern Victoria Land, Ross Sea;
- Antarctic Specially Protected Area No 107, Emperor Island, Dion Islands;
- Antarctic Specially Protected Area No 108, Green Island, Bertholot Islands;
- Antarctic Specially Protected Area No 117, Avian Island, Marguerite Bay;
- Antarctic Specially Protected Area No 121, Cape Royds, Ross Island;
- Antarctic Specially Protected Area No 123, Barwick and Balham Valleys, South Victoria Land;
- Antarctic Specially Protected Area No 124, Cape Crozier, Ross Island;
- Antarctic Specially Protected Area No 126, Byers Peninsula, Livingston Island;
- Antarctic Specially Protected Area No 130, “Tramway Ridge”, Mount Erebus, Ross Island;
- Antarctic Specially Protected Area No 137, Northwest White Island, McMurdo Sound;

- Antarctic Specially Protected Area No 147, Ablation Point - Ganymede Heights;
- Antarctic Specially Protected Area No 148, Mount Flora, Hope Bay;
- Antarctic Specially Protected Area No 157, Backdoor Bay, Cape Royds, Ross Island.

•

and which are annexed to this Measure, be adopted.

That the management plan for Cape Royds, Ross Island (ASPA No 121) be approved by the ATCM subject to agreement by the Commission for the Conservation of Antarctic Marine Living Resources.

Appendix 6

Procedures For Forwarding draft Antarctic Specially Protected Area Management Plans to CCAMLR

With regards to whether a draft management plan should be forwarded to CCAMLR in accordance with Article 6(2) of Annex V,

Noting that the Parties agreed to Decision 4(1998) on Marine Protected Areas that draft management plans which require the approval of CCAMLR are those which include marine areas

in which there is actual or potential capability for harvesting of marine living resources which might be affected by site designation, or

for which there are provisions specified in a draft management plan which might prevent or restrict CCAMLR-related activities,

the CEP agreed to the following:

When a draft management plan for a new Protected Area with any marine component is submitted, the proponent should at the same time submit this to CCAMLR through its Executive Secretary.

The proponent may, in addition, make a judgment and propose whether the marine area component is such that it falls under the definition quoted above, but it is recognized that CCAMLR will make its own judgment on this issue. The CEP chair should also submit the plan to CCAMLR with any additional information on how the CEP process will be conducted.

The same procedure will be followed where there is a revision of the marine area in existing management plans,

and recommends that the ATCM endorse this procedure.

Appendix 7

DRAFT ANNOTATED AGENDA FOR CEP VI

Item 1: Opening of the Meeting

Item 2: Adoption of Agenda

Item 3: Operation of the CEP

Item 4: Compliance with the Protocol on Environmental Protection

4a) General Matters

4b) 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 Assessment)

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: Biological Prospecting

Item 8: Emergency Response and Contingency Planning

Item 9: Data and Exchange of Information

Item 10: Co-operation with other organizations

Item 11: Election of Officers

Item 12: Preparation for CEP VI I

Item 13: Adoption of the Report

Item 14: Closing of the Meeting