

## **Review of the List of Historic Sites and Monuments**

### **Working Paper Submitted by the UK**

#### Introduction

1. At CEP IV the United Kingdom (UK) presented a Working paper (XXIV ATCM / WP 16) proposing a thorough review of the list of Historic Sites and Monuments; the first since the list was established in 1972 (paras 72 – 77 of the Final report of CEP IV refer).
2. On the advice of the CEP, ATCM XXIV adopted Resolution 4 (2001) which identified the need for a ‘review of the complete List of Historic Sites and Monuments’, and recommended that those Consultative Parties identified as ‘proposing Parties’ conduct a review of the HSMs which they solely or jointly proposed at previous ATCMs.
3. The UK offered to liaise with the Parties intersessionally in order to assist with the review.

#### Review by Questionnaire Survey

4. A questionnaire survey (Appendix 1) was distributed to the 17 ‘proposing Parties’ identified in Resolution 4 (2001). The questionnaire requested information on the continued existence and relevance of the site, the need for amendments to the site description (including boundaries if appropriate), the requirement for special protection (as an ASPA) or management (as an ASMA), and confirmation of the Party or Parties responsible for the future management of the site.
5. Eleven of the ‘proposing Parties’ (Australia, Chile, China, Japan, New Zealand, Norway, Poland, Peru, Spain, the UK and the USA) completed and returned the questionnaire, accounting for 55 of the 75 listed HSMs. In addition, IAATO’s contribution was gratefully received. However, no information was provided for HSM No’s 1, 4, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 26, 28, 29, 40, 42, 43, 44, 45, 46, 47, 48, or 60. (The questionnaire was not completed for HSM 75. Chile indicated in its response that a separate report on this site would follow).

#### Summary and Recommendation

6. The responses that have so far been received have demonstrated this to be a worthwhile exercise. Considerable progress has been made in drawing together much of the key information necessary to conduct a thorough review of the List of Historic Sites and Monuments. However, the UK is of the opinion that the objective of the review cannot be met until all 17 Parties have responded to the questionnaire survey, and information has been provided for all 75 listed HSMs. It is likely that Parties will need to amend their national laws to reflect any substantive changes to the list. As such a single comprehensive revision seems the most effective way to proceed.\*
7. If the CEP concurs with this view, the UK urges those remaining 6 Parties (as identified in Resolution 4 (2001)) that have yet to respond to the questionnaire survey to do so, and again offers to liaise intersessionally. The UK will then present a complete and updated list of Historic Sites and Monuments in Antarctica to CEP VI.

---

\* Following the entry into force of Annex V to the Protocol, the list of HSMs is now held under Article 8 of that Annex. Article 8(2) of Annex V sets out the mechanism by which the list may be amended.

## Review of the List of Historic Sites and Monuments

<b>Historic Site and Monument Number:</b>	
<b>Reviewed by:</b>	
Does the site still exist, either in whole or in part ?	
Does the site continue to meet the guidelines for Historic Sites and Monuments set out in Resolution 8 (1995) ?	
Does the description of the site require amending or updating ? If so, please include amended description.	
Are boundaries required to define the site?	
Does the site require special protection or management and, if so, should it be designated as an Antarctic Specially Protected Area or as an Antarctic Specially Managed Area ?	
In light of this review, should the site be delisted ?	
Should other Parties be included in, or assume responsibility for, the management of this Historic Site or Monument ?	