

# **Final Report of the Thirty-eighth Antarctic Treaty Consultative Meeting**



ANTARCTIC TREATY  
CONSULTATIVE MEETING

**Final Report  
of the Thirty-eighth  
Antarctic Treaty  
Consultative Meeting**

Sofia, Bulgaria  
1 - 10 June 2015

Volume I

---

Secretariat of the Antarctic Treaty  
Buenos Aires  
2015

**Published by:**



Secretariat of the Antarctic Treaty  
Secrétariat du Traité sur l'Antarctique  
Секретариат Договора об Антарктике  
Secretaría del Tratado Antártico

Maipú 757, Piso 4  
C1006ACI Ciudad Autónoma  
Buenos Aires - Argentina  
Tel: +54 11 4320 4260  
Fax: +54 11 4320 4253

This book is also available from: [www.ats.aq](http://www.ats.aq) (digital version)  
and for purchase online.

ISSN 2346-9897  
ISBN 978-987-1515-98-1

# Contents

## VOLUME I

Acronyms and Abbreviations	9
<b>PART I. FINAL REPORT</b>	<b>11</b>
<b>1. Final Report</b>	<b>13</b>
<b>2. CEP XVIII Report</b>	<b>111</b>
<b>3. Appendices</b>	<b>195</b>
Outcomes of the Intersessional Contact Group on Information Exchange Requirements	197
Preliminary Agenda for ATCM XXXIX, Working Groups and Allocation of Items	201
Host Country Communique	203
<b>PART II. MEASURES, DECISIONS AND RESOLUTIONS</b>	<b>205</b>
<b>1. Measures</b>	<b>207</b>
Measure 1 (2015): Antarctic Specially Protected Area No. 101 (Taylor Rookery, Mac.Robertson Land): Revised Management Plan	209
Measure 2 (2015): Antarctic Specially Protected Area No. 102 (Rookery Islands, Holme Bay, Mac.Robertson Land): Revised Management Plan	211
Measure 3 (2015): Antarctic Specially Protected Area No. 103 (Ardery Island and Odber Island, Budd Coast, Wilkes Land, East Antarctica): Revised Management Plan	213
Measure 4 (2015): Antarctic Specially Protected Area No. 104 (Sabrina Island, Balleny Islands): Revised Management Plan	215
Measure 5 (2015): Antarctic Specially Protected Area No. 105 (Beaufort Island, McMurdo Sound, Ross Sea): Revised Management Plan	217
Measure 6 (2015): Antarctic Specially Protected Area No. 106 (Cape Hallett, Northern Victoria Land, Ross Sea): Revised Management Plan	219
Measure 7 (2015) Antarctic Specially Protected Area No 119 (Davis Valley and Forlidas Pond, Dufek Massif, Pensacola Mountains): Revised Management Plan	221
Measure 8 (2015): Antarctic Specially Protected Area No. 148 (Mount Flora, Hope Bay, Antarctic Peninsula): Revised Management Plan	223
Measure 9 (2015): Antarctic Specially Protected Area No. 152 (Western Bransfield Strait): Revised Management Plan	225
Measure 10 (2015): Antarctic Specially Protected Area No. 153 (Eastern Dallmann Bay): Revised Management Plan	227

Measure 11 (2015): Antarctic Specially Protected Area No. 155 (Cape Evans, Ross Island): Revised Management Plan	229
Measure 12 (2015): Antarctic Specially Protected Area No. 157 (Backdoor Bay, Cape Royds, Ross Island): Revised Management Plan	231
Measure 13 (2015): Antarctic Specially Protected Area No. 158 (Hut Point, Ross Island): Revised Management Plan	233
Measure 14 (2015): Antarctic Specially Protected Area No. 159 (Cape Adare, Borchgrevink Coast): Revised Management Plan	235
Measure 15 (2015): Antarctic Specially Protected Area No. 163 (Dakshin Gangotri Glacier, Dronning Maud Land): Revised Management Plan	237
Measure 16 (2015): Antarctic Specially Protected Area No. 164 (Scullin and Murray Monoliths, Mac.Robertson Land): Revised Management Plan	239
Measure 17 (2015): Antarctic Specially Protected Area No. 168 (Mount Harding, Grove Mountains, East Antarctica): Revised Management Plan	241
Measure 18 (2015): Antarctic Specially Managed Area No. 2 (McMurdo Dry Valleys, Southern Victoria Land): Revised Management Plan	243
Measure 19 (2015): Revised List of Antarctic Historic Sites and Monuments: Lame Dog Hut at the Bulgarian base St. Kliment Ohridski, Livingston Island and Oversnow heavy tractor “Kharkovchanka” that was used in Antarctica from 1959 to 2010	245
Annex: Revised List of Historic Sites and Monuments	247
<b>2. Decisions</b>	<b>269</b>
Decision 1 (2015): Revised Rules of Procedure for the Antarctic Treaty Consultative Meeting (2015): Committees and Working Groups	271
Annex: Revised Rules of Procedure for the Antarctic Treaty Consultative Meeting (2015)	273
Decision 2 (2015): Measures on operational matters designated as no longer current	285
Annex: Measures on operational matters designated as no longer current	287
Decision 3 (2015): Secretariat Report, Programme and Budget	289
Annex 1: Audited Financial Report for 2013/2014	291
Annex 2: Provisional Financial Report for 2014/15	303
Annex 3: Secretariat Programme for 2015/16	307
Decision 4 (2015): Multi-Year Strategic Work Plan for the Antarctic Treaty Consultative Meeting	321
Annex: ATCM Multi-Year Strategic Work Plan	323
Decision 5 (2015): Liability arising from Environmental Emergencies	327
Decision 6 (2015): Exchange of Information	329
Annex: Information Exchange Requirements	331

<b>3. Resolutions</b>	<b>337</b>
Resolution 1 (2015): Cooperative Air Transport System	339
Resolution 2 (2015): Antarctic Information and Telecommunications Technology Systems	341
Resolution 3 (2015): The Antarctic Environments Portal	343
Resolution 4 (2015): CEP Climate Change Response Work Programme	345
Resolution 5 (2015): Important Bird Areas in Antarctica	347
Resolution 6 (2015): The role of Antarctica in global climate processes	349
Heads of Delegation picture	353

## **VOLUME II**

### **PART II. MEASURES, DECISIONS AND RESOLUTIONS (Cont.)**

#### **4. Management Plans**

- ASPANo. 101 (Taylor Rookery, Mac.Robertson Land): Revised Management Plan
- ASPANo. 102 (Rookery Islands, Holme Bay, Mac.Robertson Land): Revised Management Plan
- ASPANo. 103 (Ardery Island and Odbert Island, Budd Coast, Wilkes Land, East Antarctica): Revised Management Plan
- ASPANo. 104 (Sabrina Island, Balleny Islands): Revised Management Plan
- ASPANo. 105 (Beaufort Island, McMurdo Sound, Ross Sea): Revised Management Plan
- ASPANo. 106 (Cape Hallett, Northern Victoria Land, Ross Sea): Revised Management Plan
- ASPANo. 119 (Davis Valley and Forlidas Pond, Dufek Massif, Pensacola Mountains): Revised Management Plan
- ASPANo. 148 (Mount Flora, Hope Bay, Antarctic Peninsula): Revised Management Plan
- ASPANo. 152 (Western Bransfield Strait): Revised Management Plan
- ASPANo. 153 (Eastern Dallmann Bay): Revised Management Plan
- ASPANo. 155 (Cape Evans, Ross Island): Revised Management Plan
- ASPANo. 157 (Backdoor Bay, Cape Royds, Ross Island): Revised Management Plan
- ASPANo. 158 (Hut Point, Ross Island): Revised Management Plan
- ASPANo. 159 (Cape Adare, Borchgrevink Coast): Revised Management Plan
- ASPANo 163 (Dakshin Gangotri Glacier, Dronning Maud Land): Revised Management Plan
- ASPANo. 164 (Scullin and Murray Monoliths, Mac.Robertson Land): Revised Management Plan

ASPA No. 168 (Mount Harding, Grove Mountains, East Antarctica): Revised Management Plan  
ASMA No. 2 (McMurdo Dry Valleys): Revised Management Plan

## **PART III. OPENING AND CLOSING ADDRESSES AND REPORTS**

### **1. Opening and Closing Addresses**

Welcoming Address by the President of Bulgaria, Mr Rosen Plevneliev

### **2. Reports by Depositaries and Observers**

Report of the USA as Depositary Government of the Antarctic Treaty and its Protocol  
Report of Australia as Depositary Government of CCAMLR  
Report of Australia as Depositary Government of ACAP  
Report of the UK as Depositary Government of CCAS  
Report by the CCAMLR Observer  
Report of SCAR  
Report of COMNAP

### **3. Reports by Experts**

Report of IHO  
Report of ASOC  
Report of IAATO

## **PART IV. ADDITIONAL DOCUMENTS FROM ATCM XXXVII**

### **1. Additional Documents**

Abstract of SCAR Lecture

### **2. List of Documents**

Working Papers  
Information Papers  
Background Papers  
Secretariat Papers

### **3. List of Participants**

Consultative Parties  
Non-Consultative Parties  
Observers, Experts and Guests  
Host Country Secretariat  
Antarctic Treaty Secretariat

## Acronyms and Abbreviations

ACAP	Agreement on the Conservation of Albatrosses and Petrels
ASMA	Antarctic Specially Managed Area
ASOC	Antarctic and Southern Ocean Coalition
ASPA	Antarctic Specially Protected Area
ATS	Antarctic Treaty System or Antarctic Treaty Secretariat
ATCM	Antarctic Treaty Consultative Meeting
ATME	Antarctic Treaty Meeting of Experts
BP	Background Paper
CCAMLR	Convention on the Conservation of Antarctic Marine Living Resources and/or Commission for the Conservation of Antarctic Living Resources
CCAS	Convention for the Conservation of Antarctic Seals
CCRWP	Climate Change Response Work Programme
CEE	Comprehensive Environmental Evaluation
CEP	Committee for Environmental Protection
COMNAP	Council of Managers of National Antarctic Programs
EIA	Environmental Impact Assessment
EIES	Electronic Information Exchange System
HSM	Historic Site and Monument
IAATO	International Association of Antarctica Tour Operators
ICAO	International Civil Aviation Organization
ICG	Intersessional Contact Group
IEE	Initial Environmental Evaluation
IHO	International Hydrographic Organization
IMO	International Maritime Organization
IOC	Intergovernmental Oceanographic Commission
IOPC Funds	International Oil Pollution Compensation Funds
IP	Information Paper
IPCC	Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change
IUCN	International Union for Conservation of Nature
MPA	Marine Protected Area
NCA	National Competent Authority
RCC	Rescue Coordination Centre
SAR	Search and Rescue

SCAR	Scientific Committee on Antarctic Research
SC-CAMLR	Scientific Committee of CCAMLR
SGMP	Subsidiary Group on Management Plans
SOLAS	International Convention for the Safety of Life at Sea
SOOS	Southern Ocean Observing System
SP	Secretariat Paper
UAV	Unmanned Aerial Vehicle
UNEP	United Nations Environment Programme
UNFCCC	United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change
WMO	World Meteorological Organization
WP	Working Paper
WTO	World Tourism Organization

PART I

# **Final Report**



# 1. Final Report



# **Final Report of the Thirty-eighth Antarctic Treaty Consultative Meeting**

**Sofia, June 1 – 10, 2015**

- (1) Pursuant to Article IX of the Antarctic Treaty, Representatives of the Consultative Parties (Argentina, Australia, Belgium, Brazil, Bulgaria, Chile, China, Czech Republic, Ecuador, Finland, France, Germany, India, Italy, Japan, the Republic of Korea, the Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway, Peru, Poland, the Russian Federation, South Africa, Spain, Sweden, Ukraine, the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, the United States of America, and Uruguay) met in Sofia from 1 to 10 June 2015, for the purpose of exchanging information, holding consultations and considering and recommending to their Governments measures in furtherance of the principles and objectives of the Treaty.
- (2) The Meeting was also attended by delegations from the following Contracting Parties to the Antarctic Treaty which are not Consultative Parties: Belarus, Canada, Colombia, Kazakhstan, Malaysia, Monaco, Mongolia, Portugal, Romania, Switzerland, Turkey, and Venezuela.
- (3) In accordance with Rules 2 and 31 of the Rules of Procedure, Observers from: the Commission for the Conservation of Antarctic Marine Living Resources (CCAMLR), the Scientific Committee on Antarctic Research (SCAR) and the Council of Managers of National Antarctic Programs (COMNAP) attended the meeting.
- (4) In accordance with Rule 39 of the Rules of Procedure, Experts from the following international organisations and non-governmental organisations attended the Meeting: the Antarctic and Southern Ocean Coalition (ASOC), the International Association of Antarctica Tour Operators (IAATO) and the United Nations Environment Programme (UNEP).

- (5) The Host Country Bulgaria fulfilled its information requirements towards the Contracting Parties, Observers and Experts through the Secretariat Circulars, letters and a dedicated website

### **Item 1: Opening of the Meeting**

- (6) The Meeting was officially opened on 1 June 2015. On behalf of the Host Government, in accordance with Rules 5 and 6 of the Rules of Procedure, the Head of the Host Government Secretariat, Mr Vesselin Valchev, called the Meeting to order and proposed the candidacy of Ambassador Rayko Raytchev as Chair of ATCM XXXVIII. The proposal was accepted.
- (7) The Chair warmly welcomed all Parties, Observers and Experts to Bulgaria. He noted the importance of the Antarctic Treaty to preserving the beauty and uniqueness of Antarctica for present and future generations and that Bulgaria had ratified the Treaty 37 years ago and had become a Consultative Party 17 years ago. He further highlighted the adoption of a strategic work plan as a key achievement in strengthening the protection of the environment and for the effective management and regulation of human activities in Antarctica. In conclusion, Ambassador Raytchev noted the establishment of the Bulgarian Antarctic station, St Kliment Ohridski, in 1993, and its development as a centre for scientific research in close collaboration with Bulgaria's partners from Brazil, Argentina, Chile and Spain.
- (8) Delegates observed a minute of silence in honour of the passing of Mr Frédéric Chemay, at age 53, and for all those who had perished in the Antarctic over the past year. Mr Chemay had served as the Belgium commissioner at the International Whaling Commission, and had taken part in the delegation of Belgium to CEP XVI and ATCM XXXVI, as well as CEP XVII in Brazil.
- (9) His Excellency Rosen Plevneliev, President of the Republic of Bulgaria, welcomed the delegates to Bulgaria, and expressed the commitment of Bulgaria to an increase in scientific activity in Antarctica and to strengthening of the Antarctic Treaty and its fundamental values with a focus on science and scientific endeavour. Recalling the recent 37th anniversary of Bulgaria's signature to the Treaty, President Plevneliev pointed out that the Antarctic Treaty System was one of the best examples for international cooperation in which countries with different legal systems and national, religious and cultural traditions worked alongside each other to achieve the common goal of the dedication of Antarctica to peaceful uses, scientific research and exchange

of information. In emphasising the necessity for international cooperation to address climate change, deficiency of resources, and implementation of environmentally friendly technologies, President Plevneliev stressed the strategic importance of Antarctica and the role of the ATCM and the CEP in this regard. He outlined Bulgarian scientific research in Antarctica, noting Bulgaria had organised 23 Antarctic expeditions and maintained the St Kliment Ohridski station, which hosted the scientific projects of both the Bulgarian Antarctic Institute and those of other Parties. He further noted that Bulgaria had now named 525 Antarctic geographical features. He described the achievements of the recent 23rd Bulgarian Antarctic expedition during which the alpinists Mr Doichin Boyanov, Mr Nikolay Petkov and Mr Alexander Shopov successfully climbed and measured the height of Needle and Sofia peaks, both located on Livingston Island. He also recognised the importance of the contribution from the distinguished Professor Christo Pimpirev, founder and chairman of the Bulgarian Antarctic Institute and head of the Bulgarian Antarctic expedition. The full text of President Plevneliev's remarks can be found in Part III, section 1.

- (10) The Hon. Daniel Mitov, Minister of Foreign Affairs of Bulgaria, welcomed delegates. After outlining the importance of the Antarctic Treaty to the cooperative governance of the Antarctic continent, he stressed the success and uniqueness of the Antarctic area as a zone of peaceful cooperation and scientific collaboration. He emphasised Bulgaria's commitment to strengthening the Antarctic Treaty System, and using science to shape policy. He was convinced the forthcoming meeting was an opportunity to address the issues of governance, environmental protection, climate change, biodiversity, tourism management, and research activities. It was also an opportunity to renew the core principles of the Antarctic Treaty System and ensure the area was preserved for future generations. He noted the growth of the St Kliment Ohridski station on Livingston Island, from two small huts to an entire establishment including a chapel and laboratory, and acknowledged the logistical support of Spain, Brazil, Argentina and Chile. Minister Mitov stressed climate change as the ultimate challenge of our generation and pointed to understanding Antarctica's role in this as one of the most urgent priorities for our societies. He identified Bulgaria's involvement in efforts to strengthen the climate change component of polar research as an effective tool for making and promoting evidence-based policy, and highlighted the Antarctic Treaty as setting a unique example of how small and big countries could together resolve the global challenges they faced.

- (11) The Hon. Ivelina Vassileva, Minister of Environment and Water of Bulgaria, highlighted the Antarctic Treaty System as a unique legal framework for protecting the Antarctic continent, and conserving its largely untouched environment and ecosystems against a background of peace and international cooperation. She noted Bulgaria's pride in being one of the 29 Consultative Parties, its Antarctic presence on Livingston Island and the achievements of the scientists from the Bulgarian Antarctic Institute during the 23 successive Antarctic campaigns in the period 1993 to 2015. Minister Vassileva emphasised the wide range of topics covered by Bulgarian polar scientists, and emphasised an interdisciplinary approach towards understanding polar systems and their evolution. She stressed the serious challenges of climate change, biodiversity loss and global environmental problems to the Antarctic region, and the importance of minimising the cumulative footprint of all human activities in Antarctica – scientific research, tourism and fishing. She reminded Parties of the importance of 2015 in the global climate negotiation process, noting Bulgaria's expectation of a new legally binding agreement for all parties to the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change (UNFCCC) that would focus on mitigation obligations for all developed and developing countries after 2020. Finally, Minister Vassileva introduced Bulgaria's beautiful nature and preserved biodiversity, noting that nearly 35% of the territory was part of the European Union network NATURA 2000.
- (12) The Hon. Nikolina Angelkova, Minister of Tourism, noted the rapid development of tourism in the Antarctic, reporting that 37,000 tourists had visited Antarctica in the 2014/15 season. While noting that increased numbers and activities of Antarctic tourists posed pressing issues for the authorisation of activities, safety, and conservation of the landscape, flora and fauna, she also suggested that tourism could make the region more accessible. Minister Angelkova stressed that Bulgaria was a driving force in the development of Antarctic activities, and hoped they could manage to meet the expectations of an evolving world in this respect.
- (13) The Hon. Michel Rocard, former Prime Minister of France and Ambassador for the Poles, addressed the Meeting on the matter of the Conference of Parties (COP) 21 to be held in Paris in December 2015. The COP 21 Objective was to reach a global and binding agreement to limit the rise of global temperature. He highlighted the effects of climate change increasingly observed in Antarctica. In praising the consensus-based nature of the ATCM, Ambassador Rocard encouraged the same level of agreement for Parties

that were also planning to attend COP 21. He welcomed any messages of support from ATCM Parties to COP 21.

## **Item 2: Election of Officers and Creation of Working Groups**

- (14) Mr Francisco Berguño of Chile, Host Country of ATCM XXXIX, was elected vice-Chair. In accordance with Rule 7 of the Rules of Procedure, Dr Manfred Reinke, Executive Secretary of the Antarctic Treaty Secretariat, acted as Secretary to the Meeting. Mr Vesselin Valchev, head of the Host Country Secretariat, acted as Deputy Secretary. Mr Ewan McIvor of Australia acted as Chair of the Committee for Environmental Protection.
- (15) Three Working Groups were established:
- Working Group on Legal and Institutional Affairs;
  - Working Group on Tourism and Non-governmental Activities;
  - Working Group on Operational Matters.
- (16) The following Chairs of the Working Groups were elected:
- Legal and Institutional Affairs: Dr René Lefeber from the Netherlands;
  - Tourism and Non-governmental Activities: Mr Máximo Gowland from Argentina;
  - Operational Matters: Ms Jane Francis from the United Kingdom.
- (17) Consistent with the approach at ATCM XXXVII, a Special Working Group was established on Competent Authorities Issues. Ms Birgit Njåstad from Norway was elected to Chair the Special Working Group.

## **Item 3: Adoption of the Agenda and Allocation of Items**

- (18) The following Agenda was adopted:
1. Opening of the Meeting
  2. Election of Officers and Creation of Working Groups
  3. Adoption of the Agenda and Allocation of Items
  4. Operation of the Antarctic Treaty System: Reports by Parties, Observers and Experts
  5. Operation of the Antarctic Treaty System: General Matters

6. Operation of the Antarctic Treaty System: Review of the Secretariat's Situation
  7. Development of a Multi-year Strategic Work Plan
  8. Report of the Committee for Environmental Protection
  9. Liability: Implementation of Decision 4 (2010)
  10. Safety and Operations in Antarctica, including Search and Rescue
  11. Tourism and Non-Governmental Activities in the Antarctic Treaty Area
  12. Inspections under the Antarctic Treaty and the Environment Protocol
  13. Science Issues, Scientific Cooperation and Facilitation
  14. Implications of Climate Change for Management of the Antarctic Treaty Area
  15. Education Issues
  16. Exchange of Information
  17. Biological Prospecting in Antarctica
  18. Preparation of the 39<sup>th</sup> Meeting
  19. Any Other Business
  20. Adoption of the Final Report
  21. Close of the Meeting
- (19) The Meeting adopted the following allocation of agenda items:
- Plenary: Items 1, 2, 3, 4, 8, 18, 19, 20, 21.
  - Legal and Institutional Working Group: Items 5, 6, 7, 9, 17.
  - Tourism Working Group: Item 11.
  - Operational Matters Working Group: Items 10, 12, 13, 14, 15, 16.
- (20) The Meeting also decided to allocate draft instruments arising out of the work of the Committee for Environmental Protection and the Working Groups to a legal drafting group for consideration of their legal and institutional aspects.

**Item 4: Operation of the Antarctic Treaty System:  
Reports by Parties, Observers and Experts**

- (21) Pursuant to Recommendation XIII-2, the Meeting received reports from depositary governments and secretariats.

- (22) The United States, in its capacity as Depositary Government of the Antarctic Treaty and its Environment Protocol, reported on the status of the Antarctic Treaty and the Protocol on Environmental Protection to the Antarctic Treaty (IP 38). In the past year, there had been two accessions to the Treaty and two to the Protocol. For the Treaty, Kazakhstan had deposited its instrument of accession on 27 January 2015 and Mongolia had deposited its instrument of accession on 23 March 2015. For the Environment Protocol, Venezuela had deposited its instrument of accession on 1 August 2014, and Portugal had deposited its instrument of accession on 10 September 2014. The United States noted that there were currently 52 Parties to the Treaty and 37 Parties to the Protocol.
- (23) The Parties congratulated Mongolia and Kazakhstan on acceding to the Treaty, and Venezuela and Portugal on acceding to the Environment Protocol. Portugal and Venezuela expressed their satisfaction at having ratified the Protocol. Portugal acknowledged the work of Australia, France and Spain over the last three years on strengthening support for the Protocol, and Venezuela thanked other Latin American countries that supported its involvement in Antarctic matters. Venezuela informed the Meeting of its wish to request a change in status to Consultative Party, and sought all suggestions, observations and support from Parties in achieving this change of status.
- (24) Argentina reported that it had ratified Measure 4 (2004). In acknowledging Argentina's implementation of Measure 4 (2004), the United Kingdom noted that a number of Measures were not yet in force, and stressed the importance of ensuring expeditious implementation of Measures.
- (25) Australia, in its capacity as Depositary for the Convention on the Conservation of Antarctic Marine Living Resources (CCAMLR), reported that there had been no new accessions to the Convention since ATCM XXXVII. It noted that there were currently 36 Parties to the Convention (IP 22).
- (26) France pointed out to Parties who were also members of CCAMLR that two projects of Marine Protected Areas (MPAs) had been proposed since 2012, and noted that most of the Parties were in favour of reinforcing the conservation of marine living resources of the Southern Ocean.
- (27) Australia, in its capacity as Depositary for the Agreement on the Conservation of Albatrosses and Petrels (ACAP), reported that there had been no new accessions to the Agreement since ATCM XXXVII, and that there were 13 Parties to the Agreement (IP 21). It reported on the Fifth Meeting of

Parties in Tenerife, Spain from 4 to 5 May 2015, and noted that a number of countries were proceeding towards accession to ACAP. Australia noted that the Agreement shared the conservation objectives of the Antarctic Treaty System and encouraged all Parties who are not members of ACAP to consider joining the Agreement.

- (28) The United Kingdom, in its capacity as Depositary of the Convention for the Conservation of Antarctic Seals (CCAS), reported that it had not received any requests to accede to the Convention, or any instruments of accession, since ATCM XXXVII (IP 5). The United Kingdom encouraged all Contracting Parties to CCAS to submit their returns on time.
- (29) CCAMLR presented a summary of outcomes of the Thirty-third Annual Meeting of the Commission for the Conservation of Antarctic Marine Living Resources which was held in Hobart, Australia, 20 to 31 October 2014 (IP 1). It noted that it had been chaired by Mr Leszek Dybiec (Poland) and that 24 Members, two additional Contracting Parties and nine Observers from non-government or industry organisations had participated. It highlighted key outcomes of interest to the ATCM, which included an arrangement for the release of CCAMLR vessel monitoring system (VMS) data to support search and rescue (SAR) efforts in the CAMLR Convention Area. It advised that the release of VMS data, in the event of a SAR event, had been finalised with all five Marine Rescue Coordination Centres (MRCCs) responsible for SAR in the Southern Ocean. This was a positive outcome from the SAR Special Working Group that was convened at ATCM XXXVI in Brussels two years before. The Commission had adopted a Strategic Plan for the Secretariat for the period 2015–2018. Noting that the outcomes of the CCAMLR Scientific Committee from 2014 would be presented to CEP XVIII, it reported on the harvest of marine living resources under CCAMLR-regulated fisheries in the 2013/14 season and on work associated with MPAs, climate change, and capacity building initiatives for early career scientists. It noted that, as planned, during CCAMLR XXXIII, a CCAMLR Symposium to mark the 35<sup>th</sup> anniversary of the adoption of the Convention was held in Chile from 6 to 8 May 2015, and that the outcomes were currently under consideration by CCAMLR Members. It finally mentioned that the Commission had elected the Russian Federation to Chair the Commission meetings in 2015 and 2016.
- (30) Argentina thanked CCAMLR for its report and acknowledged the efficiency with which it had reached an agreement between its Executive Secretary and the five Parties with SAR responsibilities in the Antarctic waters.

It emphasised the overall importance of the initiative and underlined its contribution for enhancing SAR operational efficiency.

- (31) Chile noted that the CCAMLR Symposium aimed at building upon the outcomes of the first Symposium that took place in Valdivia in 2005. Representatives of 16 countries had participated in this second Symposium, together with other organisations. During the meeting, participants had evaluated the objectives and achievements of CCAMLR during previous years, and identified key issues that deserved future attention. Chile underlined the success of the Symposium and noted that a report had been prepared and would be distributed during the next CCAMLR meeting in October.
- (32) SCAR presented its Annual Report (IP 19). It also referred to BP 4, which highlighted a selection of key science papers published since ATCM XXXVII. SCAR referred to the work of several of its Action Groups of potential interest for the CEP and the ATCM. These included a synthesis of the scientific understanding of Southern Ocean acidification (BP 1), the Biogeographic Atlas of the Southern Ocean, the SCAR Science Horizon Scan, and Antarctic Conservation in the 21st Century. It also noted the formation of new groups focused on identifying undisturbed snow areas, nearshore terrestrial observing systems, geological mapping update, volcanism, and geoheritage and geoconservation.
- (33) Argentina expressed surprise and concern regarding the use of incorrect toponomy in the Biogeographical Atlas of the Southern Ocean with respect to Argentine National territories which are currently the object of a bilateral sovereignty dispute. It stated that it had sent a note to SCAR requesting its urgent rectification. Furthermore, Argentina called for scientific bodies and publications to maintain their neutrality and focus strictly on science, thus avoiding delicate political issues.
- (34) In response to Argentina, the United Kingdom referred to its statement under Agenda Item 19 at paragraph 396.
- (35) COMNAP presented its Annual Report (IP 8). COMNAP highlighted that the 29-member organisation also recently welcomed the National Antarctic Programmes of Portugal and Venezuela as observers, joining the National Antarctic Programme of Belarus, who had begun the process to apply for COMNAP membership. In the past year, COMNAP convened the 13th Symposium, the Waste Water Management (IP 74) and the Sea Ice Challenges (IP 56) workshops. The COMNAP Antarctic Roadmap Challenges (ARC)

project was also underway, with aims to identify technology and other science support requirements that were likely to be requested by the science community in the near- to mid-term in order to address critical science questions. Finally COMNAP noted that the telemedicine workshop and ARC workshop would be held in August 2015 in Norway.

- (36) In relation to Article III-2 of the Antarctic Treaty, the Meeting received reports from other international organisations.
- (37) Monaco, in its capacity as host country of the International Hydrographic Organization (IHO), presented its report (IP 122) *Report by the International Hydrographic Organization*, which described the state of hydrographic surveying and nautical charting of Antarctica. It reiterated that over 90 per cent of Antarctic waters remained unsurveyed, which posed serious risks for maritime incidents and impeded the conduct of maritime activities. The production of Electronic Nautical Charts for Antarctica was severely hampered by the lack of data, as well as the poor state of the corresponding paper charts. Although identifying the IHO Hydrographic Commission's dedication to working closely with stakeholder organisations such as COMNAP, IAATO, SCAR, the International Maritime Organization (IMO) and the Intergovernmental Oceanographic Commission (IOC), it noted the lack of cooperative programmes in using ships of opportunity or other resources to improve hydrographic data, with the exception of IAATO. While recalling the adoption of Resolution 5 (2014) on strengthening cooperation in hydrographic surveying and charting in Antarctic waters, Monaco noted the unfortunate postponement of the annual meeting of the IHO Hydrographic Commission on the Antarctic. Monaco stressed the importance of political support and highlighted the need for overall improvements. It encouraged Parties to participate in the next meeting of the IHO Hydrographic Commission on the Antarctic and to contribute effectively to its activities in accordance with Resolution 5 (2014).
- (38) The United Kingdom thanked Monaco and acknowledged the fundamental work undertaken by the IHO in nautical charting of Antarctic waters. It also highlighted recent United Kingdom charting work in Antarctic waters, as set out in IP 33 *The role of the United Kingdom in charting the waters of the Antarctic*.
- (39) Colombia noted that it had undertaken its first Antarctic expedition during the summer of 2014/15 and that it had conducted a hydrographic survey of the Gerlache Strait.

- (40) ASOC presented IP 137 *Report of the Antarctic and Southern Ocean Coalition*. ASOC urged Parties to take a decisive role in matters relating to area protection, tourism, climate change, cumulative impacts and vessel management. In respect to the creation of new protected areas, ASOC asked Parties to take note of the potential benefits for tourism management, biodiversity protection and wilderness preservation. ASOC believed that leadership of the ATCM was essential so that policymakers in other forums could understand the impact of climate change in Antarctica. ASOC asked Parties to make meaningful contributions to the implementation of the IMO Polar Code, including reporting maritime incidents to prevent accidents from occurring in the future.
- (41) IAATO presented IP 84 *Report of the International Association of Antarctica Tour Operators 2014-15*. IAATO noted that the 2014/15 season saw a total of 36,702 tourists visit the Antarctic, a slight decrease on the previous year's figures. IAATO indicated that, as an organisation, it continued to place emphasis on developing and improving tourism best practice. Examples of this were: investing in field staff training and development; supporting education and planning, including translating ATCM and IAATO guidelines into languages suitable for emerging markets; and strengthening safety, including improving the sharing of hydrographic data, search and rescue exercises, and preparing IAATO member operators for the implementation of the IMO Polar Code. Furthermore, IAATO was committed to continuing its policy of disclosing incidents as a method to both safeguard future safety and also ensure wise management decisions. IAATO concluded that it perceived cooperation and collaboration as key elements of its work, noting that IAATO members continued their tradition of providing both in-kind and financial support to the research community. It thanked ASOC, CCAMLR, COMNAP, IHO and SCAR for useful collaboration during the past year.
- (42) Belarus presented IP 7 *Activity of the Republic of Belarus in Antarctica in 2007–2014 and Today*. This paper reported on the seven Belarusian Antarctic Expeditions organised by the Belarusian State Programme from 2007 to 2015. It also described plans to open a scientific station at the geographic complex of Mount Vechernyaya, Enderby Land.

## **Item 5: Operation of the Antarctic Treaty System: General Matters**

- (43) The United Kingdom introduced WP 7 *Referencing ATCM Measures, Decisions and Resolutions*. The paper noted that, when issues were

proposed for discussion at ATCMs, it was often helpful to make reference to any previous Recommendations, Measures, Decisions and Resolutions relating to similar subjects. Observing that it could be time-consuming to find the relevant section of the appropriate ATCM Final Report where the discussion of the adoption of the instrument was recorded, the United Kingdom proposed several possible cross-referencing mechanisms for linking the paragraph number of the ATCM Final Report to the relevant Recommendation, Measure, Decision or Resolution.

- (44) Responding to several Parties' concerns that a cross-reference mechanism could not cover the complete negotiation history and should not be perceived in that way, the United Kingdom clarified that the sole purpose of this proposal was to identify the single reference in the report where the Recommendation, Measure, Decision or Resolution had been adopted.
- (45) The Meeting agreed that adding a new column to the ATS database listing "Relevant Final Report Paragraph" would be the most appropriate way to achieve this proposal. The Secretariat confirmed that it had the resources to action this proposal.
- (46) Chile introduced WP 43 *Report of the Intersessional Contact Group to promote broader Antarctic cooperation*. Chile reminded the Meeting that the intersessional contact group (ICG) had been established at ATCM XXXVII to facilitate discussions among Parties on ways to promote broader Antarctic cooperation. Chile noted that the ICG had focused on two main issues: ways to enhance effective cooperation among countries in order to work towards an effective participation of all Parties in the ATCM; and the working methods of the ATCM, including, *inter alia*, the proliferation of Working Groups during meetings and the problems that may arise for small delegations; the election of Working Group Chairs and the duration of their mandate; and the increasing number of ICGs. Chile noted that the paper focused on the latter point - the working methods of the ATCM - and that the eight issues and proposals identified by the ICG had been met with varying degrees of support from ICG participants.
- (47) It was observed that this was an important issue at the heart of governance in the ATCM, and that the key issue was ensuring that the structure of the ATCM became more flexible and avoided artificially limiting discussion through bureaucratic processes.
- (48) The Meeting thanked Chile for its excellent work in conducting this ICG and considered each of the eight points separately.

*1. Introducing greater flexibility into the organisation of the ATCM by modifying the current Working Groups structure and allocating much of each meeting's agenda to the plenary*

- (49) Chile noted that ICG participants had expressed support for reviewing the current agenda of the ATCM to determine if it addressed correctly the contemporary priorities and challenges, specifically through reviewing the number and mandate of Working Groups, and periodically reviewing their function.
- (50) Although many Parties agreed with the need to ensure Working Groups were flexible and responsive to changing priorities, some Parties stressed the need to evolve the system gradually and cited the special Working Groups formed to deal with Search and Rescue, and Competent Authorities as examples of flexibility within the existing system.
- (51) Some Parties emphasised the value in better utilising the Plenary for specific topics, particularly those aligned with the Multi-year Strategic Work Plan. They also noted that decisions regarding the format of an upcoming ATCM were best addressed before the end of the previous ATCM. Other Parties were cautious about moving items to the Plenary, and stressed the importance of retaining the Working Groups and the continuity of Chairs, particularly in Working Groups requiring specific expertise.
- (52) The Meeting agreed that amendments of the ATCM Rules of Procedure were not necessary to implement these various suggestions, except when deemed necessary at a particular Meeting. It further agreed that future ATCMs could continue to establish Working Groups as required, dealing with specific agenda items, on a year-by-year basis.

*2. The establishment of a Standing Working Group to handle administrative/institutional matters such as the Secretariat budget/work plan*

- (53) Noting that CCAMLRL had established a Standing Committee on Administration and Finance (SCAF) and that similar standing groups were common in other international bodies, several Parties saw the merit in establishing an ATCM Standing Working Group to handle administrative and institutional matters.
- (54) The Chair invited the Parties to reflect on the operation of the proposed Standing Working Group in the context of the ATCM. Parties discussed whether such a proposal would mean that the ATCM Agenda Item 6 on the

*Operation of the Antarctic Treaty System: Matters related to the Secretariat* would be allocated to such a Standing Working Group. Furthermore, they discussed the opportunity for such a Standing Working Group to report back to the plenary.

- (55) Some Parties advised the Meeting that although they were not opposed to a Standing Working Group, a proliferation of parallel Working Groups would be challenging. It was noted that having a budget committee that met separately but functioned within the Legal and Institutional Working Group had proved to be efficient to date.
- (56) The Meeting agreed not to propose the establishment of a Standing Working Group.

### *3 & 4. The serving period of Working Group Chairs and the timing of Working Group Chair appointments*

- (57) The Chair recalled that Rule 11 of the Rules of Procedure limited the Chair's term to no more than four consecutive meetings, unless otherwise decided.
- (58) Several Parties encouraged greater gender and geographical diversity among Working Group Chairs, and some remarked that limiting the serving period of Working Group Chairs beyond Rule 11 could help encourage this. For the first time, female Chairs were serving at an ATCM. The importance of continuity and experience in effective chairing was also noted.
- (59) Following further discussion on the basis of the proposals on the serving period of Working Group Chairs and the timing of Working Group Chair appointments developed by the ICG, the Meeting adopted Decision 1 (2015) *Revised Rules of Procedure for the Antarctic Treaty Consultative Meeting (2015): Committees and Working Groups*.

### *5. Greater transparency in the appointment of the ATCM rapporteurs and the role of the relevant Chairs in overseeing the report writing process*

- (60) In response to queries from several Parties, the Executive Secretary clarified that, as reflected in the ATCM Organisational Manual, the Host Country was responsible for contracting rapporteurs. Since ATCM XXXIII in Uruguay, host country governments had begun a pattern of contracting rapporteurs who had served at previous meetings to ensure efficient and effective production of the reports. He further noted that, since ATCM XXXV in

Australia, new rapporteurs had been trained prior to the ATCM using a curriculum developed by the Secretariat and Australia. He further explained that the rapporteur teams of recent years had consisted of equal numbers of experienced rapporteurs and young rapporteurs who were nationals of the Host Country and who benefited from this experience. The Executive Secretary remarked that the Secretariat was open to discussing potential improvements to the current system of recruiting rapporteurs.

- (61) Taking into consideration the current system of recruitment, Parties discussed ways in which to expand the pool of rapporteurs and other meeting officials and ensure a transparent recruitment system. The importance of ensuring that there was an ongoing introduction of new rapporteurs to the rapporteur team, hence ensuring a continuity of knowledge in the team, was emphasised. It was observed that this transparency should apply to other meeting officials as well.
- (62) While acknowledging that recruitment and remuneration of rapporteurs was ultimately the responsibility of the Host Country, the Meeting considered it important that there should be an avenue through which Parties could recommend rapporteur and other meeting official candidates for future ATCMs. The Meeting requested that the Secretariat communicate with the Parties in advance of future ATCMs, to seek their recommendations for potential candidates.
- (63) The Meeting also agreed that overseeing the report writing process was the responsibility of the individual Working Group Chairs to conduct as they saw fit.

#### *6. On the establishment of Intersessional Contact Groups/e-working groups*

- (64) Several Parties expressed the view that ICGs were a simple, cost-effective and useful tool, and that they facilitated intersessional work. It was also highlighted that ICGs made it possible for all Parties to participate in discussions relevant to them.
- (65) Some Parties mentioned that cultivating a broader culture of participation among Parties in ICGs was needed. It was, however, noted that the level of participation did not necessarily determine the usefulness of the outcome, as was demonstrated by the useful outcome of this ICG. It was also noted that it was easier to reach consensus within the ICGs that had a practical mandate rather than those with a policy mandate. It was suggested that the

ICG convenor facilitate broader participation in ICGs by inviting other Parties to serve as co-convenors.

- (66) Other suggestions to improve the functioning of ICGs were for the Meeting to develop clear terms of reference on the basis of the existing template for ICGs, and for the ICG convenor to organise a ‘kick-off’ meeting at the conclusion of ATCMs, to convene the ICG early in the intersessional period, to establish a list of points of contacts of Parties interested in participating in the ICG and to develop a work plan for the duration of the intersessional period.
- (67) Following a suggestion that the Secretariat should provide a quarterly update on on-going ICG work, the Executive Secretary agreed to report on a quarterly basis to the Heads of Delegation on any ICGs currently in progress.

### *7. Voluntary contributions by non-Consultative Parties*

- (68) Uruguay referred to Article 4 in Measure 1 (2003), which established that the ATCM budget was funded exclusively by the contributions of Consultative Parties. It was noted that this Measure also stated that any Contracting Party might make a voluntary contribution at any time. Uruguay noted that non-Consultative Parties may be unaware of the possibility to make contributions, and it suggested informing those Parties, either officially or by adopting report language, of this possibility.
- (69) The Meeting welcomed the idea of contributions from non-Consultative Parties. The Meeting also emphasised that the acceptance of voluntary contributions involved policy issues, and Parties should reflect on the purpose that these contributions would serve. The Meeting strongly emphasised that any action taken in this regard should not serve as a disincentive for non-Consultative Parties to participate in ATCMs, nor should it discourage the accession of new Parties.
- (70) The Meeting referred to Regulations 7.4 and 7.5 of the Financial Regulations for the Secretariat of the Antarctic Treaty. Several Parties noted that a separate fund could be created under Regulation 7.4 and 7.5. They pointed out that the scale of expected contributions should be clear and the voluntary nature of such contributions should be emphasised.
- (71) The Parties expressed different positions on the name, limits and purpose of the separate fund. Referring to Regulation 6.2 (d) of the Financial Regulations, some Parties underlined that the limits and purpose of the

separate fund would need to be clearly defined by the ATCM. However, other Parties noted that the limits and purpose of the fund should not constrain non-Consultative Parties wishing to contribute.

- (72) A few Parties suggested that non-Consultative Parties could pay a mandatory admission fee to the Host Country of an ATCM. This could partly cover the costs of their participation in the ATCM. Some non-Consultative Parties expressed their support for this idea, noting that it was practiced at other international meetings and made administrative sense on a national level. Other Parties cautioned against this proposal. They raised questions about the need for an amendment of the Financial Regulations, the administration of such fees by the Host Country, and the challenges of identifying the number of delegates far ahead in time.
- (73) Several Parties expressed concern over the function of mandatory contributions by non-Consultative Parties and how such contributions could affect the path to Consultative status and the openness of the Meeting to Contracting Parties.
- (74) The Meeting noted that the issue of voluntary contributions by non-Consultative Parties was a complex issue requiring more reflection and discussion. It invited non-Consultative Parties to continue considering any domestic measures that might be required to advance this issue, and to inform the Meeting on their reflections. The Meeting expressed the intent to continue these discussions at ATCM XXXIX and invited perspectives from non-Consultative Parties.

#### *8. Timing of ATCM and CEP Meetings*

- (75) The Meeting emphasised the benefits of receiving expert advice from the CEP. It further emphasised the importance of finding flexible ways for receiving CEP advice prior to discussions on relevant topics within the ATCM.
- (76) Several Parties suggested that, given the CEP was an advisory body to the ATCM, it would be more logical for the body to meet before the ATCM in order to avoid parallel sessions occurring simultaneously on a common topic. Other Parties noted the importance of the ATCM running alongside the CEP, given the connections between personnel and subject matter in both meetings. The Executive Secretary pointed out that staggering or extending the Meeting could have financial implications both for the Host Country and/or the Secretariat.

- (77) The Meeting also discussed the possibility of holding biennial ATCMs. Some Parties opposed this idea, stressing the need to maintain regular contact between Parties.
- (78) Following discussion, the Meeting decided to keep the present meeting format of eight days for the ATCM in 2016 in Chile. This period would also include a day for the symposium to recognise the 25th anniversary of the Environment Protocol. For the meeting in 2017 in China, the meeting period would be extended by one day to nine days overall, with the CEP starting its work on Monday of the first week and ATCM starting on Tuesday of the first week.
- (79) Norway introduced WP 44 *A symposium celebrating the 25<sup>th</sup> anniversary of the Environmental Protocol to the Antarctic Treaty* on behalf of the United Kingdom, Australia, Chile, France and New Zealand. The paper highlighted the effectiveness of the CEP as an advisory body to the ATCM. It also reminded the Meeting that the 25th anniversary of the Environment Protocol to the Antarctic Treaty was included in the CEP Five-year Work Plan. It proposed a symposium to celebrate and discuss achievements in relation to the Protocol's role as the framework tool for environmental protection in Antarctica as well as the focus on ensuring that the Protocol is future-proof. The paper recommended that this should be held in conjunction with CEP XIX in 2016.
- (80) The Meeting expressed support for holding a symposium in the course of the next meeting in Santiago, Chile, in celebration of the 25<sup>th</sup> Anniversary of the Protocol on Environmental Protection to the Antarctic Treaty. Several Parties observed that the Protocol set a good precedent for other international forums.
- (81) Parties considered that it was important for the symposium to be forward-looking and to provide a focus for the future of the Protocol, while providing some reflection on the implementation of the Protocol and on its successes to date.
- (82) The Meeting agreed to establish an ICG to function as the Steering Committee for the Symposium in celebration of the 25th Anniversary of the Environment Protocol to the Antarctic Treaty, with the following Terms of Reference:
1. to develop a programme for the Symposium that both provides a reflection of the development, implementation and application of the Protocol as well as takes stock of environmental protection in Antarctica more generally;
  2. to invite presenters on the basis of equitable geographical and functional representation;

3. to consider the participation of the wider public in the Symposium besides Parties, Observers and Experts;
  4. to consider the wider outreach that might be achieved through use of social media;
  5. to take account of the publication on the 25<sup>th</sup> Anniversary that is being prepared within the CEP and to link into the CEP ICG established for this purpose; and
  6. to offer appropriate advice to the Host Country of ATCM XXXIX on the organisation of the Symposium.
- (83) It was further agreed that:
- Observers and Experts participating in the ATCM as well as the current and former Chairs of the CEP would be invited to provide input for the ICG;
  - The Executive Secretary would open the ATCM Forum for the ICG and provide assistance to the ICG; and
  - Australia, Chile, France, New Zealand, Norway and the United Kingdom would act as convenors and report to the next ATCM on views expressed by Parties and on the progress made during the ICG.
- (84) At the request of the Meeting, the United Kingdom made reference to WP 18 *Inspection of Yachts under the Antarctic Treaty and its Protocol on Environmental Protection*, which had been submitted under agenda Item 11.
- (85) Parties thanked the United Kingdom for its suggestions to clarify Article VII (3) of the Antarctic Treaty. Recalling the incident at Wordie House in 2012 (ATCM XXXIII - WP 25), Parties agreed that the presence of yachts would be a continuing issue in the Antarctic Treaty area and that a clear understanding of the scope of Article VII (3) could be helpful. Some Parties also recalled that, at the time of the adoption of Article VII (3), yachts were not present in the Antarctic Treaty area, and that the suggested definition of the term ‘yacht’ was unclear. Parties further considered that a more robust regime for the regulation of yachting activity could be helpful, and that ATCM XXXIII - WP 25 formed a useful basis for discussion. In responding to a comment, the United Kingdom confirmed that it did not propose inspections during navigation.
- (86) Some Parties considered a Measure, as proposed in WP 18, would not be appropriate, as it may be seen to reinterpret Article VII, and instead suggested a Resolution be adopted. It was stressed that any approach taken on this matter

would need to take into account the Law of the Sea and Article VI of the Antarctic Treaty. Parties also noted that it was useful to inspect yachts.

- (87) The proposal was further discussed under Item 11 (see paragraph 237).
- (88) The Secretariat introduced SP 8 *Operational Recommendations subject to review*. This paper was prepared in response to a request from ATCM XXXVII to produce a paper on outdated measures on operational matters that were still subject to review. Eight operational matters were considered by the Meeting:
- Rec. I-XII Cooperation on postal services;
  - Rec. VII-7 Antarctic telecommunications: continued information exchange;
  - Rec. VIII-7 Cooperative Air Transport System;
  - Rec. X-3 Antarctic meteorological data; telecommunications handbook;
  - Rec. XII-2 Use of Antarctic telecommunications systems;
  - Rec. XV-17 Establishment of new stations;
  - Res. 1 (1997) Contingency plans;
  - Dec. 4 (2004) Shipping guidelines.
- (89) The Meeting thanked the Secretariat for its efforts and success in completing its multi-year review of the operational recommendations subject to review, on the basis of advice provided by COMNAP and other relevant expert bodies (the World Meteorological Organization (WMO), IHO, SCAR and IAATO).
- (90) The Meeting noted that Recommendation I-XII *Cooperation on postal services* was resolved at ATCM XXXVII (see Final Report, paragraph 62), and did not consider any further action was necessary on this point.
- (91) The Meeting further agreed that Recommendation VIII-7 *Cooperative Air Transport System* was no longer current, as COMNAP was mandated to conduct the type of work envisioned by this Recommendation. Parties confirmed that the potential benefits to be derived from a cooperative air transport system remained valid, as agreed at ATCM VIII. Accordingly, Parties should continue to work with COMNAP to review their scientific programmes in order to identify the ways in which cooperative air transport systems might benefit them. The Meeting adopted Resolution 1 (2015) *Cooperative Air Transport Systems*.

- (92) The Meeting agreed that Recommendation VII-7 *Antarctic telecommunications: continued information exchange* was no longer current, but considered that the general provisions for National Antarctic Programmes to exchange information on communications equipment and methodology remained valid and were encouraged. The Meeting also agreed that Recommendation XII-2 *Use of Antarctic telecommunications systems* was no longer current, as it was necessary to update it to reflect the significant technological advances that had occurred in the past 30 years. The Meeting adopted Resolution 2 (2015) *Antarctic Information and Telecommunications Technology Systems (ICTS)*.
- (93) The Meeting agreed that Recommendation X-3 *Antarctic meteorological data: telecommunications handbook* was no longer current, as its provisions related to meteorological data were covered by Resolution 2 (2014) and other provisions were outdated. The Meeting noted that COMNAP maintained a handbook on telecommunications called the Antarctic Telecommunications Operators Manual (ATOM). The Meeting continued to support the usefulness of ATOM and encouraged National Antarctic Programmes to inform COMNAP regularly of any changes to their telecommunication practices and contact details which are included in ATOM.
- (94) The Meeting agreed to leave operative Recommendation XV-17 *Establishment of new stations*, knowing that it will be read in the light of developments since its adoption, including the entry into force of the Environment Protocol.
- (95) The Meeting agreed that Resolution 1 (1997) *Emergency Response Action and Contingency planning* was no longer current. It noted that emergency response action and contingency planning remained highly relevant and were now covered by the Environment Protocol, in particular Article 15 and Annex IV (Article 12), and by related decision documents and guidance adopted since the Protocol entered into force.
- (96) The Meeting agreed that the *Shipping guidelines* were no longer current, as the shipping guidelines had been incorporated into the recently adopted Polar Code of the IMO, which was expected to enter into force on 1 January 2017.
- (97) As a result of the adoption of these new Resolutions and because earlier ATCM measures had been deemed no longer current, the Meeting adopted Decision 2 (2015) *Measures on Operational Matters designated as no longer current*.

**Item 6: Operation of the Antarctic Treaty System:  
Matters related to the Secretariat**

- (98) The Executive Secretary introduced SP 2 *Secretariat Report 2014/15*, providing details on the Secretariat's activities in the Financial Year 2014/15 (1 April 2014 to 31 March 2015). Noting the 10th anniversary of the establishment of the Antarctic Treaty Secretariat, he highlighted the Secretariat's achievements in supporting the Antarctic Treaty System, crafting the final reports of ATCMs and CEPs, and facilitating the exchange of information between Parties in the course of the last decade.
- (99) He further noted that the Secretariat's activity during 2014/15 focused on the support of the organisation of ATCM XXXVII, coordination with Bulgaria on hosting ATCM XXXVIII, improvement in the exchange of information, and the continuation of the Secretariat's efforts regarding the collection of documents. The Executive Secretary noted that there had been no changes in Secretariat personnel during the 2014/15 period.
- (100) The Executive Secretary then introduced SP 3 *Secretariat Programme 2015/16*, which outlined the activities proposed for the Secretariat in the Financial Year 2015/16 (1 April 2015 to 31 March 2016). He highlighted the Secretariat's requests to upgrade the position of the ATS Editor from salary level G3 to G2, and to create a part-time position for a cleaner.
- (101) The Executive Secretary also introduced SP 4 *Five Year Forward Budget Profile 2015-2019*, which provided the Secretariat's budget profile for the period 2015-2019 and noted that the budget profile allowed a zero nominal increase in contributions until 2019/20.
- (102) The Executive Secretary drew the attention of the Meeting to the need to begin to consider planning for the recruitment of a new Executive Secretary as his contract would finish in 2017.
- (103) Ukraine introduced WP 45 *On Payment of Contributions by Consultative Parties to the Antarctic Treaty Secretariat by Instalments*, which noted its current difficulties in meeting its contribution obligations, and proposed to arrange for payment by instalments.
- (104) Following discussion on this matter, it was pointed out that, under the Financial Regulations, Parties in arrears would not be impeded from full participation in ATCMs. Parties also remarked that they felt confident about Ukraine's ability to meet its financial commitments once it had resolved

its current difficulties. The Meeting considered that an amendment to the Financial Regulations was not necessary.

- (105) Following further discussion the Meeting adopted Decision 3 (2015) *Secretariat Report, Programme and Budget*.

### **Item 7: Multi-year Strategic Work Plan**

- (106) The Meeting considered the Multi-year Strategic Work Plan adopted at ATCM XXXVII (SP 1). It considered how to take each priority item forward in the coming years, and whether to delete current priorities and add new priorities.
- (107) The Meeting agreed to insert a new priority relating to tourism reflecting the intention to have an ICG on Working towards Developing a Strategic Approach to Environmentally Managed Tourism and Non-governmental Activities in Antarctica, and further agreed to consider the report of that ICG during ATCM XXXIX. Having considered the outcomes of the workshop on Education and Outreach, the Meeting agreed to add Education and Outreach as an additional priority issue for the Multi-Year Strategic Work Plan.
- (108) After discussion, the Meeting adopted Decision 4 (2015) Multi-Year Strategic Work Plan for the Antarctic Treaty Consultative Meeting.

### **Item 8: Report of the Committee for Environmental Protection**

- (109) Mr Ewan McIvor, Chair of the Committee for Environmental Protection, introduced the report of CEP XVIII. The CEP had considered 41 Working Papers and 45 Information Papers. In addition, 4 Secretariat Papers and 9 Background Papers had been submitted under CEP agenda items.

### ***Strategic Discussions on the Future Work of the CEP (CEP Agenda Item 3)***

- (110) The Chair of the CEP advised that the Committee had considered two papers submitted by New Zealand, Australia, Belgium, Norway and SCAR, which had reported on the completion of the Antarctic Environments Portal project. The Committee had agreed to advise the ATCM that it had: welcomed the completion of the project; expressed its support for the final product; and acknowledged the utility of the Antarctic Environments Portal as a voluntary

tool which would help ensure the Committee was as informed as possible on the state of Antarctic environments.

- (111) The Meeting congratulated the proponents and the CEP for the work on the Antarctic Environments Portal. It further noted that the Antarctic Environments Portal was a very valuable and useful tool for both the CEP and the ATCM.
- (112) Accepting the CEP's advice, the Meeting adopted Resolution 3 (2015) *The Antarctic Environments Portal*.
- (113) The Chair of the CEP reported that the Committee had discussed possible arrangements for a commemorative symposium in conjunction with the ATCM and CEP meeting in 2016. The Committee had noted that the ATCM would also be considering the proposal and had agreed to advise the ATCM that the 25<sup>th</sup> anniversary of the Protocol was a milestone that provided a timely, relevant and desired opportunity to focus on the Environment Protocol as the environmental management framework for Antarctica, and that a symposium would be a useful and appropriate vehicle to achieve this.
- (114) The Committee had furthermore agreed to advise the ATCM that such a commemorative symposium should be held in conjunction with CEP XIX/ ATCM XXXIX in Chile, potentially on the Saturday immediately following the meeting of the CEP.
- (115) The Committee had agreed to recommend that a steering committee, consisting of representatives of the proponent countries, other interested Members, and potentially including former CEP Chairs should be established. This steering committee could further develop the symposium programme, taking into account, as appropriate, the ideas raised by CEP Members with regard to potential scope, balanced procedures for presentations and presenters and budgetary frameworks. The steering committee could consider mechanisms to ensure an opportunity for Parties to provide advice to the steering committee in the development of the symposium programme during the intersessional period.
- (116) Many Parties supported the CEP's recommendations and strongly supported the idea of holding a symposium to celebrate the 25<sup>th</sup> anniversary of the Protocol on Environmental Protection. They highlighted the importance of considering future challenges as well as reflecting on achievements, and of creating diversity, both in the composition of the steering committee and in the selection of the symposium presenters. The Meeting welcomed the

CEP's advice, which it noted would inform its further consideration of the proposed symposium.

- (117) The Chair of the CEP also reported that the Committee had considered a report by Argentina on informal intersessional discussions regarding a publication marking the 25<sup>th</sup> anniversary of the Madrid Protocol, and had established an ICG to develop a publication for consideration at CEP XIX. The Chair of the CEP further noted that the Committee had updated its Five-year Work Plan, and had agreed that for future meetings the work plan should be submitted in a Secretariat Paper alongside the ATCM work plan.

#### ***Operation of the CEP (CEP Agenda Item 4)***

- (118) The Chair of the CEP advised that the Committee had considered a report by Australia on the ICG to review information exchange requirements. The Committee had agreed to provide further advice to the ATCM, as appropriate, on the exchange of information relating to environmental matters.
- (119) The Committee had noted that ATCM XXXVII had updated the ATCM multi-year strategic work plan to include a priority on 'strengthening cooperation between the CEP and the ATCM', and had discussed opportunities to further enhance its working relationship with the ATCM.
- (120) The Committee had welcomed the priority assigned by the ATCM to considering its relationship with the CEP and had agreed to encourage the ATCM to provide feedback regarding opportunities to enhance its approach to providing advice, including to more closely align with ATCM priorities.
- (121) The Meeting emphasised the importance of the relationship between the CEP and the ATCM, and welcomed the CEP's advice. It noted that the very clear manner in which the CEP's advice to the ATCM had been presented by the CEP Chair was one way to facilitate improved information exchange between the CEP and ATCM. It further noted that the ATCM should be proactive and systematic in asking the CEP for advice, and cited its multi-year strategic work plan as a tool for achieving this.

#### ***Cooperation with other Organisations (CEP Agenda Item 5)***

- (122) The Chair of the CEP reported that the Committee had received annual reports from COMNAP, the Scientific Committee of CCAMLR (SC-CAMLR) and SCAR and had nominated CEP representatives to attend the meetings of other organisations.

- (123) The Committee had also considered a paper by the United States and the United Kingdom, which reported on developments during the intersessional period to plan for a second joint CEP/SC-CAMLR meeting in 2016. It had agreed that the most convenient timing for CEP Members would be just prior to the ATCM/CEP meeting in Chile and, recognising that this might be less convenient for SC-CAMLR participants, had agreed that mechanisms to facilitate remote participation should be explored.

***Repair and Remediation of Environment Damage (CEP Agenda Item 6)***

- (124) The Chair of the CEP reported that the Committee had agreed to provide, as required, further advice to the ATCM on the topic of repair and remediation of environmental damage.
- (125) The Committee had also considered a paper by Brazil and Argentina, which reported on their approaches to environmental risk and remediation in Antarctica, and had: acknowledged the usefulness of the results and outcomes of bilateral and multilateral workshops that allow for a more thorough exchange of views and experiences; encouraged National Antarctic Programmes to cooperate on issues related to remediation; and encouraged Members and Observers to include their experiences in the Antarctic Clean-up Manual.
- (126) The ATCM welcomed the CEP's work on repair and remediation, including the work to expand the Clean-up Manual. The Meeting further highlighted that this work was useful for its ongoing deliberations on liability for environmental damage. In this regard, the United Kingdom encouraged the CEP to provide examples of repair and remediation to the ATCM, with costs if available.

***Climate Change Implications for the Environment: Strategic approach (CEP Agenda Item 7)***

- (127) The Chair of the CEP noted that the Committee had considered a report by the United Kingdom and Norway on the ICG to develop a Climate Change Response Work Programme (CCRWP) for the CEP and had adopted the CCRWP with minor modifications. The Committee had recognised the importance of maximum engagement and participation in this topic, and in the implementation of the CCRWP.

- (128) The CEP Chair reported that the Committee had agreed to forward to the ATCM a draft Resolution expressing the intention to implement the CCRWP as a matter of priority. Accepting the Committee's advice, the Meeting adopted Resolution 4 (2015) *CEP Climate Change Response Work Programme*.
- (129) The Chair of the CEP reported that the Committee had considered a paper by the United States and Australia, which recommended that Parties note the importance of Southern Ocean observations and modelling to understanding climate change, and the need for international cooperation and investment in this area. The Committee had noted that the paper would also be considered by the ATCM.
- (130) The Committee had agreed to advise the ATCM that it had noted the relevance of the matters discussed in WP 39 to the proposed CEP/SC-CAMLR workshop, and to the actions identified in the CCRWP to support and undertake collaborative long-term monitoring of change in the Antarctic environment, and had endorsed the recommendations presented in the paper.
- (131) The ATCM welcomed the Committee's focus on the implications of climate change for the Antarctic environment, and noted the importance of international scientific cooperation and collaborations in observations and climate modelling.
- (132) The CEP Chair noted that the Committee had also considered a paper by the United Kingdom and the Czech Republic, which reported that the application of the RACER (Rapid Assessment of Circum-Arctic Ecosystem Resilience) conservation planning tool to James Ross Island had identified key features that were likely to persist under different climate scenarios. The Committee had looked forward to receiving further details of a proposal to designate a multi-site ASPA at James Ross Island.

### ***Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA) (CEP Agenda Item 8)***

#### *Draft Comprehensive Environmental Evaluations*

- (133) The Chair of the CEP reported that the Committee had considered a paper by Italy, which reported on its progress in preparing a draft Comprehensive Environmental Evaluation (CEE) for the proposed construction and operation of a gravel runway near Mario Zucchelli Station. Some Members had expressed a desire to receive further details on certain matters, as identified

in the CEP XVIII Final Report, and the Committee had encouraged any other interested Members to provide further comments to Italy as it continued to prepare a formal draft CEE.

- (134) Further, the Committee had welcomed an IP from Belarus, presenting its final CEE for the construction and operation of a new research station at Mount Vechernyaya, Enderby Land. Belarus warmly thanked the CEP and its Members in providing input on its CEE. Belarus highlighted the spirit of teamwork that had produced the report, which Belarus noted would be actively used.

### *Other EIA Matters*

- (135) The Chair of the CEP reported that the Committee had considered a report by Australia and the United Kingdom on the ICG to review the Guidelines for Environmental Impact Assessment in Antarctica, and had endorsed terms of reference for a continued ICG, to be led by Australia and the United Kingdom, to provide a final report to CEP XIX.
- (136) The Committee had agreed to advise the ATCM that its review of the Guidelines for Environmental Impact Assessment in Antarctica would: incorporate new or additional guidance to emphasise the importance of key matters; reflect new and revised CEP procedures and resources for environmental impact assessment (EIA); and include references to other relevant guidelines and resources. The review process would also identify broader policy issues relating to environmental impact assessment, including cumulative impacts and environmental repair and remediation. The final report of the review would be presented at CEP XIX, and would likely be of interest to the ATCM.
- (137) The Chair of the CEP also reported that the Committee had considered several papers on the use of unmanned aerial vehicles (UAVs) in Antarctica, noting that some of the papers had also been submitted to the ATCM. The Committee had focused its discussion on the environmental aspects of such activity, but had noted the importance of also giving consideration to the associated safety risks, which would be more fully considered by the ATCM and COMNAP.
- (138) The Committee had recognised the benefits of developing guidance on the environmental aspects of UAV use in Antarctica, and had agreed that it would consider at CEP XIX initiating work to develop such guidance.
- (139) The Meeting congratulated the Committee for the attention it had given to the emerging issue of UAVs. The Meeting highlighted the need to continue research into the effects of UAV use on the Antarctic environment.

## ***Area Protection and Management Plans (CEP Agenda Item 9)***

### *Management Plans*

- (140) The CEP Chair reported that the Committee had considered papers that presented 17 revised Antarctic Specially Protected Area (ASPA) management plans and one revised Antarctic Specially Managed Area (ASMA) management plan.
- (141) The Committee had thanked the Subsidiary Group on Management Plans (SGMP) for its work, and agreed that during the next intersessional period the group would continue its review of five revised draft ASPA management plans, and would initiate work to develop guidance on determining whether an area should be designated as an ASMA.
- (142) The Committee had also thanked China for its report on informal intersessional discussions of its proposal to designate a new ASMA at Dome A, and had welcomed China's offer to lead further informal intersessional discussions on the proposed ASMA.
- (143) The Meeting acknowledged the CEP's work to review ASPA and ASMA management plans as a good example of the CEP's continued efforts to provide the ATCM with sound and timely advice. It also welcomed the form and manner in which the advice was provided.
- (144) Accepting the CEP's advice, the Meeting adopted the following Measures on Protected Areas:
- Measure 1 (2015) *Antarctic Specially Protected Area ASPA No. 101 (Taylor Rookery, Mac.Robertson Land): Revised Management Plan.*
  - Measure 2 (2015) *Antarctic Specially Protected Area ASPA No. 102 (Rookery Islands, Holme Bay, Mac.Robertson Land): Revised Management Plan.*
  - Measure 3 (2015) *Antarctic Specially Protected Area ASPA No. 103 (Ardery Island and Odbert Island, Budd Coast, Wilkes Land, East Antarctica): Revised Management Plan.*
  - Measure 4 (2015) *Antarctic Specially Protected Area ASPA No. 104 (Sabrina Island, Balleny Islands): Revised Management Plan.*
  - Measure 5 (2015) *Antarctic Specially Protected Area ASPA No. 105 (Beaufort Island, McMurdo Sound, Ross Sea): Revised Management Plan.*
  - Measure 6 (2015) *Antarctic Specially Protected Area ASPA No. 106 (Cape Hallett, Northern Victoria Land, Ross Sea): Revised Management Plan.*

- Measure 7 (2015) *Antarctic Specially Protected Area ASPA No. 119 (Davis Valley and Forlidas Pond Dufek Massif, Pensacola Mountains): Revised Management Plan.*
- Measure 8 (2015) *Antarctic Specially Protected Area ASPA No. 148 (Mount Flora, Hope Bay, Antarctic Peninsula): Revised Management Plan.*
- Measure 9 (2015) *Antarctic Specially Protected Area ASPA No. 152 (Western Bransfield Strait): Revised Management Plan.*
- Measure 10 (2015) *Antarctic Specially Protected Area ASPA No. 153 (Eastern Dallmann Bay): Revised Management Plan.*
- Measure 11 (2015) *Antarctic Specially Protected Area ASPA No. 155 (Cape Evans, Ross Island): Revised Management Plan.*
- Measure 12 (2015) *Antarctic Specially Protected Area ASPA No. 157 (Backdoor Bay, Cape Royds, Ross Island): Revised Management Plan.*
- Measure 13 (2015) *Antarctic Specially Protected Area ASPA No. 158 (Hut Point, Ross Island): Revised Management Plan.*
- Measure 14 (2015) *Antarctic Specially Protected Area ASPA No. 159 (Cape Adare, Borchgrevink Coast): Revised Management Plan.*
- Measure 15 (2015) *Antarctic Specially Protected Area ASPA No. 163 (Dakshin Gangotri Glacier, Dronning Maud Land): Revised Management Plan.*
- Measure 16 (2015) *Antarctic Specially Protected Area ASPA No. 164 (Scullin and Murray Monoliths, Mac.Robertson Land): Revised Management Plan.*
- Measure 17 (2015) *Antarctic Specially Protected Area ASPA No. 168 (Mount Harding, Grove Mountains, East Antarctica): Revised Management Plan.*
- Measure 18 (2015) *Antarctic Specially Managed Area ASMA No. 2 (McMurdo Dry Valleys, Southern Victoria Land): Revised Management Plan.*

### *Historic Sites and Monuments*

- (145) The CEP Chair reported that the Committee had considered a proposal by Bulgaria to add the Lame Dog Hut, St Kliment Ohridski, Livingston Island to the List of Historic Sites and Monuments (HSM), and a proposal by the

Russian Federation to add the Oversnow heavy tractor “Kharkovchanka” to the List. The Committee had supported the proposals, noting that the reasons outlined in the respective papers were the basis for the proposed designation, in accordance with Resolution 3 (2009).

- (146) The CEP Chair noted that the Committee had agreed to forward the two proposals to the ATCM for approval by means of a Measure.
- (147) Accepting the CEP’s advice, the Meeting adopted Measure 19 (2015) *Revised List of Antarctic Historic Sites and Monuments: Lame Dog Hut at the Bulgarian base St. Kliment Ohridski, Livingston Island and Oversnow heavy tractor “Kharkovchanka” that was used in Antarctica from 1959 to 2010.*
- (148) The CEP Chair reported that the Committee had supported a suggestion by Norway to initiate further discussion on the designation of Historic Sites and Monuments, in the broader sense, including considering alternatives for *in-situ* preservation of historical values, and guidance on the issue of potential conflicts between the provisions of Annexes III and V to the Protocol. The Committee had welcomed Norway’s offer to do preparatory work for a discussion of these matters at CEP XIX, and had noted that it would be useful to seek guidance from expert organisations such as the International Polar Heritage Committee (IPHC).
- (149) The Committee had agreed that future proposals for new designations of HSMs should be put on hold until some further guidance had been established in this regard.
- (150) The CEP Chair reported that the Committee had also considered papers by New Zealand on the Ross Sea Heritage Restoration Project, and had congratulated the New Zealand Antarctic Heritage Trust for its comprehensive work to conserve the buildings and artefact collections from ASPAs 155, 157 and 158 on Ross Island.

### *Marine Spatial Protection and Management*

- (151) The CEP Chair reported that the Committee had supported the main outcomes presented in a report by Belgium on the ICG on “outstanding values” in the marine environment under Annex V of the Protocol, and had established a further ICG, to be led by Belgium, to continue discussion on these matters.

*Other Annex V Matters*

- (152) The CEP Chair reported that the Committee had discussed a paper by Norway, which had proposed the establishment of a non-mandatory preliminary assessment procedure for ASPA and ASMA proposals. Following some comments from Members and minor modifications to the wording presented in the paper, the Committee had agreed to adopt the *Guidelines: A Prior Assessment process for the designation of ASPAs and ASMAs*.
- (153) The Committee had encouraged Members to utilise these guidelines in future ASMA and ASPA designation processes. The Committee had noted that the procedure for prior assessment of ASPAs or ASMAs should not apply to any areas that had already been proposed as an ASPA or an ASMA.
- (154) The CEP Chair reported that the Committee had also supported a paper by New Zealand, Spain, the United Kingdom and the United States, which had presented a draft Code of Conduct for Activities within Terrestrial Geothermal Environments in Antarctica. The Committee had welcomed SCAR's offer to review the draft Code, in consultation with COMNAP, and to resubmit a final version for consideration at CEP XIX.
- (155) The Committee had considered a report by Argentina on the results of a survey related to the protection of fossils in Antarctica. It had noted the scientific value of fossils and the importance of ensuring their protection, and had agreed to consider these matters further at a future meeting.

***Conservation of Antarctic Flora and Fauna (CEP Agenda Item 10)***

*Quarantine and Non-native Species*

- (156) The CEP Chair reported that, under this agenda item, the Committee had supported a proposal by the United Kingdom, France and New Zealand to review the Non-native Species Manual and had established an ICG, to be led by the United Kingdom, to initiate the review.
- (157) The Committee had considered a paper by Argentina reporting on studies to determine the occurrence of non-native species introduced through natural pathways. The Committee had noted that such issues could be considered further in the review of the Non-native Species Manual.

*Other Annex II Matters*

- (158) The CEP Chair reported that the Committee had considered the elements of the paper by SCAR on wildlife disturbance (WP 27) that had not been addressed in its UAV discussions under agenda item 8b. On the basis of information provided by SCAR, the Committee had agreed to advise the ATCM that: approach distances in existing ATCM guidelines should be regularly reviewed on the basis of emerging scientific research; precautionary approaches are urged in all circumstances when operating in the vicinity of wildlife; and further research should be undertaken to ensure management decisions are taken on the basis of the best available knowledge.
- (159) The Meeting thanked the CEP for its advice in relation to wildlife disturbance and endorsed its recommendations.
- (160) The CEP Chair also noted that the Committee had considered a paper by Australia, New Zealand, Norway, the United Kingdom and the United States, which reported on a recently completed analysis, by Birdlife International, of Important Bird Areas (IBAs) in Antarctica. The Committee had recognised the value of the IBA report, which was of considerable relevance to its deliberations on the protection and management of Antarctica. The Committee had agreed to forward a draft Resolution on Important Bird Areas in Antarctica to the ATCM for adoption.
- (161) Accepting the CEP's advice, the Meeting adopted Resolution 5 (2015) *Important Bird Areas in Antarctica*.
- (162) Australia, in its capacity as Depositary for ACAP and host of the ACAP Secretariat, noted it would bring the IBA report to the attention of ACAP, consistent with the Resolution.

***Inspection Reports (CEP Agenda Item 12)***

- (163) The CEP Chair reported that, under this agenda item, the Committee had considered a paper that reported on inspections conducted by the United Kingdom and the Czech Republic, and had welcomed the inspection team's observations regarding the generally high level of awareness of the provisions of the Environment Protocol, and the significant examples of good practice.

***Election of Officers (CEP Agenda Item 14)***

- (164) The Chair of the CEP reported that the Committee had re-elected Dr Polly Penhale (United States) to a second two-year term as CEP vice-Chair, and had congratulated Dr Penhale on her appointment to the role.

***Preparation for CEP XIX (CEP Agenda Item 15)***

- (165) The Chair of the CEP noted that the Committee had adopted a Preliminary Agenda for CEP XIX. To reflect its discussions under Agenda Item 7, the Committee had modified Agenda Item 7 for CEP XIX to ‘Climate Change Implications for the Antarctic Environment’ and added two sub-items: ‘7a. Strategic Approach’, and ‘7b. Implementation and Review of the Climate Change Response Work Programme’.
- (166) The Meeting thanked Mr Ewan McIvor for his excellent leadership and for ensuring that the CEP’s advice to the ATCM was provided in a clear and comprehensive manner. It further acknowledged the extensive and valuable work of the CEP, and the importance of ensuring that the CEP’s advice could be considered and incorporated into ATCM deliberations in a timely manner.

**Item 9: Liability: Implementation of Decision 4 (2010)**

- (167) The United States, as Depository Government of the Antarctic Treaty and its Protocol on Environmental Protection to the Antarctic Treaty, reported that 12 Consultative Parties had communicated their approval of Annex VI (IP 40).
- (168) Parties provided updated information on the status of their ratification of Annex VI, and implementation of Annex VI in domestic legislation. Of the Parties who had approved Annex VI (Australia, Finland, Italy, the Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway, Peru, Poland, South Africa, Spain, Sweden and the United Kingdom) and/or had passed the necessary legislative measures to implement Annex VI (the Russian Federation), five reported that they were applying domestic legislation implementing Annex VI pending the entry into force of Annex VI (Finland, the Netherlands, Norway, the Russian Federation and Sweden).
- (169) Most other Parties reported that they were in the process of implementing Annex VI in domestic legislation. Some Parties reported on intersessional

work completed, including Japan, which had conducted a comprehensive domestic implementation study. Several Parties indicated implementation might be completed within the current legislative period. Some Parties reported on ongoing inter-ministerial consultations and consultations with industry.

- (170) The Russian Federation introduced WP 33 *On the problems of approval of Annex VI “Liability Arising from Environmental Emergencies” to the Protocol on Environmental Protection to the Antarctic Treaty*. Expressing concern over the general lack of progress made towards the entry into force of Annex VI, this paper proposed that the Secretariat be tasked with monitoring the status of Annex VI approval by those Consultative Parties which had not yet completed the approval process.
- (171) New Zealand introduced WP 36 *Annex VI to the Protocol on Environmental Protection to the Antarctic Treaty: Next Steps*, jointly prepared with the Netherlands, Finland and Sweden. It recommended that the ATCM adopt a decision to address the mandate in Decision 4 (2010) regarding consideration of the resumption of negotiations on liability in accordance with Article 16 of the Protocol. In addition, it encouraged Parties that had not yet approved Measure 1 (2005) to provide the Secretariat with information to inform a focused discussion on progress at ATCM XXXIX.
- (172) The Meeting thanked the Russian Federation, New Zealand, the Netherlands, Finland and Sweden for their papers. It identified two major issues raised by WP 33 and WP 36. These were: the moving forward of the process of approval and entry into force of Annex VI to the Protocol; and addressing Decision 4 (2010) on the establishment of a time frame for the resumption of negotiations in accordance with Article 16 of the Protocol.
- (173) The Meeting agreed to continue to monitor implementation of Annex VI. Some Parties did not consider that it would be appropriate or desirable for the Secretariat to collect or request information on the implementation of Annex VI.
- (174) Parties that had already approved Annex VI to the Protocol, as well as those that had implemented or were in the process of implementing Annex VI into their domestic legislation, offered to share their experiences with other Parties.
- (175) Some Parties suggested that it was important to prioritise the entry into force of Annex VI before focusing on additional discussions relating to

comprehensive liability. Some Parties expressed the view that additional focused discussions were not required at next year's meeting.

- (176) Noting that there were other international mechanisms developed to address repair and remediation of environmental damage, the Meeting agreed to invite, through the Executive Secretary, a representative from the International Oil Pollution Compensation Funds (IOPC Funds) as an expert to the next ATCM. The Meeting noted this expert could share its experience on the functioning of the IOPC Funds, the associated advantages and disadvantages, and how it differed from the mechanism envisaged under Annex VI.
- (177) Following discussions, the Meeting adopted Decision 5 (2015) *Liability arising from Environmental Emergencies*.

## **Item 10: Safety and Operations in Antarctica**

### *Aviation matters*

- (178) SCAR introduced WP 27 *Wildlife Approach Distances in Antarctica, and referred to BP 22 A Meta-Analysis of Human Disturbance Impacts on Antarctic Wildlife*. WP 27 was prepared in response to a request from CEP XVII and considered more than 60 research studies conducted on 21 species. The meta-analysis indicated that human disturbance had a significant negative impact on Antarctic wildlife. In the case of camping and UAVs, SCAR noted that little scientific evidence currently existed about the nature or extent of their impacts on Antarctic wildlife. SCAR also noted that research was underway globally to inform understanding of UAV impacts on wildlife, and this might also prove useful in informing Antarctic policy in this area. It recommended that the CEP: encourage Members to undertake further research in support of setting evidenced-based guidelines to approach distances to wildlife in Antarctica; encourage Members using UAVs near wildlife concentrations to support research on UAV impacts; and encourage Members to consider avoiding UAV launches closer than 100 metres to wildlife and consider avoiding vertical approaches by UAVs until Antarctic-specific information became available.
- (179) COMNAP introduced WP 22 *UAV Use in Antarctica – Risks and Benefits*, which presented the practical benefits of the use of UAVs by National Antarctic Programmes in supporting science, operations and logistics. COMNAP indicated there were clear benefits to using this technology

in the Antarctic, including safety to human life and supporting scientific investigation. As one of the recommendations in the paper suggested, National Antarctic Programmes and other operators in the Antarctic region should make every effort to collect and share information on UAV use in the Antarctic Treaty area and share that openly to expedite the development of evidence-based guidelines, standards and recommendations as necessary. COMNAP also noted that there would be a UAV session at the next COMNAP annual general meeting in August 2015.

- (180) IAATO presented IP 88 *IAATO Policies on the Use of Unmanned Aerial Vehicles (UAVs) in Antarctica*. IAATO noted that, following the IAATO 26 Meeting in Rotterdam, new policies regarding the use of UAVs and operator experiences had been put in place, including a ban on their recreational use in coastal areas. IAATO detailed criteria under which it would accept the general use of UAVs by its members. IAATO further highlighted that its members agreed to take into consideration information regarding the legal requirements for using UAVs, flight operations and piloting of UAVs, flight restrictions, environmental restrictions, and record keeping.
- (181) The Meeting thanked SCAR, COMNAP, IAATO and the United States for presenting their papers. In considering these contributions, the Parties raised a number of ideas and issues relating to the benefits arising from the use of UAVs in Antarctica; the importance of considering the risks associated with UAV use to logistics and science; and on their own experiences of UAV use and regulation.
- (182) In relation to the benefits associated with UAVs for scientific activities, France noted the difficulties associated with entering Specially Protected Areas and the possible use of UAVs to minimise the environmental impacts associated with scientific monitoring. France also suggested the use of UAVs for logistical purposes including navigation in ice-covered areas and the detection of crevasses in coastal areas, and underlined the importance of guidelines for the use of UAVs. Identifying the potential use of UAVs to transfer bulk data faster than satellite communication, the United States noted that the many potential uses of UAVs were still to be determined. Parties broadly recognised the use of UAVs and the significant benefits they offered.
- (183) Many Parties stressed the risks associated with the use of UAVs, and Argentina expressed its concerns that UAVs had already been lost in connection with recreational activities in Antarctica. Parties agreed with SCAR that significant gaps existed in the scientific information surrounding

the use of UAVs, and supported COMNAP's recommendations to exchange information regarding UAV use.

- (184) In reporting on its UAV activities, Argentina noted that it did not use UAVs near penguin populations given the advice from its experts that penguins could mistake UAVs for predators. The United States emphasised that it had banned uncontrolled UAV use in its own programme, and the United Kingdom reported on its comprehensive training programme and careful monitoring of UAV use. Other Parties informed the Meeting that they were in the process of establishing UAV guidelines and regulations.
- (185) The Meeting expressed general support for UAV use, and acknowledged UAVs as an important tool for the future. It also agreed that more research was needed. The Meeting welcomed COMNAP's efforts in this area, and looked forward to considering COMNAP's forthcoming guidelines on UAV use.
- (186) Australia suggested that the Meeting may wish to consider scheduling, in the Multi-year Strategic Work Plan, a future discussion on developments regarding UAVs. This could reassess the state of play in light of advice from bodies such as IAATO, COMNAP, CEP and SCAR, and consider any further response and next steps by the ATCM.
- (187) The following papers were also submitted and taken as presented under this item:
- IP 55 *Antarctic Flight Information Manual (AFIM)* (COMNAP). The paper provided a progress update on the reformatting of the Antarctic Flight Information Manual (AFIM) as an electronic product.
  - IP 82 *A risk-based approach to safe operations of unmanned aircraft systems in the United States Antarctic Program (USAP)* (United States). It reported on the use of unmanned aircraft systems (UAS) by the United States Antarctic Program, on the use of operational guidelines, and on a risk assessment of UAS operations performed by the National Science Foundation to validate and inform the evolving guidelines.
  - IP 83 *Guidance on unmanned aerial system (UAS) use in Antarctica developed for applications to scientific studies on penguins and seals* (United States). This paper presented lessons that the United States had learned while operating UAVs in the Antarctic. It described the work conducted by the United States Antarctic Marine Living Resources (AMLR) programme to advance the work of CCAMLR's ecosystem monitoring programme by using UAVs to study seals and penguins. It

described the rigorous training and UAV selection process undertaken before field operations began. The United States presented this paper as a useful reference for those considering permitting UAV operations in Antarctica.

### *Search and Rescue*

- (188) New Zealand presented IP 52 *Joint Search and Rescue Exercise in the Antarctic*. It provided information on a table-top Antarctic SAR Exercise held in February 2015. The exercise featured live components with the intention to test existing protocols, contingency plans and lines of communication between the ships in distress, the New Zealand Rescue Coordination Centre (RCCNZ) and IAATO. New Zealand highlighted the differences between the SAR operations in the Ross Sea compared to those on the Antarctic Peninsula. It pointed out that the distance between vessels requiring assistance and the closest SAR facility was likely to be greater in the Ross Sea than on the Antarctic Peninsula.
- (189) IAATO also noted that, in addition to the obvious value of training and testing of systems, these multinational, multi-stakeholder SAR exercises were extremely useful in building trust and understanding of different perspectives, and welcomed the opportunity to work with other Rescue Coordination Centres (RCCs) in SAR exercises in the future.
- (190) The Meeting thanked New Zealand and IAATO for the information and for organising the SAR exercise. The United States noted the considerable effect and increasing attention to SAR following the Special Working Group on SAR held at ATCM XXXVI.
- (191) Argentina noted the recent adoption of an agreement between the five RCCs of the countries with SAR-coordination responsibilities in Antarctica and CCAMLR, which permitted the RCCs to access much more complete information on what the existing situation was at specific sites of an accident or incident.
- (192) COMNAP presented IP 60 *COMNAP Search & Rescue Workshop III* which provided advance notice of the intended plans for the COMNAP SAR Workshop III to be held in Valparaíso, Chile, in 2016. The workshop would be of a practical and technical nature, in order to continue to improve effective coordination of SAR activities.

- (193) The Meeting thanked COMNAP and emphasised its support for the workshop. Chile confirmed its readiness to host the workshop, and IAATO noted that it was willing to assist where required.
- (194) The United States noted that it had assisted in the response to the emergency situation declared by the Australian flagged *FV Antarctic Chieftain* in February 2015 (IP 51). Australia welcomed and acknowledged the assistance of the United States in this incident.
- (195) The following papers were also submitted and taken as presented under this item:
- IP 51 *Search and Rescue Incident: Antarctic Chieftain (2015)* (New Zealand). It reported on the steps undertaken in response to the urgency situation declared by the Australian flagged *FV Antarctic Chieftain* in February 2015.
  - BP 9 *Polish Sailing Yacht Accident at King George Island (Antarctic Peninsula)* (Poland).
  - BP 11 *Vigésima Tercera Expedición Científica del Perú a la Antártida (ANTAR XXIII)* (Peru).
  - BP 16 *Desarrollo y aplicación de eco-materiales para un prototipo habitable de emergencia en la Antártida* (Ecuador).
  - BP 18 *Results of an Investigation into the Aircraft Incident Mount Elizabeth, Antarctica on January 23, 2013* (Canada).

### *Marine matters*

- (196) Germany presented IP 61 *Improving Sea Ice Information in Antarctica*. It reported on the 15<sup>th</sup> meeting of the International Ice Charting Working Group (IICWG) on “Ice Information in the Southern Ocean: Status, Challenges, and the Future” held in Punta Arenas, Chile, 20-25 October 2014. Germany noted the engagement of Southern Hemisphere organisations that provided ice information for Antarctic waters. The five countries having responsibilities for the broadcast of meteorological information in Antarctica (Antarctic Metareas) had agreed to produce a regularly updated circumpolar ice edge bulletin for broadcast on the Global Maritime Disaster and Safety Service (GMDSS). Germany further pointed out the advances made in the joint Antarctic Ice Chart Production. It invited Parties to the next IICWG meeting that will take place 19-23 October 2015 in Germany.

- (197) ASOC presented IP 113 *Next Steps for Vessel Management in the Southern Ocean*. It provided an update on the provisions and limitations of the International Code for Ships Operating in Polar Waters (Polar Code). ASOC informed that Part 1 of the Code and related amendments to the International Convention for the Safety of Life at Sea (SOLAS) were adopted in November 2014 and were expected to enter into force on 1 January 2017. ASOC informed the Meeting that Step 2 of the work, due to commence in 2016, would focus on inclusion in the Polar Code of provisions applicable to vessels not covered by SOLAS. ASOC noted that ahead of the work commencing, information would be needed on the number of such “non-SOLAS” ships operating in polar waters and reports of accidents and incidents including those requiring search and rescue interventions since 2010. It encouraged the Parties to formally assist in Step 2 of the development of a mandatory Polar Code by contributing to the information gathering exercise through the provision of copies of relevant ATCM papers and reports to the IMO.
- (198) The Parties thanked ASOC for the update and some Parties expressed their support for the development of Step 2 of the Polar Code as well as for the provision of the necessary information to the IMO. The United States noted that New Zealand, South Africa and Iceland had submitted a paper to the June 2015 session of the IMO which had requested data on incidents within Polar waters.
- (199) IP 56 *COMNAP Sea Ice Challenges Workshop (COMNAP)* was taken as presented. It described the Sea Ice Challenges Workshop in Hobart, Australia, in May 2015. The aim was to scope the challenges these trends pose for National Antarctic Programmes and to identify and discuss potential solutions. A workshop publication was planned.
- (200) In referring to IP 56, the United States thanked COMNAP for the paper and noted the benefits of the workshop in bringing together the short-term operational and long-term climate perspectives regarding sea ice forecasting. It looked forward to the publication of the report of the workshop.

### *Hydrography*

- (201) Colombia presented IP 28 *Contribución de Colombia a la Seguridad Marítima en la Antártica*. It noted its project “Marine Scientific Research for Maritime Safety in Antarctica - 2014/2018”, which involved the construction of simulation models of drift ice and the trajectory of spilled oil at sea. In accordance with WP 39, Colombia wanted to cooperate with other Parties

using the data produced during its expedition. It also wanted to have access to atmospheric models data referred to in WP 39. The Colombian project included a further hydrographic expedition to update nautical charts of the Gerlache Strait. Colombia noted that this was a contribution to the hydrography of an area for which no information was previously available and thanked Chile and the United Kingdom for their support.

- (202) Chile thanked Colombia for the information, and noted the support Colombia had provided to Chile through its hydrographic expedition. Chile suggested that an English translation of IP 26 and IP 28 would have facilitated the analysis of these documents by Parties.
- (203) Australia presented IP 44 *Australia's Antarctic Hydrographic Surveys*. The paper recalled Resolution 5 (2014) on cooperation on hydrographic surveying and charting. Australia further encouraged liaison and cooperation between National Antarctic Programmes and national hydrographic offices to assist with meeting safety, operational, environmental and scientific objectives in the Antarctic.
- (204) IP 33 *The role of the United Kingdom in charting the waters of the Antarctic* (United Kingdom) was taken as presented. It summarised recent work by the United Kingdom Hydrographic Office, British Antarctic Survey, and the Royal Navy.
- (205) New Zealand referred to IP 33 and IP 44, noting that it was embarking on a hydrographic risk assessment of the Ross Sea and New Zealand coast, and that it intended to present the result of this work to ATCM XXXIX.

#### *Other Matters*

- (206) New Zealand presented IP 50 *Damage to the Observation Hill Cross (HSM 20)* which reported on damage to the Observation Hill Cross (HSM 20), and steps taken in response. These included charging a New Zealand service member with damaging the Cross under the Armed Forces Discipline Act 1971 (AFDA). In the view of the New Zealand Government, this outcome was appropriate, while also sending a valuable message to personnel stationed at Scott Base as to the significance of the Observation Hill Cross and other monuments on Ross Island.
- (207) The United Kingdom commended New Zealand for its action on the matter.

(208) The following papers were also submitted and taken as presented under this item:

- IP 74 *Waste Water Management in Antarctica COMNAP Workshop* (COMNAP). It reported on the “Advancing Antarctic Station Waste Water Management Workshop” held in New Zealand in August 2014. The workshop had discussed items related to waste management systems in use in Antarctic stations.
- IP 15 *Proposed routes for all-terrain vehicles based on impact on deglaciated area of James Ross Island* (Czech Republic). It reported on the use of all-terrain vehicles for the first time by a Czech expedition, during the 2015 expedition to support field camps with delivery of scientific and technical cargo, and food.

(209) The following papers were also submitted under this item:

- BP 2 *Cooperation Visit to Stations/ Bases Facilities in Antarctica* (Brazil).
- BP 3 *XXXIII Brazilian Antarctic Operation* (Brazil).

## **Item 11: Tourism and Non-Governmental Activities in the Antarctic Treaty Area**

### ***Review of Tourism Policies***

(210) New Zealand introduced WP 24 *Adopting a Strategic Approach to Environmentally Managed Tourism and non-governmental activities in Antarctica*, jointly prepared with the United Kingdom, Norway, and the Netherlands. Acknowledging the effort made at previous ATCMs to review tourism policies, this paper highlighted that little headway had been made on consolidating this work and progressing towards setting priorities for future discussion. It recognised that tourism was expanding in Antarctica and that tourism activities were diversifying. The proponents encouraged the Meeting to adopt a forward thinking, proactive approach to the management of tourism and non-governmental activities in Antarctica, with a view to drafting a work programme to develop a strategic vision for the management of tourism.

(211) New Zealand, the United Kingdom, Norway and the Netherlands recommended to task the Secretariat to review and summarise all ATCM discussions and papers relating to the adoption of the 2009 General Principles

and subsequently, about all aspects of Antarctic tourism, including identifying outstanding questions and issues on Antarctic tourism. This should include those held and presented during the Special Working Group on Competent Authorities at ATCM XXXVIII. The Secretariat should be requested to report back to ATCM XXXIX (2016); establish an ICG following discussions at ATCM XXXIX (2016) to identify priority questions and develop a draft work programme for consideration at ATCM XL (2017); and build the agreed priority questions into the ATCM's Multi-year Strategic Work Plan.

- (212) The Meeting thanked New Zealand, the United Kingdom, Norway and the Netherlands for the paper and agreed on the importance of attempting to create a coherent strategic vision for safe and environmentally responsible tourism management in Antarctica.
- (213) France, supported by Canada, mentioned that a compendium of existing regulations adopted by the ATCM on tourism would be useful. In addition to providing an overview of regulations, the compendium could also point out gaps. Some Parties noted that the most important task was to determine priorities, in particular which specific topics relating to tourism should be focused on at future meetings, on the basis of Working Papers submitted in advance of meetings.
- (214) ASOC thanked the co-sponsors of WP 24 and noted that tourism had been a topic of discussion of the ATCM since the 1960s, with progress made with the adoption of Resolution 7 (2009). ASOC also stated that, in its view, it was time to move from strategic thinking on tourism to strategic action.
- (215) With reference to IP 104 rev. 1, presented by India, and existing overviews, some Parties suggested that the Meeting could move forward with establishing an ICG prior to ATCM XXXIX.
- (216) The Meeting requested the Secretariat to review all ATCM discussions and papers relating to the adoption of the 2009 General Principles and subsequently, about all aspects of Antarctic tourism. The Secretariat was asked to report back to ATCM XXXIX with a summary of this review and to provide this review to inform ICG discussions ahead of ATCM XXXIX. This summary would include identifying outstanding questions and issues on Antarctic tourism, including those arising during the Special Working Group on Competent Authorities Issues at ATCM XXXVIII. The Secretariat indicated that it would complete the task requested by the end of September 2015.

(217) The Meeting further agreed to establish an ICG on Working towards Developing a Strategic Approach to Environmentally Managed Tourism and Non-governmental Activities in Antarctica, which would report back to ATCM XXXIX. The ICG would have the following Terms of Reference:

1. Noting ATCM XXXVII - WP 24, IP 104 rev. 1 and the General Principles on Antarctic Tourism (2009) and in the light of existing ATCM/CEP recommendations, identify priority questions and gaps with respect to Antarctic tourism, on the basis of which a focused discussion on identifying a limited number of priority questions and gaps could take place at ATCM XXXIX;
2. In undertaking this work, participants of the ICG shall take into account, but not be limited to:
  - A summary by the Secretariat as requested by ATCM XXXVIII;
  - The outcomes of the 2011/2012 Intersessional Contact Group 'Outstanding Questions' on Antarctic Tourism;
  - The Committee on Environmental Protection's Tourism Study (2012) and actions under way to advance its recommendations;
  - Outcomes from the Special Working Group on Competent Authorities (2015); and
  - Existing ATCM/CEP/Antarctic Treaty Meeting of Experts (ATME) papers and recommendations.
3. Report to ATCM XXXIX.

(218) It was further agreed that:

- Observers and Experts participating in the ATCM would be invited to provide input;
- The Executive Secretary would open the ATCM forum for the ICG and provide assistance for the ICG; and
- New Zealand and India would act as joint convenors.

(219) The Russian Federation introduced WP 32 *On possibilities of monitoring adventure tourism and non-governmental expeditions in the Antarctic*, which noted the inconsistency in permit requirements between Parties and non-Parties. In reference to recent incidents that required search and rescue operations, the Russian Federation drew attention to unofficial tourism activities associated with adventure tourism and non-governmental organisations' activities in the Antarctic. In some cases, the logistics that enabled access to Antarctica were provided by tour operators that were not

regulated. The Russian Federation proposed that prior to the beginning of the Antarctic summer season, it would provide the Secretariat, as well as the countries of the Antarctic Gateways, with a list of Russian citizens and organisations which had been granted permits to operate in Antarctica. It noted that this would permit Port Authorities to identify which Russian individuals or organisations were not authorised by the Russian Federation. The Russian Federation pointed out that this action would not restrict the operations of foreign tour operators and encouraged the Parties that ran into similar problems to join in this initiative.

- (220) The Meeting thanked the Russian Federation for its contribution. It further emphasised the importance of exchanging information bilaterally and referred to IP 75, which described the monitoring of tourist activities carried out by French nationals and departing from Chile. New Zealand noted that it would be useful if Parties, when issuing permits for activities in the Ross Sea region, would communicate with New Zealand or other authorities which had expertise in the specific environmental conditions of that region.
- (221) Argentina and Chile indicated that, although further information to Antarctic Gateways on authorised expeditions was welcomed and useful, this was without prejudice to the responsibilities of the States with regard to their nationals' actions.
- (222) The Meeting also emphasised the importance and value of the Electronic Information Exchange System (EIES) as an essential tool for the monitoring of tourist activities, and suggested ways in which the system could be enhanced. It urged Parties to provide full information in a timely manner. In this way, the information provided in the EIES did not in any way undermine Flag State responsibility.
- (223) The Russian Federation thanked the Parties for their comments, pointing out that they were useful. It noted that the concerns presented in the paper related in particular to non-governmental activities and that the ideal solution would be for all Parties to have national procedures and legislation on permitting.
- (224) Ecuador introduced WP 51 *How to address the problem of commercial tour vessels navigating under a third party flag in the Antarctic Treaty Area*. It identified the issue of tourist vessels flagged to states not party to the Antarctic Treaty, particularly those registered under Flags of Convenience, visiting the Antarctic Treaty area. Ecuador stressed the need to reach a decision to allow the Parties to monitor everything that happens in the Antarctic Treaty area waters, and prevent accidents.

- (225) The Meeting thanked Ecuador for the intersessional work, and the usefulness of data that was presented in the paper. It agreed that regular and effective regulation of ships visiting the Antarctic region was essential for the protection of the environment.
- (226) Noting that the Polar Code would enter into force for SOLAS vessels from 1 January 2017, some Parties reiterated the comprehensive environmental and safety protections provided within the IMO regime. Bearing in mind that some non-SOLAS private vessels, used for tourism in the Antarctic Treaty area, could potentially be as large in size as some SOLAS vessels, several Parties said that they were highly supportive of calls for the IMO to work on developing a new stage of work, following the Polar Shipping Code, which would apply to non-SOLAS vessels.
- (227) While noting that it authorised tourist activities involving non-Party State vessels in Antarctica, Canada reported on its authorisation requirements including insurance and IMO certification, and encouraged Parties to use IMO certifications and regulations to manage their own authorisation processes. Canada referred to the positive results from the inspections of Canadian authorised tourist vessels as reported in IP 57. The United States also noted that all of its tourist activities allowed to proceed to Antarctica were flagged to non-Party states, and noted there had been no issues.
- (228) Ecuador thanked Parties for their comments, and stressed that the Meeting should find a stronger mechanism between the IMO and the Antarctic Treaty System to help Parties enforce their precautionary systems.
- (229) The Meeting confirmed that the IMO was an appropriate body for addressing safety and environmental concerns related to maritime shipping, and encouraged Parties to work with the IMO towards these matters. It also encouraged Parties with information regarding problems in a tourism context to bring it to the attention of the Meeting.
- (230) India presented IP 104 rev. 1 *Towards a Comprehensive, Proactive and Effective Antarctic Tourism Policy: Turning Recommendations into Action*. It pointed out that many of the issues related to the regulation of Antarctic tourism had remained on the ATCM agenda over several decades. In applying a strategic approach, it suggested that the ATCM could make use of its institutional memory. It considered this would contribute to avoiding duplication of debate on certain issues on the one hand, and underline the urgency to continue discussions in other cases. India further proposed that the ATCM should have a focused discussion on how best to formalise,

institutionalise and operationalise the measures on the regulation of tourism that had accumulated over the decades at various ATCMs.

- (231) The Meeting thanked and congratulated India on the comprehensive analysis provided in IP 104 rev. 1 and considered it a crucial input for the task of the Secretariat. Many Parties endorsed the paper's recommendations, and supported the development of a strategic approach in a step-by-step manner. Some Parties noted that the recommendations would facilitate reaching more concrete actions, including translating many of the recommendations reported into Measures.
- (232) ASOC reminded Parties that some of the actions identified in the paper were not yet complete, noting, for example, that Recommendation XVIII-1 was not yet in force with one Consultative Party yet to ratify it.
- (233) France presented IP 37 *French measures to increase the security of tourism and non-governmental activities in the Antarctic*, which noted that competent French authorities were facing a rising number of requests regarding activities that involved a high level of risk to human life. France noted that it had adopted Measure 4 (2004) in August 2008. It recalled further that Parties recommended at ATCM XXXVII that the steps implementing Measure 4 in their national legislation were undertaken, pending the entry into force of the Measure. To address this issue and comply with the measures and resolutions adopted in compliance with regulations adopted by the ATCM, it reported on an order issued on 12 February 2015, which was in line with Resolutions 6 (2014) and 7 (2014). The order established that: expedition leaders shall assess the risks of the planned activity and medical care, evacuation, costs and insurances; and that the National Competent Authority (NCA) shall take safety into account as part of the authorisation process. Noting that French nationals were submitting similar requests to the Competent Authorities of other Parties, France urged Parties to implement the Measure and strengthen cooperation and the EIES in this area.
- (234) Germany presented IP 65 *Alleged Solo Expedition to the South Pole by a German National*, which highlighted the cooperation among Competent Authorities, and logistic companies concerning the alleged South Pole expedition by the German national Martin S. in January 2015. Noting that the conduct of an unauthorised expedition in the Antarctic was an administrative offence according to its domestic law, Germany informed the Meeting that it had to close the administrative proceeding in this case for lack of evidence that the expedition had taken place. Germany thanked all Parties involved as well as the logistics companies contacted for advice and information given

in order to clarify this matter and highlighted that this example demonstrated the importance of strengthening cooperation among Parties in the exchange of information and organisation of tourist expeditions in the Antarctic.

- (235) IAATO thanked Germany for presenting this good example of collaboration and cooperation between various stakeholders under the Antarctic Treaty System.
- (236) ASOC presented IP 109 *Antarctic Tourism and Protected Areas*, which elaborated on the Antarctic tourism dynamics and its expected impacts. It referred to the interface between protected areas, in a broad sense, and the regulation and management of tourism, and recommended that Parties consider strategically using ASPAs and ASMAs to regulate current and potential future tourism. It recognised that ASMAs were one of the best tools for the management of tourism, including at the subregional level. It noted that ASMA coverage could be usefully extended to that effect. It also suggested that ASPAs could be designated to protect from tourism sites that meet the criteria of Article 3(2) of Annex V to the Environment Protocol.
- (237) New Zealand welcomed a more strategic approach towards this issue and suggested that this line of reasoning could be expanded to particular examples of areas potentially threatened by the increase of touristic activities in the Antarctic. The United Kingdom added that ASMAs may be a useful management tool for managing tourism in Antarctic interior areas, where there are also a range of scientific and other activities. IAATO agreed that a strategic approach towards the use of protected areas and other site management tools was important to address all human activities in Antarctica, not only the activities of non-governmental organisations.

#### *Yachting and other activities in the Antarctic*

- (238) The United Kingdom introduced WP 18 *Inspection of Yachts under the Antarctic Treaty and its Protocol on Environmental Protection*, which reported on inspections of yachts in the Antarctic during the 2005, 2012 and 2014/15 seasons, including a yacht that had refused an inspection. It noted that, under Article VII of the Treaty, access rights for inspections were limited to “points of discharging or embarking cargoes or personnel in Antarctica.” It further noted that it would be undesirable to pursue yachts, or to have to wait for them to make a landing before an inspection took place. The United Kingdom was therefore keen to seek the views of the Parties as to whether it would be helpful to clarify that yachts may be inspected

whilst they were at potential landing sites, or at sites where a landing would be possible, whether or not the yacht was in the process of “discharging or embarking cargoes or personnel”.

- (239) The United Kingdom noted that some Parties had been undertaking inspections of yachts for many years. It also noted that all of the yachts which UK observers had inspected had welcomed the process, particularly those yachts which were members of IAATO. Other than the unauthorised yacht which had refused an inspection during the 2015 season, the United Kingdom reported that it had not experienced any other issues in relation to the inspection of yachts. The United Kingdom considered that yacht inspections provided a significant amount of useful information, and encouraged other Parties undertaking inspections to also inspect yachts where possible.
- (240) The Legal and Institutional Working Group discussed the legal implications arising from this paper separately (see paragraphs 84-87).
- (241) The Meeting thanked the United Kingdom for submitting this useful paper, which had promoted significant discussion on the legal side. The United Kingdom indicated that it would continue to engage other Parties in further discussion intersessionally before determining whether and how to proceed with its proposal.
- (242) New Zealand presented IP 49 *The unauthorized voyage of SV Infinity (2014): Next Steps*, jointly prepared with Germany. It provided an update on the steps taken by New Zealand and Germany in response to the unauthorised voyage of *SV Infinity* in 2014, first reported by New Zealand in ATCM XXXVII - IP 48. New Zealand noted that, despite the *SV Infinity* having breached domestic legislation, it could not take action without extradition, an action it did not consider viable or appropriate in this case. The paper noted that legal proceedings had been taken against the German skipper of *SV Infinity* in respect to his unpermitted entry into ASPA 159, and that these proceedings were ongoing. It recommended that Parties be alert to unpermitted voyages into the Antarctic Treaty area, and share information and cooperate with one another to support legal proceedings where possible under their domestic law.
- (243) Germany clarified that while it had initiated legal proceedings against the skipper of the *SV Infinity* for unauthorised entry into ASPA 159, it could take no further actions regarding: (1) the unauthorised entry to the Antarctic Treaty area because the voyage was not organised in Germany and did not

proceed from German territory; or (2) the damage to the historic hut that was part of HSM 22 due to lack of evidence that the damage was caused by the crew of the *SV Infinity*.

- (244) The Meeting took note of this helpful report from Germany and New Zealand, and noted that the legal issues associated with it would be fully discussed during the Special Working Group on Competent Authorities issues.
- (245) Germany presented IP 64 rev. 1 *The yacht Sarah W. Vorwerk within the Antarctic Treaty area during the season 2014/2015*, jointly prepared with Argentina. It delivered a factual account of the activities of *Sarah W. Vorwerk*, a German-registered, non-IAATO member yacht with a Dutch captain suspected of making an unauthorised journey in the Antarctic Treaty area. It reported that, in previous years, the vessel had been permitted by the German Authorities, but due to the skipper no longer being domiciled in Germany and the organisation of the trip not being from German territory, Germany was no longer the Competent Authority in this case. It noted that the activities included performing dives near Deception Island. In accordance with the Environment Protocol and national implementing legislation, the *Sarah W. Vorwerk* expedition was required to submit a notification and an EIA of its intended Antarctic expedition to a Competent Authority. It acknowledged that there was a community of individuals who spent significant portions of time at sea with no registered domicile, making it challenging to determine the correct Competent Authority to permit their voyages to the Antarctic. The *Sarah W. Vorwerk* had been observed in Antarctica, but it was not clear which Party had issued it a permit. The paper raised concerns regarding unauthorised activities in the Antarctic Treaty area and recommended that Parties concerned consider how to proceed further on this particular episode.
- (246) Several Parties noted the importance of this paper in documenting the complexity that could arise when dealing with highly mobile yachts. They noted that jurisdictional issues may result in challenges to enforcing domestic law. They highlighted that cooperation between Parties was essential to understand the situation both for permitting the activities in advance and resolving any issues associated with such voyages.
- (247) Argentina noted that the master of the *Sarah W. Vorwerk* had entered the country as a tourist on several occasions and had not informed the authorities of his intended activities, thus making any prosecution procedures very difficult. It also underscored the value of cooperation on these matters.

- (248) IAATO thanked the Parties for their follow-up on the issue of non-compliant yachts. It noted that such follow-up was important to responsible operators.
- (249) The Meeting thanked Germany, Argentina, the United Kingdom and New Zealand for submitting these papers. It noted that it was helpful for all Parties to learn about the issues of non-authorized expeditions, and to note the complexity of these issues. It noted that the more complex legal issues related to jurisdiction would be discussed by the Special Working Group on Competent Authorities Issues.
- (250) IAATO presented IP 86 *IAATO Guidelines for Sea Kayaking and Underwater activities*. These guidelines were adopted at its 26<sup>th</sup> Meeting in Rotterdam, 28 – 30 April, 2015 and would be incorporated into the IAATO Field Operations Manual for the 2015/16 season onwards. IAATO mentioned that the guidelines took the Czech-United Kingdom Treaty inspection recommendations into account. Both France and the United Kingdom thanked IAATO for the guidelines.
- (251) The Meeting thanked IAATO for its paper. Some Parties highlighted the utility of such guidelines in ensuring common standards among tour operators, whilst recognising that individual operators must retain full responsibility for the safe conduct of such activities.
- (252) The United Kingdom particularly welcomed IAATO's reference to the recommendation in WP 19 rev. 1 that had encouraged IAATO to develop industry peer and expert reviewed guidelines for the range of activities undertaken by cruise passengers (such as kayaking, snorkelling and diving).
- (253) France informed the Meeting that, while it would take the guidelines into account, it reserved the right to apply stricter regulations than those of IAATO.

*Landing sites related activities*

- (254) IAATO presented IP 85 *Report on IAATO Operator Use of Antarctic Peninsula Landing Sites and ATCM Visitor Site Guidelines, 2013-2014 and 2014-15 Season*. IAATO confirmed that its members remained interested in gaining a better understanding of the use of ATCM Visitor Site Guidelines by non-IAATO visitors.

- (255) New Zealand and the United States presented IP 102 *Antarctic Site Inventory: Results from long-term monitoring*. It provided an update on results of the Antarctic Site Inventory (ASI) project through February 2015. It noted that the ASI Project had monitored the rapid change in the relative populations of gentoo, chinstrap and Adélie penguins throughout the western Antarctic Peninsula, with gentoo populations increasing rapidly and expanding their range southward, and the other two species declining significantly.
- (256) The United Kingdom highlighted the importance of the ASI in producing data that was useful for the ongoing work of the ATCM.
- (257) ASOC noted that site inventories were an additional useful tool to inform the management of tourism.
- (258) Argentina presented IP 128 *Areas of tourist interest in the Antarctic Peninsula and South Orkney Islands region. 2014/2015 austral summer season*. Argentina reported on the distribution of tourist visits to the Antarctic Peninsula and South Orkney Islands region according to the voyages made by vessels during the 2014/15 summer season, operating through the port of Ushuaia. It noted that since ATCM XXXIV it had submitted information about the distribution of tourist visits to the Antarctic Peninsula and South Orkney Islands regions. It highlighted that this paper detailed the most visited areas in the region.
- (259) Argentina presented IP 132 *Tourist Activity in Brown Scientific Station. Study, analysis and management measure*, which provided an update on the development of Argentina's tourism monitoring programme at Brown Scientific Station. It noted that the station was one of the most visited in Antarctica and that all visits to the station were conducted in accordance with the General Guidelines for Visitors to the Antarctic, adopted by Resolution 3 (2011). It informed the Meeting that it had already taken steps to improve management of visitors at Brown Station including marking of trails and surveying vessel passengers. It noted the importance of cooperation with and among tour operators in facilitating the work to improve tourism management. It highlighted the need to regulate visitors to ensure that all visits took place in compliance with environmental measures.
- (260) The Meeting welcomed the papers from IAATO, New Zealand, the United States and Argentina. It noted that all the papers provided useful information.

**Overview of Antarctic Tourism in the 2014/15 season**

- (261) IAATO presented IP 53 *IAATO Overview of Antarctic Tourism: 2013-14, 2014-15 Season and Preliminary Estimates for 2015-16 Season*. Preliminary numbers indicated that the general picture for the 2014/15 season (36,702 persons) were similar to those forecast in ATCM XXXVII - IP 103, and slightly lower than the final figures for the 2013/14 season (37,405 persons). Forecasts for 2015/16 indicated that the numbers would rise to approximately 40,029 individuals, largely due to the addition of two new 200-person passenger vessels and an increase in air-cruise departures. It also highlighted the breakdown of the number of tourists by nationality, and noted that this number was strongly correlated with a country's gross domestic product. IAATO's membership continued to incorporate the majority of private-sector tour operators. All commercial SOLAS passenger ship operators conducting tourism activities in the Antarctic Treaty area were members of IAATO.
- (262) The United Kingdom noted that one terrestrial operator, Arctic Trucks, had recently come under the Competent Authority of the United Kingdom. Several Parties highlighted the benefit of all operators falling under the authority of a country that implemented the Environment Protocol.
- (263) Several Parties noted the recent increase in air-cruise tourism and expressed concerns in respect of these developments. Some Parties questioned IAATO regarding its future plans for refuelling vessels and bunkering of fuel and supplies in relation to this increase.
- (264) IAATO clarified that none of its operators refuelled in the Antarctic nor bunkered fuel or supplies. It noted that none of its operators had expressed a desire to change current practice in this regard.
- (265) In response to a question from ASOC regarding an increase in the number of tourism field camps with respect to the previous year, on account of additional operators listed in IAATO's report, and the operational locations of White Desert and Arctic Trucks, IAATO clarified that no new field camps had been established. The United Kingdom informed the Meeting that it was happy to provide information to interested Parties and Observers about these operations.
- (266) The Meeting welcomed this paper and thanked IAATO for providing such useful information to the Parties. It encouraged IAATO to fully participate in the ICG on Working towards Developing a Strategic Approach to Environmentally Managed Tourism and Non-governmental Activities in Antarctica.

- (267) Bulgaria thanked IAATO for the logistics support it provided to the Bulgarian Antarctic Institute.
- (268) The United Kingdom presented IP 96 *Data Collection and Reporting on Yachting Activity in Antarctica in 2014-15* which it had prepared jointly with IAATO. It reported on the number of yachts sighted in the Antarctic during the past season. The data were derived from reports by the British team at Port Lockroy. The United Kingdom, IAATO and other vessels provided additional data. Compared to the previous year, the overall number of yachts sighted showed a minor increase. The paper highlighted an increase in unauthorised yachts, where six such yachts were sighted. Three unauthorised yachts were flagged to states that had implemented the Environment Protocol; three yachts were flagged to states that had not acceded to the Environment Protocol. The paper encouraged Parties to continue to share information about yachts they had authorised, including via the EIES Pre-season Information facility and via the post-visit site reports, in line with Resolution 5 (2005). IAATO would continue to welcome information about non-IAATO yachts receiving authorisation.
- (269) Several Parties highlighted that the presence of unauthorised yachts in Antarctica was a growing concern. France pointed out the grey area of tourism, comprised of unauthorised activities involving non-IAATO members, and possibly registered under flags of convenience. They noted that some skippers did not seem to be aware of the dangers of navigation nor the SAR challenges for Antarctic waters. They also noted that SAR activities were a burden on the resources of National Antarctic Programmes, authorised tour vessels, and legally operated fishing vessels.
- (270) In response to a question by ASOC concerning the commercial activities of yachts that were not members of IAATO, IAATO noted that half of the authorised non-IAATO yachts regularly, though not annually, conducted charters in Antarctic waters.
- (271) The Meeting thanked IAATO and the United Kingdom for their papers. The Meeting recognised that consideration of issues relating to yachting activities in Antarctica was a high priority topic that should remain on the agenda. It acknowledged that the technical functions of the EIES were currently under review, and requested that the Secretariat generate annually a webpage on which a list of all authorised yachts, vessels and aircraft for each season is included.

- (272) Argentina presented IP 126 *Report on Antarctic tourist flows and cruise ships operating in Ushuaia during the 2014/2015 Austral summer season*. It reported on the cruise ships operating through Ushuaia, including their number and capacity. It further identified the nationalities of tourists, expedition staff members, and the states of registers of vessels that operated in Antarctica. A total of 36,625 passengers on board 28 vessels had gone to Antarctica through Ushuaia. The total number of passengers was 1.4% less than in the 2013/14 season. Argentina commented that the information was based on the vessel manifests provided to the Argentine port authorities.
- (273) Argentina presented IP 127 rev. 1 *Non-commercial pleasure and/or sport vessels that travelled to Antarctica through Ushuaia during the 2014/2015 season*. Argentina pointed out that since ATCM XXXVI it had been providing information on non-commercial recreational vessels that had travelled to Antarctica through Ushuaia. The paper reported on: the number of pleasure or sport boats that had gone to Antarctica from Ushuaia; the duration of the season; the identified sailing vessels; and the number and nationalities of people travelling onboard these sailing boats to Antarctica.
- (274) The Meeting thanked Argentina for providing this useful information. IAATO also noted that data collection from multiple sources was useful for verification purposes and for ensuring the accuracy of information.

## **Special Working Group on Competent Authorities Issues**

### ***Item 1: Introduction***

- (275) At ATCM XXXVI, the Meeting adopted Decision 5 (2013) *Multi-Year Strategic Work Plan (MYSWP) for the Antarctic Treaty Consultative Meeting* whose purpose was to complement the Agenda by assisting the ATCM in identifying priority issues and operating more effectively and efficiently. ATCM XXXVII decided to hold a special session on Competent Authorities issues relating to tourism and non-governmental activities in Antarctica and, through Decision 3 (2014), updated the Multi-year Strategic Work Plan. It was decided that a Special Working Group would convene for one day at ATCM XXXVIII. The aim of the Special Working Group was to: enable Parties, Observers and Experts to exchange experiences relating to particular areas of concern; discuss Environment Protocol implementation; and discuss areas of commonality to define future direction.

- (276) The ATCM XXXVIII Special Working Group on Competent Authorities Issues was held on Monday 8 June 2015 in Sofia, Bulgaria. The Special Working Group was chaired by Ms Birgit Njåstad (Norway) (SP 16 rev. 1).
- (277) The following papers were submitted to the Special Working Group and were taken as presented:

*i. Information Papers summarising national authorisation and permitting processes*

- IP 4 *Special WG on Competent Authorities issues: Summary of the United Kingdom's Antarctic Permitting Process* (United Kingdom). This paper reported on the implementation of the Antarctic Treaty and its Protocol on Environmental Protection (including its Annexes I-VI) into United Kingdom law through the UK Antarctic Acts 1994 and 2013, and associated Antarctic Regulations.
- IP 6 rev. 1 *Special WG on Competent Authorities issues: Summary of Japan's Certification Process of Antarctic Activity* (Japan). This paper outlined Japan's certification process of Antarctic activity and recent trends. It also informed on some challenges that Japan had faced in its certification process, in spite of the few annual applications submitted by non-governmental operators.
- IP 36 *Special WG on Competent Authorities session - Brief summary of the French competent authority domestic process* (France). It outlined the French competent authority authorisation process.
- IP 38 *Special WG on Competent Authorities Issues - Summary of South Africa's Antarctic Authorisation Process* (South Africa). This paper reported on South Africa's Antarctic Treaties Act No. 60 of 1996 which incorporated the Antarctic Treaty and Environment Protocol into South African law. It also outlined South Africa's authorisation process for Antarctic activities.
- IP 72 *Proceso de autorización de actividades no gubernamentales en la Antártica. [Authorisation process of non-governmental activities in Antarctica]* (Chile). This paper reported on the authorisation process applicable to non-governmental activities undertaken by Chilean citizens or organised in Chilean territory, to comply with the Environment Protocol and the complementary rules on the protection of the Antarctic environment.

- IP 81 *Special WG on Competent Authorities issues - Summary of the United States Framework for Regulation of Antarctic Tourism* (United States). This paper presented an overview of the current United States framework for regulation of United States tourist expeditions to Antarctica. The United States implemented the Protocol through legislation and regulations and had an interest in minimising environmental impacts of United States tourists and United States-based tour operators.
- IP 108 *Special WG on Competent Authorities Issues - Summary of Canada's Antarctic Permitting System* (Canada). This paper reported on Canada's Antarctic Environmental Protection Act (2003) (AEPA) and the associated Antarctic Environmental Protection Regulations to implement the Antarctic Treaty and the Protocol. It also reported on the number of permits issued each year to Antarctic tour operators, scientific expeditions, and adventure expeditions.
- IP 117 *Special WG on Competent Authorities issues - Summary of Parties' competent authority domestic process* (Norway). This paper presented an overview of the brief summaries on domestic process Parties had submitted to the Special Working Group on Competent Authorities Issues. It noted that 13 of the 37 Parties that had ratified the Environment Protocol had responded.

*ii. Information Papers containing examples and experiences relevant to the agenda of the Special Working Group on Competent Authorities Issues.*

- IP 35 *Special WG on Competent Authorities session - French issues and experiences of relevance to the paragraphs III to VII of the agenda* (France). This paper highlighted the issues of relevance for the Competent Authority of France, in relation to the Competent Authorities Special WG Agenda items III, IV, V, VI and VII.
- IP 54 *Special WG on Competent Authorities Issues - Agenda Item V - Development of Domestic Guidance on Emergency Preparedness, Response Planning and Insurance Requirements (Measure 4 (2004))* (New Zealand). It provided information on New Zealand's domestic guidance for applicants on emergency preparedness, response planning and insurance requirements (Measure 4 (2004)).
- IP 58 *Special Working Group on Competent Authorities issues - Examples and Issues from the United Kingdom* (United Kingdom). This paper highlighted some examples of recent issues arising from the work of

the United Kingdom's Competent Authority for the implementation of the Treaty and the Protocol: applications for additional activities within expeditions authorised by another Consultative Party; applications involving relatively novel or potentially high risk activities; applications involving non-Treaty Party assets or operators; and British activities in Antarctica for which no application was received.

- IP 66 *Special Working Group on Competent Authorities session – German contribution* (Germany). The paper highlighted some questions including: whether other Parties had refused authorisation of adventure activities in the past; and which special permit provisos and conditions were in use among Parties in order to regulate such activities.
- IP 75 *Special WG on Competent Authorities session - An illustration of successful cooperation between NCAs* (Chile and France). This paper reported on the experience of an activity carried out by French nationals during season 2014/15. After the authorisation to conduct the activity had been refused by the French National Authority, the expedition attempted to obtain an authorisation from Chilean authorities. Due to good communication and cooperation between Chilean and French authorities, the activity was monitored and ultimately carried out in compliance with the Antarctic regulatory framework.
- IP 95 *Special WG on Competent Authorities session - Implementing the Madrid Protocol. Dutch experiences and questions for the ATCM workshop of Competent Authorities* (Netherlands). This paper reported on the implementation process of the Treaty and Protocol into Dutch law through the Protection of Antarctica Act 1998.
- IP 107 *Special WG on Competent Authorities Issues - Recent Canadian Permitting Issues* (Canada). This paper reported on the recent permits that Canada had issued relating to marine based tourism, flight support for scientific research, and a solo adventure expedition. In the course of its permitting activities, Canada had identified a number of areas where additional guidance or coordination with other Parties would be of possible benefit, such as adventure activities, UAVs, Canadians operating as part of tours organised by other Parties, forum shopping, and activities involving national bases.
- IP 123 *Special WG on competent Authorities session - Experiences and examples from the Norwegian competent authorities* (Norway). Norway considered that a joint assessment of all aspects of an activity would

provide the best approach to the issues that must be considered. This included environmental impact, contingency plans and insurance.

*iii. Other papers submitted to the ATCM that may inform the discussions at the Special Working Group*

- IP 37 *French measures to increase the security of tourism and non-governmental activities in the Antarctic* (France). This paper reported that, in compliance with regulations adopted by the ATCM and in view of the rising number of requests regarding activities that involved a high level of risk to human life, the French Competent Authority adopted an order on 12 February 2015 establishing that expedition leaders shall assess the risks of the planned activity and the competent national authority shall take security into account as part of the authorisation process.
- IP 49 *The unauthorised voyage of the SV Infinity (2014): Next Steps* (New Zealand & Germany). The paper described the unauthorised voyage of the *SV Infinity* in the Ross Sea in early 2014, and provided an update on the steps taken by New Zealand and Germany in response to the voyage.
- IP 64 rev. 1 *The yacht Sarah W. Vorwerk within the Antarctic Treaty area during the season 2014/2015* (Germany and Argentina). This paper was submitted with reference to Article 13, paragraph 4 of the Protocol regarding the sharing of information on activities affecting the implementation of the Protocol. It presented a factual account of the activities of the *SV Sarah W. Vorwerk*. It was suspected that in December 2014, the yacht had performed a journey within the Antarctic Treaty area without authorisation.
- IP 65 *Alleged Solo Expedition to the South Pole by a German National* (Germany). This paper highlighted the cooperation among Competent Authorities, Parties and logistic companies concerning the alleged South Pole expedition by the German national Martin S. in January 2015.

***Item 2: Views from the tourist operators' (applicants') perspective by the International Association of Antarctica Tour Operators (IAATO)***

(278) IAATO provided an overview of Competent Authorities issues from the perspective of tour operators (applicants) noting that, between them, IAATO operators' activities were assessed by 14 different Competent Authorities. The different approaches by Competent Authorities within the ambit of

IAATO member operations were contrasted and IAATO highlighted that the different approaches created some challenges, but also some benefits in terms of supporting the Antarctic Treaty System. IAATO noted that, from its perspective, the principal key in ensuring success in the authorisation system was good communication with all stakeholders as this allowed for transparency and a clear understanding of the various roles and responsibilities.

(279) The Meeting thanked IAATO for its presentation and for the useful information and insights provided, noting that this would indeed inform the further discussions.

***Item 3: What issues have Parties' Competent Authorities encountered when handling activities involving participants from multiple nations and/or organisations?***

***Item 4: What issues have Parties' Competent Authorities encountered when handling activities where various elements of the activities have been handled/approved/permited by different national authorities?***

(280) The Meeting discussed a range of issues encountered by National Competent Authorities on determining whether an activity had been approved by another NCA, and how to avoid double, or lack of, authorisation. These included:

- the question of multiple authorisations;
- the quality of communication mechanisms between NCAs;
- the EIES's limitations with regard to relevant information regarding Competent Authorities, expedition details, authorisations, information regarding permits or authorisations denied, and the updating of the NCA contact list;
- the need to face the issue of forum shopping and third-party flagged vessels;
- the difficulty of accessing lists of denied permits or authorisation and understanding the reasons for their denial;
- the desirability for NCAs to provide information to Parties with Antarctic SAR coordination responsibilities of activities planned to take place in their area;
- the problems related to the enforcement of relevant provisions within domestic legislation;

- the lack of progress in the ratification of Annex VI of the Environment Protocol;
  - station visits that involve multiple NCAs;
  - authorisations particularly related to adventure sport tourism activities; and
  - complications arising from expeditions that contain a mix of NGO and governmental visitors.
- (281) Acknowledging the issue of communication and timely notifications of activities as a common theme and concern shared among Parties, there was broad agreement to continue working on updating the EIES to be more user-friendly, current and comprehensive. It was suggested that the EIES should be used to produce more easily accessible detailed information on: permitting or authorisation of activities; information on Competent Authorities' contact details; permitted or authorised activities that also involved nationals from different Parties; and a list of non-permitted or non-authorised activities. Parties also recommended that Competent Authorities' contact information be available on the Secretariat's website. It was further suggested that communication be enhanced with NCAs with Antarctic SAR coordination responsibilities.
- (282) The Secretariat informed the Meeting that it had the capability and flexibility to enhance the contacts database to include dynamic and detailed information on Competent Authorities' contact points in accordance with Parties' suggestions.
- (283) The Meeting discussed a range of issues on how to determine which NCA was responsible for permitting or authorising a particular activity. The Meeting noted that it was not always clear which NCA was responsible for permitting or authorising a proposed non-governmental activity, and highlighted the complexities that arose when, for example, at least two NCAs had been contacted regarding authorisation of the same activity.
- (284) It was noted that, in the case of cruise ship and land-based tourism, it was general practice for the operator, and not individual tourists, to be identified as the responsible entity. It was more difficult to determine the responsible entity in the case of very small expeditions such as yachts, one-off activities and adventure tourism.
- (285) Some Parties also pointed out the difficulties in prosecuting unauthorised activities of their nationals. Complexities relating to the prosecution of unauthorised nationals included: dealing with individuals with multiple

passports; national legislation that only applied to activities organised nationally; and different levels of involvement between those who initiated an activity and those responsible for its execution. One suggestion was that the Meeting consider discussing an instrument such as CCAMLR's Conservation Measure 10-08 (2009), which promoted compliance by contracting party nationals with CCAMLR conservation measures. Another suggestion was to consider the notion of "Illegal, Unreported and Unregulated" tourism.

- (286) In cases where operators from more than one Party were involved in permitting or authorising an activity, the Meeting highlighted the importance of bilateral communication between relevant NCAs. This should be done in addition to the use of the EIES.
- (287) Suggested ways forward on this matter included considering ideas on: follow-up of nationals participating in unauthorised activities; communicating on-the-ground observations and monitoring of unauthorised activities; considering the extent of unauthorised activities; developing principles for communication between NCAs, including when communication should be initiated; and coordinated and timely reporting through the EIES.
- (288) The Meeting noted a number of examples showing that an activity was often defined as a compilation of one or more smaller, distinct sub-activities. It further noted that, from the NCA's perspective, it was important to ensure that all aspects of an activity were considered appropriately while, at the same time, ensuring that no aspect of an activity was considered by more than one Party.
- (289) Based on previous experience and information exchanged, the Parties raised various issues relating to the identification and authorisation of sub-activities. These included:
- taking into account the various national procedures and legislation of NCAs;
  - amending activity applications after granting a permit or authorisation; and
  - establishing principles about when communication and consultation with other Parties were required.
- (290) The Meeting noted that, upon receiving notification of such sub-activities, it could sometimes be difficult for an NCA to identify if such a sub-activity had been considered part of a larger activity already permitted/authorised, or whether it should be considered a separate activity that needed its own

approval/permit. This could be particularly challenging if the original (larger) activity was approved by another Party. Several Parties raised concerns that one part of the activity may dovetail with the other parts of the activity in a manner that made it difficult to distinguish which entity was responsible for an activity. A number of examples were given, such as belated requests to use UAVs, or requests for additional permits or authorisations for swimming and diving activities.

- (291) The Meeting considered that an activity might be defined as a ‘sub-activity’ when it exceeded the framework of the main activity originally permitted/authorised or when it was an activity for which the entity requesting the initial permit/authorisation was not competent to supervise, for example in the case of a non-governmental science activity using tour vessel transport to conduct its work ashore. In this and similar cases separate approval for the sub-activity could be required, and could be problematic when operators were reluctant to apply for additional permits/authorisations or resubmit an application. Some Parties pointed out that splitting the activities involved certain risks to the process of overseeing all the activities involved. The Meeting acknowledged the complications involved in issuing different permits/authorisations for similar or linked activities and that, in principle, NCAs should assess activities in their entirety to the largest extent possible.
- (292) The Meeting noted the utility of post-visit reporting, as provided for in Resolution 6 (2005) on the Antarctic Post Visit Site Report Form, for determining the extent to which the proposed activities matched the reported activities. Post-visit reporting had also been used as the basis for assessment of renewal of permits/authorisations. The Meeting welcomed further discussions on post-visit reporting and the possibility of sharing this information more broadly.
- (293) The Meeting had fruitful discussions on activities that included several sub-activities. There was general agreement that it would be best practice to consider the entirety of an activity during the permitting, authorisation, or notification process, but recognised that this was not always possible. The Meeting also discussed the need to comprehensively consider the contingency plans for expeditions, including insurance and SAR services.
- (294) The Meeting discussed the circumstances that could enable forum shopping. It noted that Parties had nuances in how they interpreted and implemented the Environment Protocol, which could lead to differences in standards and assessment criteria. It further noted that, when an activity involved

participants from multiple nations, an organiser might be appointed who could seek permit/authorisation from the Party where the outcome of the application process was most likely to be beneficial. The Meeting noted that participants in an activity who could demonstrate that the activity had received authorisation from another Party would not have to seek authorisation from their own Party. Establishing that such activities had actually received appropriate permits/authorisations, authorisations or notifications would require the Competent Authority to contact colleagues in other Parties' Competent Authorities, but it would be too late to reverse the application process.

- (295) The Meeting noted that there were both positive and negative issues associated with forum shopping. The practice could productively be used to bring operators from countries that had not implemented the Environment Protocol under the oversight of Parties that had. It further noted that there was merit in discussing forum shopping, but that the scope of the issue was not well understood. Acknowledging that forum shopping was an important topic, the Meeting noted that it would be helpful to further explore the scope of the issue. The Meeting considered that it would be able to readily develop ways to implement the two suggested mechanisms that sought to decrease negative forum shopping through increased communication. The Meeting expressed concern that such issues would likely increase with the further diversification of human activities in Antarctica and the further development of domestic policies regarding the assessment of diverse types of activities in the Antarctic. Additionally, it noted that forum shopping also could be an issue when the activity involved participants from one nation seeking to get approval/permit from a different nation when national procedures/requirements/strategies were considered limiting.
- (296) There was an exchange of information and experience in which Parties discussed one clear example of forum shopping by an organiser of a potentially risky adventure activity. The Parties involved noted that effective communication and cooperation had been key in ensuring that this activity did not proceed in Antarctica. The Parties also highlighted the importance of cooperating with the relevant MRCC when such an application had been received. They also noted that, in this case, the organiser made two failed attempts to seek a permit/authorisation from one Party's Competent Authority. This Party then clearly communicated to others that the application had been denied for a number of reasons including safety and liability concerns. A second Party then identified the participants of this activity at an Antarctic gateway port, where they were informed that they lacked the

necessary authorisation to proceed. At this point the organiser attempted to submit an application to the Competent Authority of the second Party. The application was not accepted, and the expedition did not proceed to Antarctica.

- (297) The Meeting discussed two potential mechanisms for improving communication to reduce the incidence of potentially negative forum shopping. The first involved adding a mechanism in the EIES to alert all NCAs when an application had been denied so as to inform on possible forum shopping. They noted that such formal notification had been very helpful in the example discussed above. The second mechanism involved creating an informal mechanism for Competent Authorities to discuss potentially problematic expeditions before a formal decision had been made. It was suggested that this could be facilitated by creating a password protected forum on the ATS website dedicated to this purpose and ensuring that only Competent Authorities had access to the site. The Meeting considered that such early communications about expeditions could resolve issues before they escalated.
- (298) The Meeting emphasised the importance of communication and exchange of information when participants or entities from different nations were involved in an activity. It had previously recognised the necessity of communication between NCAs and Parties in such instances, most recently through Resolution 3 (2004). This Resolution encouraged Parties: to exchange information about activities, involving potential implications for other Parties; to consult relevant Parties as appropriate during the process of evaluating activities and, where applicable, prior to any decision to authorise the activity or permit to proceed; and to nominate to the Secretariat a single contact point for information about tourism and non-governmental activities in Antarctica. In view of the issues mentioned by the Parties, it was suggested that there was still room for improvement in implementing these resolutions.
- (299) Recalling Resolution 3 (2004) *Tourism and non-governmental activities: Enhanced cooperation amongst Parties* and Resolution 6 (2010) *Improving the co-ordination of maritime search and rescue in the Antarctic Treaty Area*, the Meeting noted that these were both helpful resolutions but could be updated to improve communication efforts. Specifically, the Meeting noted that Resolution 3 (2004) contained a list of a single contact point for tourism activities in each Party, and that this contact point was not always the Competent Authority. Making reference to Resolution 6 (2010), it was noted

that it would also be useful to have this information and a list of contacts of the five Antarctic RCCs available on the Antarctic Treaty Secretariat website.

- (300) On the basis of this exchange, the Meeting suggested that a way to move forward would be to create a list of Competent Authority contact points and to create a comprehensive list of the five relevant MRCC and RCC contact points. It further noted that it might be useful to consider ways to share lessons learned after the completion of different cases.

***Item 5: What issues have Parties' Competent Authorities encountered when assessing safety issues related to activities?***

- (301) The Meeting noted that there was an increasing number of activities in Antarctica. It further suggested that new activities, especially sport and adventure-related, presented risks and that Competent Authorities might lack information on the risks involved. The Meeting further noted that petitioners often underestimated the risks involved, which called for more in-depth considerations by the NCAs and more extensive communication with the petitioners on this topic. The Meeting noted examples of cooperation amongst NCAs to contain forum shopping pursuant to denials of authorisation, and agreed that enhancing cooperation between NCAs was a major point to avoid potentially risky unauthorised expeditions taking place in Antarctica.
- (302) The Meeting noted that, in regards to Resolution 4 (2004), when assessing applications it could be challenging to define "sufficient experience". It was noted that understanding the term "sufficient experience" could be key to understanding some safety aspects of the proposed activity. Parties further noted that, as activities diversified, it could become harder to assess the applications and determine that participants' safety and environmental protection were ensured. Some Parties gave examples of situations in which they found it challenging to assess the safety of an activity. The Meeting noted that the five relevant MRCCs and RCCs had a critical role to play in ensuring the safety of participants and the environment and could be consulted to seek advice. Some Parties noted that each individual activity should be assessed for specific risks and made reference to risk assessment matrices that had been developed for this purpose. Parties also suggested that particular activities might need to include additional risk specific information, such as special medical evaluation certificates, in order to ensure they are thoroughly assessed. IAATO noted that it had already implemented such a sample medical checklist for its members, highlighting the importance

to the operators of knowing their clients and also the proposed activity so they could tailor their medical capabilities accordingly. The Meeting acknowledged that it was important for those conducting the activity to be aware of situation and site specific conditions, and to be self-sufficient as much as possible to both prevent emergencies and deal with situations as they arose. The Meeting discussed that potentially risky activities conducted by non-governmental organisations also posed risks to National Antarctic Programmes. It noted that, in the event of an emergency, National Antarctic Programme resources could be diverted away from their core objectives to assist with an emergency response.

- (303) Suggested ways forward on the issues included revising the site specific Guidelines for Visitors to include an identification of risks associated with in-water activities and developing guidelines for assessing the conduct of specific activities in Antarctica.
- (304) It was noted that the discussions and exchange of information at the Meeting were important, and should continue. The Meeting acknowledged that further discussions were needed to understand elements of Measure 4 (2004), including a need to better understand or define “sufficient experience” and “sufficient medical requirements”. Recalling Resolution 7 (2014), the Meeting also encouraged Parties to bring Measure 4 (2004) into force so that it could be fully implemented. The Meeting expressed the intent to consider developing further guidance for the review of activities.
- (305) Parties were also encouraged to monitor social media, such as expedition websites or blogs, as a source of information on non-governmental activities. NCAs were further encouraged to communicate such relevant information to their counterparts.
- (306) Recognising that many NCAs had developed guidelines or conditions/provisos in the permits related to assessment procedures, the Meeting noted the usefulness in sharing such tools and considered that an information exchange forum could be appropriate. This could be achieved through a mailing list of Competent Authorities. IAATO reminded parties of its ATCM XXV – IP 72 rev. 1, which identified the various guidelines available to its members, and noted its willingness to be involved in any form of information sharing. The Meeting noted the value of IAATO’s ownership of industry peer-reviewed guidelines and encouraged IAATO to continue sharing its guidelines with the ATCM, so that NCAs could use them for assessing proposals from non-IAATO operators.

***Item 6: What issues/challenges of wider implication/interest have Parties' Competent Authorities handled with regard to various types of activities?***

(307) The Meeting discussed a range of issues encountered by NCAs when assessing the increasing diversification of new activities. These issues included:

- the lack of guidelines or information on activities that specific NCAs had not dealt with before, such as kite skiing, snorkelling, and leisure fishing;
- how to address individuals in National Antarctic Programmes engaging in leisure activities;
- potentially risky adventure activities masked under an application as a scientific activity;
- the lack of a harmonised position across Treaty Parties, especially in relation to potentially risky activities for the environment and the safety of the environment;
- the existence of different types of activities that added to the diversity of behaviour and interaction with the environment;
- the difficulty in regulating and anticipating the types of interactions with the environment in relation to new activities;
- the need for comprehensive descriptions of activities;
- the need to consider cumulative impact when assessing the range of activities proposed;
- the challenge in preventing unauthorised expeditions taking place; and
- the diversification of proponents of activities.

(308) The Meeting suggested a focus on risk rather than specific types of activities, noting the consistency of this approach with the provisions of the Environment Protocol. The Meeting also identified the broadcasting of the requirements and applicability of the Protocol to new proponents of activities in the Antarctic Treaty area as an important step in addressing the diversification of proponents.

(309) Some Parties highlighted that the existence of non-Treaty Party assets and operators in the Antarctic Treaty area was a continuing challenge to the comprehensive regulation of activities in Antarctica.

- (310) The Meeting, while noting that these were complex issues, suggested further consideration and discussion in the future.

***Item 7: Have Parties' Competent Authorities encountered challenges/ issues considering activities in light of the purpose and principles of the Protocol and other relevant ATCM recommendations?***

- (311) The Meeting considered how NCAs had taken into account the general principles of the Environment Protocol, as set out in Article 3(1). Since the Protocol did not provide specific guidance on how to incorporate the principles into the authorisation of activities, the Meeting noted how the diversification of activities allowed in Antarctica posed additional challenges to NCAs. The Meeting discussed instances where activities were discouraged or permits/authorisations were denied in relation to the principles of the Protocol and other relevant ATCM recommendations.
- (312) The Meeting considered examples where permits/authorisation had been either delayed or denied as a result of their being considered inconsistent with the principles set out in Article 3(1) of the Protocol. Some NCAs commented that they discouraged applications for activities that would be inconsistent with their national policies and legislation. Other Parties had refused permits/authorisation on a range of grounds, including procedural concerns, safety concerns, potential environmental impact and breaching legislation related to intrinsic, wilderness and aesthetic values. Some Parties noted that the intrinsic values of Antarctica, including wilderness and aesthetic values, had been incorporated in national legislation, and subsequently informed the work of NCAs. Further definition of values protected under the Protocol such as wilderness, and guidance on the role of these values in assessing Antarctic activities, would aid NCAs in their permitting/authorisation role, particularly in view of the diversification of Antarctic activities.
- (313) The Meeting noted that existing work and recommendations should be taken into account in further discussions on Competent Authorities, with specific reference to the ATME on Tourism and Non-governmental Activities (2004); the ATME on Management of Ship-borne Tourism in the Antarctic Treaty Area (2009) and the CEP Tourism Study (2012).
- (314) It was further suggested that, in addition to a precautionary approach, an anticipatory approach should be considered in relation to emerging issue areas. For example, new trends in airborne tourism that posed a different set of challenges than those addressed in the recommendations arising from

the 2009 ATME on the Management of Ship-borne Tourism in the Antarctic Treaty area.

***Item 8: General Summary and concluding remarks***

- (315) The Special Working Group gave NCAs the opportunity to exchange experiences and information on a number of relevant issues and challenges faced by NCAs in handling non-governmental activities in Antarctica. The Meeting noted the utility of having the opportunity for such exchange at suitable intervals in the future.
- (316) The Meeting concluded that there was a need to develop: contact lists for Competent Authorities and the five relevant RCCs; more comprehensive guidance for assessment of various types of activity; the development of principles for communication between NCAs; a forum to exchange information between Competent Authorities; further development of the EIES to enhance its usefulness for Competent Authorities; understanding and guidance on Measure 4 (2004); informing other NCAs on non-permitted or authorised activities, both in terms of the formal decline of permits/authorisation and on those operators who had been engaged with and discouraged from activity; and increasing outreach to new proponents of Antarctic activity.
- (317) The Meeting reported on continuing issues with regards to: dealing with participants in activities who were not nationals of the Parties that authorised the activity; and how to direct legal action against those individuals.
- (318) The Meeting also noted the utility of post visit reports in considering these issues; and the desirability of bringing Measure 4 (2004) into force.

**Item 12: Inspections under the Antarctic Treaty and the Environment Protocol**

- (319) The United Kingdom introduced WP 19 rev. 1 *General Recommendations from the Joint Inspections undertaken by the United Kingdom and the Czech Republic under Article VII of the Antarctic Treaty and Article 14 of the Environmental Protocol*, and referred to IP 57 *Report of the Joint Inspections undertaken by the United Kingdom and the Czech Republic under Article VII of the Antarctic Treaty and Article 14 of the Environmental Protocol*. Both papers were jointly prepared with the Czech Republic. The United Kingdom reported on the joint Antarctic Treaty Inspection conducted in

the Antarctic Peninsula region during the 2014/15 season by the United Kingdom and the Czech Republic. The inspections included 12 research stations, one non-governmental facility, one refuge, six cruise vessels and five yachts. It identified a total of 26 recommendations. A number of these were general recommendations arising from the inspection programme, and it was highlighted that these had relevance beyond the specific recommendations for the individual stations and vessels contained within the full inspection report. The recommendations were framed in the following areas: Personnel and Training; Scientific Research; Logistics and Infrastructure; Transport and Communications Safety; Training and Emergency Procedures; Environmental Management; Medical; and Tourism.

- (320) The Meeting thanked the proponents for the paper, and congratulated the Czech Republic for participating in its first inspection so soon after becoming a Consultative Party in 2014. Parties acknowledged the expense, time and logistics necessary to carry out an inspection, and noted that co-operative endeavours in inspections represented the spirit of cooperation at the heart of the Antarctic Treaty System.
- (321) Some Parties reported on specific recommendations made in IP 57. In relation to the inspections of the German Antarctic Receiving Station (GARS) O'Higgins, Germany reiterated its feedback that GARS was neither utilised for military activities nor processed data for military purposes. Chile reported on a special training course it had implemented, which included specific training on the Antarctic Treaty and environmental protection measures.
- (322) In responding to the recommendations in IP 57, Ukraine reported on its current station development work, including the plan for upgrading and modernising the station up to 2020. It noted that the inspector's remarks had been studied and that measures had been taken to address the recommendations. Norway noted that Ukraine's comments reflected the different capacities of different Parties in responding to recommendations, and considered these capacities should be taken into account in inspection reports.
- (323) Ukraine also noted the submission of its site guidelines in relation to its station, and IAATO commented on the utility of those guidelines.
- (324) Brazil thanked the United Kingdom and the Czech Republic, whose findings about the Brazilian station were very positive. Brazil recognised the usefulness of inspections insofar as they aimed to reinforce the objectives of the Antarctic Treaty and the Protocol. Brazil spoke about its courtesy visits to seven stations, together with Argentina, which were described in BP 2.

Brazil highlighted the recommendatory nature of the inspection reports which reflected the view of the proponents of inspections and could be taken into account as appropriate by the inspected Parties.

- (325) Australia welcomed the report on inspections of two Australian yachts and the process of consultation subsequently undertaken by the inspecting Parties.
- (326) Referring to Recommendation 9 of WP 19 rev. 1, some Parties advised others to be careful in encouraging scientific activities on tourist vessels, or as part of tourist expeditions, and noted a trend among tour operators to promote a scientific element of their programme as a way of justifying their expeditions. The Netherlands referred specifically to a recent fatal accident with two polar explorers in the Arctic during a voyage that had been flagged under science but was mainly driven as an adventure trip. In responding to Recommendation 9, IAATO expressed sympathy with the concerns raised by the Netherlands but noted the significant value of citizen science, and hoped efforts between authorising parties and operators would resolve these issues without threatening the potential for citizen science as a whole.
- (327) Several Parties and ASOC emphasised the importance of Parties providing follow-up on inspection report recommendations to the ATCM, and cited BP 14 from India as a good example of this. Argentina noted the utility of the existing inspection procedure which permitted the inspected Parties to comment on a draft report, and indicated that a follow-up with a discussion at the ATCM was the best way of providing feedback.
- (328) Several Parties expressed reservations on Recommendation 7 of WP 19 rev. 1, specifically noting that the scope of inspections should be limited to Article 14 of the Environment Protocol, and should not extend to commentary on the scientific activities of National Antarctic Programmes. Other Parties noted that Article VII of the Antarctic Treaty permitted broader inspections than Article 14, and stressed that it should be up to the inspector to decide the scope of the inspection within the context of the Antarctic Treaty System. In relation to Recommendation 11, Argentina noted that, although desirable, it was not always possible for Parties to utilise renewable energy. Argentina also expressed some concerns regarding Recommendation 20, pointing out that different waste water systems may be appropriate for stations with different numbers of personnel.
- (329) The Meeting expressed appreciation to the United Kingdom and the Czech Republic for conducting these inspections and for their efforts to provide

this report. It further agreed that the recommendations of inspection reports were specific to the proponents of the inspections, and should be considered as appropriate by the inspected Parties.

### **Item 13: Science Issues, Scientific Cooperation and Facilitation**

- (330) The United Kingdom introduced WP 16 *The role of Antarctica in global climate processes*, jointly prepared with Norway. The paper proposed that, prior to COP21 of the UNFCCC being held in Paris in December 2015, the ATCM adopt a new Resolution to further highlight the importance of climate change scientific activity and expertise in Antarctica, encouraging National Antarctic Programmes to continue this important work to further improve understanding of, and to more accurately predict, global dynamics in a changing climate. It also included a draft Resolution on the role of Antarctica in global climate processes, fostering representatives' National Antarctic Programmes to work with SCAR to consider how best to promote international Antarctic climate change research to COP21.
- (331) In response to initial concerns raised by some Parties that such a Resolution may be beyond the mandate of the ATCM, some Parties stressed that debates on climate change within the ATCM should focus only on the impacts of climate change in Antarctica and should not address issues that refer to mitigation measures or any other aspect related to the substance of the negotiations on climate change in the context of the UNFCCC. In response, the United Kingdom and Norway emphasised that the objective of the draft Resolution was to promote the importance of climate science conducted in Antarctica. The intention was not to formally relay the Resolution to a specific body outside the ATCM. The United Kingdom also clarified why this proposal had not been presented to the CEP, noting that WP 16 concerned the promotion of climate change science in Antarctica, and not the impacts of climate change.
- (332) The Meeting thanked the United Kingdom and Norway, and recognised that scientific research on climate change conducted in Antarctica played an important role in improving our understanding of the effects of climate change. ASOC also supported the resolution and noted the importance of the ATCM's leadership on Antarctic climate change science.
- (333) The Meeting adopted Resolution 6 (2015) *The Role of Antarctica in Global Climate Processes*.

### *Future Programmes*

- (334) SCAR presented IP 20 *Outcomes of the 1st SCAR Antarctic and Southern Ocean Science Horizon Scan*, which advised Parties on the results from the project aiming to identify the most important scientific questions in and about the Antarctic that should be addressed over the next two decades and beyond. It informed the Parties that more than 70 of the world's leading Antarctic scientists, policy makers and visionaries identified the 80 highest priority questions in six broad areas. SCAR noted further that, to answer these questions, it would be necessary to: provide long-term sustained and stable research funding; ensure access to Antarctica throughout the year; apply emerging technologies; strengthen protection of the region; grow international cooperation; and improve communication among all interested parties.
- (335) COMNAP presented IP 59 *The COMNAP Antarctic Roadmap Challenges (ARC) project*, which was a follow-on from the SCAR Horizon Scan. The ARC project identified associated challenges of a technical and logistical nature in the delivery of such science. It advised that the results would be considered in a workshop in Tromsø 2015 that would produce an outcome document for National Antarctic Programmes, highlighting the likely technology and logistical needs for future science programmes in the Antarctic Treaty area.
- (336) The Meeting thanked SCAR and COMNAP and congratulated them for undertaking these projects. It was noted that the projects strengthened knowledge of the Southern Ocean and Antarctica, not only for the Antarctic scientific community, but worldwide.

### *International Scientific Cooperation*

- (337) Australia presented IP 116 *East Antarctic / Ross Sea Workshop on Collaborative Science*, jointly prepared with China. It proposed to host two East Antarctic/Ross Sea Workshops on Collaborative Science in Hobart, Australia in 2016 and in China in 2017 to allow nations with an active research programme in East Antarctica and the Ross Sea region to help plan major, multinational collaborative research science projects for 2017/18 onwards. The first workshop would identify major science projects that could be undertaken, whilst the second workshop would focus on logistics. Australia invited National Antarctic Programmes wanting to participate to contact the workshop organisers.
- (338) The Meeting thanked Australia and China and commended this initiative to promote international cooperation on science in Antarctica.

- (339) In presenting IP 116, Australia referred to the Multi-year Strategic Work Plan priority to collate and compare strategic science priorities with a view to identifying cooperation opportunities. Australia noted that promoting international cooperation in the conduct of globally significant science in Antarctica was a fundamental aim of the Antarctic Treaty. Australia supported the ATCM playing a greater role in identifying shared scientific objectives and advancing international cooperation to achieve these objectives. Australia invited further consideration of this subject by the ATCM, with a view to assisting individual Parties to direct their national scientific programmes, avoid duplication of effort, and help to effectively identify and coordinate projects that require international cooperation to be achieved.
- (340) Romania presented three papers reporting on its cooperation with other Parties in Antarctica: IP 91 *Cooperation between Romania and Korea (ROK) in Antarctica*; IP 135 *Cooperation of Romania with Australia in Antarctica*; and IP 136 *Cooperation of Romania with Bulgaria in the Antarctic field*. Romania thanked the Republic of Korea, Australia and Bulgaria for their cooperative efforts.
- (341) Germany presented IP 63 *EU-PolarNet – Connecting Science with Society*, prepared jointly with Belgium, Bulgaria, France and Portugal. It reported on the five-year European coordination and support action EU-PolarNet. From 2015 to 2020 EU-PolarNet would develop and deliver a strategic framework and mechanisms to prioritise science; optimise the use of polar infrastructure; and broker new partnerships that would lead to the co-design of polar research projects. It comprised all major polar research institutions and polar infrastructure providers in Europe. The results would be presented to policy and decision makers and the aim was a coherent design of a European Polar Research Programme. EU-PolarNet was coordinated at the Alfred Wegner Institute in Bremerhaven and the legacy of the project will be sustained in the future by the European Polar Board.
- (342) The Republic of Korea presented IP 70 *Report from Asian Forum of Polar Sciences to the ATCM XXXVIII*. It reported that AFoPS, a ten year old Asian organisation dedicated to polar research and cooperation, had become an important medium of collective endeavours in human and information exchange, research collaboration, and logistics cooperation between the Asian polar science institutions. The Republic of Korea mentioned that four Consultative Parties and one non-Consultative Party were members of AFoPS and Korea was now the Chair. It noted that AFoPS was developing

new initiatives based on the framework produced by the SCAR Horizon Scan and, although these were regionally based, they were intended to link with the wider Antarctic community. Finally, the Republic of Korea expressed support for the initiatives put forward by Australia and China in IP 116.

- (343) SCAR affirmed its commitment to strengthen ties and broaden discussions with AFoPS.
- (344) Uruguay presented IP 125 *“From East to West” initiative*. This was intended to invite staff and scientists operating in East Antarctica to the Uruguayan stations in West Antarctica. It also considered that there were different scientific and operational conditions in the Eastern and Western areas of Antarctica and that sharing facilities had been found to be a useful tool for reducing the human footprint on the environment and promoting the cooperation wished for between Parties. Uruguay appreciated the advice and support of COMNAP on this matter. Uruguay encouraged Parties to join this initiative and offer similar opportunities to visit and conduct scientific research at their own Antarctic facilities.
- (345) The Meeting noted the many good examples of international scientific collaboration amongst Parties presented in these papers.

### *National Science Activities*

- (346) The Russian Federation presented IP 67 *Russian studies of subglacial Lake Vostok in the season 2014–2015*. The paper recalled that, on 5 February 2012, Russian scientists were the first in the world to penetrate Lake Vostok. The details of the penetration and preliminary scientific results were captured in the following papers submitted by the Russian Federation: ATCM XXXV - IP 74 *Results of Russian activities for penetration to the subglacial Lake Vostok in the season 2011-2012* and ATCM XXXVI - IP 49 *Results of studies of the subglacial Lake Vostok and drilling operations in deep ice borehole at Vostok station in the season 2011-2012*. The Russian Federation noted that drilling continued during the 2012/2013, 2013/2014 and 2014/2015 field seasons. On 25 January 2015, the second penetration by the drill to the surface layer of the subglacial Lake Vostok occurred. The results demonstrated that Russian drillers had mastered the technology of the management of water-level rise in the borehole and that they could regulate this process during repeated drilling of “ice plugs”, which would be created at the end of each Antarctic season before investigating the water column characteristics of the lake. The Russian Federation hoped to present preliminary scientific results to ATCM XXXIX.

- (347) In response to a query from France, which asked why this IP was not also submitted this year to the CEP, the Russian Federation reminded the Meeting that it had submitted several Papers regarding the potential environmental impact of the drilling process to the CEP, and that the CEP's advice had been taken on board. The Meeting welcomed future updates on the scientific results from the Russian Federation.
- (348) India presented IP 100 *Antarctic Lakes and Global Climate Perspectives: The Indian Footprint*. It reported on long-term paleolimnological studies focusing on the lakes of the Schirmacher Oasis and Larsemann Hills of East Antarctica.
- (349) Colombia presented IP 23 *Primera Expedición Científica Colombiana a la Antártica 2014/15. [First Colombian Scientific Expedition to Antarctica 2014/2015]*. It reported on the first Colombian scientific expedition to Antarctica during the summer of 2014/15, and noted that the expedition took into account the framework provided by the Colombia Antarctic Scientific Agenda. The scientific projects were in the area of physical, chemical and biological oceanography as well as marine biology in the area of the Gerlache Strait. Other projects were concerned with marine engineering and human physiology. The data and samples obtained had been processed and results widely published. Colombia considered that the international cooperation component had been a priority in this expedition, and it thanked Brazil, Chile, Ecuador, Argentina and the Republic of Korea for their support. Based on the positive operating experience obtained by Colombia's Navy and Air Force, and on the good scientific teamwork carried out in Antarctica, Colombia remarked that it would engage in continuing scientific work, either by using its own logistics or by entering into cooperation agreements with other countries.
- (350) Colombia also presented IP 26 *Agenda Científica Antártica de Colombia 2014 – 2035 [Antarctic Scientific Affairs Agenda of Colombia 2014-2035]*. This paper presented Colombia's Antarctic Scientific Affairs Agenda, including its objectives, strategic priorities, and plan of action. It was designed taking into account the SCAR Horizon Scan and was a national effort that included universities, research centres, NGOs, and institutions and concluded with the prioritisation of eight research fields.
- (351) Venezuela presented IP 47 *VIII Campaña Venezolana a la Antártida 2014-2015 [VIII Venezuelan Antarctic Campaign 2014-2015]*, which reported on the Eighth Venezuelan Antarctic Campaign, from October 2014 to March 2015. Venezuela expressed its gratitude to Argentina and Chile for their collaboration in carrying out the campaign.

- (352) Canada presented IP 134 *Update on the Canadian Polar Commission and Canadian High Arctic Research Station (CHARS) Project*. The paper provided an update on Canada's work to establish a national Antarctic research programme, being led by the Canadian Polar Commission. It also provided an update on the merger of the Canadian Polar Commission with the Canadian High Arctic Research Station (CHARS) project to create a new federal agency called Polar Knowledge Canada, which would continue the work to develop a national Antarctic research programme for Canada. Polar Knowledge Canada would explore opportunities to operate through partnerships with the national programmes of other countries to facilitate access to existing Antarctic research infrastructure and logistics, and in turn provide access to Canadian research infrastructure and logistics in the Arctic.
- (353) Portugal presented IP 3 *Portugal's Antarctic Science and Policy Activities: a Review*, which provided an overview of the Antarctic activities carried out by Portugal since 2005. In addition to its commitment to excellent science, Portugal drew attention to its education and outreach activities (IP 2). Portugal also noted that its national polar programme joined COMNAP as an Observer in 2015.
- (354) Finland presented IP 25 *Finland's Antarctic Research Strategy 2014*, which provided information on its Antarctic Research Strategy 2014, updated by the Finnish Coordination Committee for Antarctic Research. It highlighted that the Strategy took into account the developments in national and international research environments and priorities since the previous Strategy in 2007. Finland noted that the Academy of Finland had granted 2.5 million euros for research in the Antarctic for 2013-16.
- (355) Japan presented IP 30 *Japan's Antarctic Research Highlights 2014–15*. This paper introduced three selected topics from the Japanese Antarctic Research Expedition last season. Among these were atmospheric observations carried out by a cost-effective hybrid system of UAV and a balloon which returned autonomously to Syowa after observation and collected data on aerosols distribution up to 23 kilometres in altitude. Another activity was the completion of constructing the largest atmospheric radar system in Antarctica, called PANSY. With planned fuel resupply, the system would start continuous observation of winds up to 500 kilometres above Syowa station, for about 12 years, a little more than one solar cycle. It should contribute significantly to the development of global circulation models. The third was sea ice observations around the Shirase navigation area with satellite imagery and with an airborne ice thickness sensor.
- (356) Australia presented IP 115 *Australian Antarctic Science Program: highlights of the 2014/15 season*. The paper discussed research within the Australian Antarctic

Program, guided by the “Australian Antarctic Science Strategic Plan 2011-12 to 2020-21”. The Plan focused efforts within four research themes: Climate Processes and Change; Terrestrial and Nearshore Ecosystems: Environmental Change and Conservation; Southern Ocean Ecosystems: Environmental Change and Conservation; and Frontier Science. It highlighted the extensive international collaboration under the Australian Antarctic Science Program.

- (357) India presented IP 99 *Recent Developments in Indian Ice-core Drilling Program in Dronning Maud Land, East Antarctica*. India highlighted that one of the major objectives of the Indian Ice-core Drilling Program was the reconstruction of Antarctic climate for the past two millennia using an array of shallow to medium depth ice cores from coastal Dronning Maud Land.
- (358) SCAR presented IP 98 *Report on the 2014-2015 activities of the Southern Ocean Observing System (SOOS)*. This report highlighted Southern Ocean Observing System (SOOS) achievements in 2014 and planned activities for 2015.
- (359) Malaysia presented IP 130 *XXXIV SCAR Biennial Meetings including the 2016 Open Science Conference, 19-31 August 2016, Kuala Lumpur, Malaysia*. Malaysia noted that it was hosting the XXXIV SCAR Biennial Meetings including the 2016 Open Science Conference in Kuala Lumpur, from the 19th – 31st August 2016.
- (360) The following papers were also submitted and taken as presented under this item:
- IP 14 *Research Activity Report Czech Antarctic Expedition to James Ross Island Jan-Feb 2015* (Czech Republic). This provided an overview of the activities related to long- and short-term projects carried out during the Czech Antarctic expedition to James Ross Island (Mendel Station) held in January-February 2015, including projects in the disciplines: climatology, glaciers and permafrost, hydrology and limnology, terrestrial biology, environmental science, and medical science.
  - IP 79 *Chilean Antarctic Science Program: Evolution and challenges* (Chile). The paper described the Chilean Antarctic Program’s strong development of terrestrial and coastal ecology, with an emphasis on ecophysiology. Effects of climate change on the terrestrial-coastal-marine gradient were therefore a key issue. Current challenges included assessing not only status and trends, but also the evolving responses of populations, communities and ecosystems to climate change. Complementary efforts from multidisciplinary and multinational teams were required for studies to undertake such research.

- IP 94 *Climate Change in Antarctica* (United Kingdom). This paper presented a graphic produced by the British Antarctic Survey showing the patterns and magnitudes of change in the climate of Antarctica and the Southern Ocean.

(361) The following papers were also submitted under this item:

- BP 1 *Abstract of the SCAR Lecture: Southern Ocean Acidification* (SCAR).
- BP 4 *The Scientific Committee on Antarctic Research (SCAR) Selected Science Highlights for 2014/15* (SCAR).
- BP 5 *Action Plan: Development of the Brazilian Antarctic science* (Brazil).
- BP 8 *Report from the Republic of Korea on Its Cooperation with the Consultative Parties and the Wider Polar Community* (Republic of Korea).
- BP 10 *Actividades del Programa Nacional Antártico Perú periodo 2014 – 2015. [Activities of the Peruvian National Antarctic Program 2014-2015.]* (Peru).
- BP 15 *Síntesis de biodiesel a partir de aceite producido por microalgas antárticas. [Synthesis of biodiesel from the oil produced by Antarctic microalgae.]* (Ecuador).
- BP 24 *Determinación del marco de referencia geodésico oficial de la Estación Maldonado* (Ecuador).
- BP 25 *Implementación de UAV's en la generación de cartografía oficial de la Estación Maldonado* (Ecuador).

#### **Item 14: Implications of Climate Change for Management of the Antarctic Treaty Area**

(362) The United States introduced WP 39 *Shared science priorities and cooperation: systematic observations and modelling in the Southern Ocean*, jointly prepared with Australia. The United States recalled that one of the priorities in the Multi-year Strategic Work Plan related to collaboration and capacity building for science, and particularly in relation to climate change. It highlighted the role of the Southern Ocean in global climate and productivity and indications of change in the Southern Ocean. It noted that sparse data limited understanding, and thus highlighted the need for international cooperation in Southern Ocean

observations and modelling. It encouraged Parties to support and engage in the SOOS. The United States had also initiated, and welcomed participation in, the Southern Ocean Carbon and Climate Observation and Modelling (SOCCOM) project, which was a contribution to SOOS. SOCCOM entailed an extensive programme of observations accomplished via a robotic observing system to create an unprecedented database for modelling activities. The United States referred Parties to IP 98 for further details on the SOOS related activities since the last ATCM.

- (363) The Meeting thanked the United States and Australia, and acknowledged the fundamental importance of long-term observation and modelling to improve the current understanding of the Southern Ocean and develop projections of the future trajectory of the Southern Ocean and Earth's climate. Portugal emphasised the implications of this research for the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (IPCC) and the relationship with the SCAR Horizon Scan project. Many Parties reported on their specific contributions to the SOOS and encouraged other Parties to contribute to the cooperation in long-term observation and modelling of the Southern Ocean.
- (364) Argentina noted its view that the term "Southern Ocean" is only used to denote the oceans surrounding Antarctica from a scientific point of view. It pointed out that, from a political or legal point of view, there were several different national views on the meaning of the term, as was evidenced by the lack of definition within the IHO.
- (365) Recalling the ATCM Multi-year Strategic Work Plan and, in particular, Decision 3 (2014), Australia referred to *SP 7 Actions taken by the CEP and the ATCM on ATME recommendations on climate change*. Australia encouraged Parties to consider ATME Recommendations 9 to 17 referred to in SP 7, which were prioritised for discussion at ATCM XXXVIII. It also suggested adding an action to the Multi-year Strategic Work Plan for ATCM XXXIX calling for the review of the state of knowledge on climate change in Antarctica. In general, Australia considered that a number of the ATME recommendations could usefully be progressed by the ATCM encouraging relevant research by national programmes and SCAR. With respect to Recommendation 9, Australia suggested that the ATCM should continue to welcome WMO input, attendance and reporting to the ATCM. With respect to ATME Recommendation 14, Australia suggested that discussion on WP 39 represented an appropriate response by the ATCM to the recommendation that Parties should strongly encourage collaboration and development of sustained integrated observing systems.

- (366) The United Kingdom agreed with Australia and also noted that Recommendations 12 and 13 referred to the collaboration of integrated earth system models and coordinated observations of the Antarctic system from space, which were both addressed in WP 39.
- (367) Brazil reiterated that the Meeting should limit discussions on climate change to the implications of climate change in Antarctica and not go beyond its mandate.
- (368) The Meeting agreed to continue addressing the recommendations in SP 7.
- (369) The following papers were also submitted and taken as presented under this agenda item:
- IP 92 *Antarctic Climate Change and the Environment – 2015 Update* (SCAR). It provided an update on recent advances in the understanding of climate change and its impact across the Antarctic continent and the Southern Ocean. The update built on the material included in the Antarctic Climate Change and the Environment (ACCE) Report.
  - IP 110 *Climate Change 2015: A Report Card* (ASOC). It provided a summary of up-to-date scientific findings about current and future climate change in the Antarctic.
  - IP 114 *The Antarctic Treaty System, Climate Change and Strengthened Scientific Interface with Relevant Bodies of the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change (UNFCCC)* (ASOC). It noted that the Antarctic Treaty System had an important role to play in promoting the relevance of climate-related Antarctic research to the climate change community, including the UNFCCC.

## Item 15: Education Issues

- (370) Bulgaria introduced WP 52 *Co-chairs' Report of the Workshop on Education, Sofia, Bulgaria, May 2015*, jointly prepared with Belgium, Brazil, Chile, Portugal and the United Kingdom. It reported on the Workshop on Education and Outreach, held on 31 May 2015. It noted that 97 participants from 37 Parties, Observers and Experts had attended. Bulgaria reported that 26 oral presentations, 19 poster presentations and 22 papers had been delivered to the workshop, which aimed to: learn more about education and outreach activities; discuss the possibility of establishing a virtual forum on educational outreach; and discuss the 25th anniversary of the Environment Protocol at the ATCM XXXIX in Chile.

- (371) Bulgaria noted that workshop participants had recommended the formation of an ATCM forum in the field of education and outreach, and that they proposed this should take the form of an ICG. Bulgaria highlighted that this forum would work together to maximise the impact of the 25th anniversary of the Madrid Protocol.
- (372) The Meeting noted that the following papers had been taken at the workshop:
- WP 47 *Workshop on education and outreach - report of the informal discussions on the development of a publication on the occasion of the 25th anniversary of the Madrid Protocol* (Argentina). This paper presented the report of the informal discussions, and recommended that the CEP: recognise the progress made during the informal discussions; consider the various options provided by participants; continue this debate within the Education and Outreach Workshop; and analyse the convenience of formalising the process of elaboration of the publication for the next intersessional period.
  - IP 2 *Workshop on education and outreach - Portugal's Antarctic education and outreach activities* (Portugal). This paper outlined the education and outreach activities undertaken by Portugal since 2005, in preparation of the International Polar Year (2007/08) involving national educational organisations, the Association of Polar Early Career Scientists, and Polar Educators International. The paper also informed on specific projects which highlighted Portugal's commitment to education relating to the polar regions and the ATCM.
  - IP 9 rev. 1 *Workshop on education and outreach - making an impact: national Antarctic program activities which facilitate education and outreach* (COMNAP). This paper noted that COMNAP member programmes had a commitment to communicating their countries' Antarctic stories at a national level. The paper presented a compilation of information gathered on education and outreach activities facilitated by each National Antarctic Programme. The results demonstrated that the range of education and outreach activities currently facilitated by National Antarctic Programmes or made possible in partnership with National Antarctic Programmes was significant. The paper also discussed COMNAP's role in supporting National Antarctic Programmes to exchange information and ideas on education, communication, public engagement and outreach.

- IP 17 *Workshop on education and outreach - APECS-Brazil E&O activities during the XXXVII Antarctic Treaty Consultative Meeting (ATCM)* (Brazil). This paper reported on the role of APECS-Brazil and its activities during 2014. In particular, it noted: “I Scientific Journey: Brazil and the Antarctic Treaty”; the “XII International Polar Week”; and the “II Workshop on Career Development” that took place in October in Southern Brazil together with a Photo Exhibition organised by Brazil and Portugal entitled “Glances over a Frozen Continent”. It also informed on the “Antarctic Day Celebration” and the project “Researcher-Educator and Educator-Researcher Training Program”.
- IP 18 *Workshop on education and outreach - cultural contest - “Brasil in Antarctica”* (Brazil). This paper reported on a nation-wide cultural contest organised by the Brazilian Navy entitled “Brazil in Antarctica”. In order to promote awareness about the importance of the continent among future generations, the target audience of the activity were high school students from 15 to 19 years old. The contest and the journey itself were broadcasted by Brazil’s largest television channel, reaching out to a broad and diversified audience.
- IP 31 *Workshop on education and outreach - UK’s Antarctic education and public engagement programmes*. (United Kingdom). This paper reported that education and outreach were an important part of the United Kingdom’s overall Antarctic policy. Key United Kingdom Antarctic partners, including the Foreign & Commonwealth Office, British Antarctic Survey, Scott Polar Research Institute and the UK Antarctic Heritage Trust, shared a common goal of engaging many different sectors of society in the global scientific importance of Antarctica and in the objectives and work of the Antarctic Treaty System.
- IP 43 *Workshop on education and outreach - education and outreach activities of the United States Antarctic Program (USAP)* (United States). This paper reported on the support of the United States Antarctic Program (USAP) of education and outreach activities for the IPY 2007-09, and on the variety of events that the USAP had continued to support directly and with other organisations. It also reported on the participation and support of SCAR and COMNAP education and outreach efforts, and on the future directions of USAP education and outreach activities, including efforts to bring scientific data from the polar regions directly into the classroom and to develop international collaborations for scientists at an early stage in their careers.

- IP 48 *Taller sobre educación y difusión - proyecto libro digital juguemos en la Antártida. [Workshop on education and outreach: digital book project “Let’s play in Antarctica”]* (Venezuela). With the aim to promote Antarctic education and outreach, Venezuela presented the digital book: “Let’s play in Antarctica”, a pedagogical tool whose purpose was to motivate children to learn about Antarctica. The digital book introduced basic knowledge of Antarctic sciences to children in pre-school and the first year of primary school.
- IP 62 *Workshop on education and outreach - whom, how and what do we reach with Antarctic education and outreach?* (Germany). This paper reported on the long tradition of Antarctic education and outreach activities in Germany. For more than 30 years, polar researchers had been trying to bring fascinating wildlife, the remote environments of the Southern Ocean and the White Continent closer to the general public. This paper reported the use of a wide range of programmes aimed at reaching a general public showing a primary interest in Antarctica, as well as specialised format programmes, developed with the objective to strengthen the interface between schools and Antarctic institutions and experts.
- IP 73 *Taller sobre educación y difusión - principales actividades de divulgación y educación del programa chileno de ciencia antártica. [Workshop on education and outreach: principal Antarctic science outreach and education activities of the Chilean Antarctic Program]* (Chile). It reported on the principal aspects of a range of activities developed by Chile in the framework of education and outreach about Antarctic science, carried out in the fields of education, culture and scientific journalism, making effective use of networking and collaboration with various institutions domestically and abroad.
- IP 76 *Workshop on education and outreach - Antarctic education & outreach in Italy before and after the 4th International Polar Year* (Italy). This paper reported on Italy’s continued interest in education and training activities related to Antarctica and polar subjects, initiated by a group of scientific and logistic staff from the very beginning of the Italian “Programma Nazionale di Ricerche in Antartide”, and on the positive outcome of international collaborations developed in this field following the participation in the fourth IPY.
- IP 87 *Workshop on education and outreach - using education to create a task force for Antarctic conservation (IAATO)*. IAATO reported that it had long advocated the importance of education and outreach and, as

part of its ongoing education programmes, promoted the work of the Antarctic Treaty to a wide audience both in and outside Antarctica, most of whom were nationals from countries supporting their own National Antarctic Programmes. The paper outlined the different components of IAATO's educational programme: before leaving home, en route to Antarctica, in Antarctica, and during the journey home and beyond.

- IP 89 *Workshop on education and outreach – New Zealand ICE-REACH: inspiring communities to connect with Antarctica* (New Zealand). This paper included a summary of work from three organisations based in Christchurch, New Zealand's gateway to Antarctica, connecting national and international communications, outreach and education initiatives: Antarctica New Zealand, delivering Antarctic education and outreach objectives; Christchurch City Council, NZ IceFest, delivering a biannual festival celebrating Antarctica; and Gateway Antarctica, University of Canterbury, delivering a world-class learning environment. It also reported on further Antarctic-related education and outreach activities across New Zealand.
- IP 90 *Workshop on education and outreach - education and outreach in the Australian Antarctic Programme* (Australia). This paper looked at the range of media, public relations and education activities utilised by the Australian Antarctic Division (AAD). The AAD was responsible for delivering the Australian Antarctica programme, including leading and coordinating education and outreach activities. The AAD managed media interactions, public relations and multi-media, maintained a comprehensive website and increasingly supported engagement with social media. The AAD also ran an education programme, a key initiative of which is enabling students to make a virtual visit to Australian Antarctic stations from their classrooms.
- IP 97 *Workshop on education and outreach – examples of educational and outreach activities of the Belgian scientists, school teachers and associations in 2013-2015* (Belgium). This paper outlined the education and outreach activities undertaken by Belgian scientists, school teachers and associations in 2013-15 since Brussels hosted ATCM XXXVI. It illustrated the commitment of Belgium to education and outreach in relation to the Antarctic continent studies and the role of the Antarctic Treaty.
- IP 105 *Workshop on education and outreach - Antarctic education and outreach activities in Bulgaria* (Bulgaria). This paper noted that Bulgaria and in particular the Bulgarian Antarctic Institute (BAI) had

recognised the need for continuous public and educational outreach related to the polar regions in the last fifteen years. The paper defined the education and outreach activities undertaken by Bulgaria since 2000, involving APECS Bulgaria and some national educational organisations in projects such as “Antarctica in your school”, “Antarctic Arts” and “Polar Science Communication”.

- IP 118 rev. 1 *Workshop on education and outreach - Norway’s Antarctic education and outreach activities* (Norway). This paper outlined the education and outreach activities undertaken by Norway in the most recent years. It included two publications on the Antarctic, a royal visit for the celebration of the 10-year anniversary of Troll station as an all-year station, the free database “Quantartica”, updating the Norwegian Polar Institute’s website and fact sheets, the production of maps on the Antarctic, participation in the establishment of the Antarctic Environments Portal, and the production of a white paper on the Antarctic that is planned.
- IP 120 *Workshop on education and outreach - summary of CCAMLR initiatives* (CCAMLR). This paper provided a summary of CCAMLR’s initiatives relating to capacity building, support to early career professionals, awareness raising and public relations. The initiatives, which supplemented related activities supported by individual CCAMLR members at the national level, including partnerships, internships, and scholarships, as well as awareness raising and public relations focused on CCAMLR’s website and the use of social media.
- IP 124 *Workshop on education and outreach - South Africa’s Antarctic education and outreach activities* (South Africa). This paper outlined the education and outreach activities undertaken by South Africa. Although the South African National Antarctic Programme (SANAP) had no formally structured education and outreach strategy, it did make full and effective use of opportunities which arose from time to time, as well as during annual celebratory events. The paper reported on activities related to library collections, exhibits and materials, interaction with media, activities for schools, and other related activities.
- IP 129 *Workshop on education and outreach – Argentina’s Art Programme and International Cooperation. Art in Antarctica, a ten-year project* (Argentina).

- BP 7 *Workshop on education and outreach – poster abstract on education and outreach activities of the United States Antarctic Program (USAP)* (United States).
  - BP 19 *Taller sobre educación y difusión - el tema antártico en los textos del nivel secundario del Ecuador. [Workshop on education and outreach: Antarctica in high school text books in Ecuador]* (Ecuador).
  - BP 20 *Uruguayan Antarctic Institute: Outreach, Culture and Education Program* (Uruguay).
  - BP 21 *Workshop on Education and Outreach – Poster Abstract On Education And Outreach Activities Of Bulgarian Antarctic Institute (BAI)* (Bulgaria).
  - BP 23 *Workshop on Education and Outreach - First Uruguayan Antarctic Research School: training the next generation of Uruguayan Antarctic researchers* (Uruguay).
  - BP 26 *Report on the ATCM XXXVIII Workshop on Education and Outreach* (Bulgaria, Belgium, Brazil, Chile, Portugal and the United Kingdom).
- (373) The Meeting thanked Bulgaria for organising the workshop and emphasised the importance of Parties increasing their education and outreach efforts. Australia noted its interest in better virtual collaborative forums and exploring different avenues of outreach. Many Parties, IAATO and ASOC expressed their interest in participating in the ICG.
- (374) The Meeting decided to establish an ICG on education and outreach with the following Terms of Reference:
- foster collaboration and support, at both the national and international level;
  - develop, encourage, and share results of educational and outreach initiatives that promote scientific observations and results, environmental protection initiatives and the work of Antarctic Treaty Parties in managing the Antarctic Treaty area, as an educational and outreach instrument to reinforce the importance of the Antarctic Treaty and its Protocol on Environmental Protection;
  - acknowledge the related education and outreach activities by expert groups and encourage cooperation with these groups;
  - coordinate educational and outreach activities related to the 25<sup>th</sup> Madrid Protocol anniversary celebrations; and

- provide an initial report to Working Group 2 at ATCM XXXIX.

(375) It was further agreed that:

- Observers and Experts participating in the ATCM would be invited to provide input;
- The Executive Secretary would open the ATCM forum for the ICG and provide assistance to the ICG;
- Bulgaria would act as convenor and report to the next ATCM on progress made at the ICG.

(376) IP 101 *COMNAP practical training modules: Module 2 – non-native species* (COMNAP) was also submitted under Agenda Item 15. This paper presented the second training module entitled “Non-native Species”, as the result of the identification by the COMNAP Training Expert Group of areas of common training interest across National Antarctic Programmes, during the 2013 COMNAP Annual General Meeting.

## **Item 16: Exchange of Information**

(377) Australia introduced WP 14 *Report of the Intersessional Contact Group Established to Review Information Exchange Requirements*. The ICG had been established by ATCM XXXVII to conduct a comprehensive review of the existing requirements for information exchange, and to identify any additional requirements. Australia further noted that, in accordance with the agreement reached by ATCM XXXVII, the ICG undertook discussions with the aim of: reviewing the information currently required to be exchanged; considering whether there was a continued value for Parties to exchange information on each item and whether some items needed to be modified, updated, differently described, made mandatory (where currently included as optional), or removed; considering the pending issues relating to information exchange listed by the ATCM XXXVII - SP 7; considering where other information exchange mechanisms (for example those operated by COMNAP) may overlap with current ATCM requirements; considering the timing of information exchange, including where Parties might desire continuous exchange of information rather than annual reporting; and considering how each item best fit into the categories of pre-season, annual, and permanent information.

(378) Australia presented a summary of four categories and items of information exchange: Environmental, Scientific, Operational, and Other. In addition to the issues on information exchange likely to be easily resolved by the

Meeting, the paper also provided information on areas where no clear agreement had been reached yet.

- (379) The ICG recommended that the ATCM: consider its report, and any advice from the CEP in relation to the exchange of information relating to environmental matters; discuss those where minor changes might obtain general support, with a view to concluding any changes required; consider those categories and items of information where further discussion was likely to be required; determine if further work on any of those categories and items was necessary; and propose a process to progress that work.
- (380) Following discussion, the Meeting adopted Decision 6 (2015) *Exchange of information* to serve as a single point of reference for the information to be exchanged by the Parties. The considerations relating to the amendments to the information exchange requirements, annexed to the Decision, are contained in Appendix 1 to this Report. The Meeting agreed further to review and modify the consolidated list of the information to be exchanged by the Parties, as included in the Decision, on a regular basis.
- (381) The Meeting also agreed to establish a further intersessional contact group to progress the comprehensive review of the existing requirements for information exchange, begun at ATCM XXXVII, with the following Terms of Reference:
1. Review the items of information currently required to be exchanged, with a focus on those remaining items already identified as requiring attention (as listed in Annex 1 to WP 14 submitted to ATCM XXXVIII);
  2. Formulate recommendations on:
    - a. Whether there is continued value for Parties to exchange information on these items;
    - b. Whether some of them need to be modified, updated, differently described, made mandatory (where currently described as optional) or removed;
    - c. The timing of information exchange for these items;
    - d. How each item should best fit into the category of pre-season, annual and permanent information;
    - e. Whether the information could be better exchanged through other mechanisms (for example those operated by COMNAP); and
  3. Report to ATCM XXXIX.

(382) It was further agreed that:

- Observers and Experts participating in the ATCM would be invited to provide input;
- The Executive Secretary would open the ATCM forum for the ICG and provide assistance for the ICG; and
- Australia would act as convenor.

(383) The Russian Federation introduced IP 68 *Russia-U.S. Removal of Radioisotope Thermoelectric Generators from the Antarctic*, jointly prepared with the United States. The Russian Federation depicted the joint Russian-U.S. project of removing radioactive isotopic equipment from various Russian Antarctic stations. It noted that the removal of the radioisotope thermoelectric generators (RTGs) was prompted by the threat of the unauthorised use of Antarctic RTGs for acts of terrorism. The Russian Federation further thanked Argentina and Germany for facilitating the *R/V Akademik Fedorov*, which called into their respective seaports with a load of RTGs en route to decommissioning in Saint Petersburg.

(384) The United States emphasised that this Information Paper demonstrated an important example of arms control cooperation. It also provided a valuable example of how co-operation between Antarctic Treaty Parties could proceed in the Antarctic regardless of differences in other regions.

(385) The Meeting congratulated the Russian Federation on the successful removal of the isotopic equipment.

(386) The removal of the RTGs was identified as an example of environmental remediation. Furthermore, reference was made to Recommendations VI-5 y VI-6 regarding the control of radio isotopes in scientific investigations and information exchange on the use of radio isotopes.

## **Item 17: Biological Prospecting in Antarctica**

(387) The Netherlands presented IP 133 *An Update on Status and Trends Biological Prospecting in Antarctica and Recent Policy Developments at the International Level*. It provided an update on the status and trends of biological prospecting in Antarctica, as well as a review of recent relevant policy developments at the international level. The Netherlands noted that these issues had been taken up by the General Assembly in the United Nations through the ad hoc open-ended informal Working Group to study issues

relating to the conservation and sustainable use of marine biological diversity in areas beyond national jurisdiction. It reported that the ninth meeting of the Working Group earlier in 2015 had recommended a decision be taken at the 69<sup>th</sup> session of the UN General Assembly to develop a new legally binding instrument on biodiversity beyond national jurisdiction under the United Nations Convention on the Law of the Sea. The Netherlands emphasised that the Working Group had not excluded Antarctic marine living resources and highlighted the relevance of this issue to the ATCM.

- (388) The Meeting thanked the Netherlands for this update. In responding to the possible negotiation of a relevant instrument to the Antarctic Treaty area, several Parties highlighted that the collection and use of biological material from the Antarctic should be discussed within the Antarctic Treaty System. It was noted that Parties should be mindful of the regulatory system of the Antarctic Treaty System and be careful of engaging in discussions on the possible application of other, possibly conflicting, regimes. The Meeting reaffirmed that the Antarctic Treaty System was the appropriate framework for managing the collection of biological materials in the Antarctic Treaty area and for considering its use. Many Parties underlined the importance of keeping biological prospecting on the agenda of the ATCM.

## **Item 18: Preparation of the 39<sup>th</sup> Meeting**

### ***a. Date and place***

- (389) The Meeting welcomed the kind invitation of the Government of Chile to host ATCM XXXIX in Santiago, tentatively from 6 to 15 June 2016.

- (390) For future planning, the Meeting took note of the following likely timetable of upcoming ATCMs:

- 2017 China
- 2018 Ecuador.

### ***b. Invitation of International and Non-governmental Organisations***

- (391) In accordance with established practice, the Meeting agreed that the following organisations having scientific or technical interest in Antarctica should be invited to send experts to attend ATCM XXXIX: the ACAP Secretariat, ASOC, IPCC, IAATO, the International Civil Aviation Organization (ICAO), IHO, IMO, IOC, IOPC Funds, the International Union for Conservation

of Nature (IUCN), UNEP, UNFCCC, WMO and the World Tourism Organization (WTO).

***c. Preparation of the Agenda for ATCM XXXIX***

(392) The Meeting approved the Preliminary Agenda for ATCM XXXIX (see Appendix 2).

***d. Organisation of ATCM XXXIX***

(393) After discussion on the working methods of the ATCM, the Meeting decided to make changes to the number of regular Working Groups. In 2016, WG1 would deal with policy, legal and institutional issues and WG2 would have responsibility for operations, science and tourism. In addition, a Special Working Group (WG3) could be established as required. For 2016, the Meeting agreed to establish WG3 for the 25<sup>th</sup> anniversary of the Protocol on Environmental Protection.

(394) According to the revised Rules of Procedure adopted at this ATCM, Chairs for these groups should be appointed before the close of the Meeting and, in the absence of any nomination, Chairs would be appointed at the start of the next ATCM. The Meeting agreed to appoint Dr René Lefeber from the Netherlands as Chair for WG1 for 2016. The Meeting agreed to appoint Mr Máximo Gowland from Argentina and Ms Jane Francis from the United Kingdom as co-Chairs for WG2 in 2016. Chile, as host country for the next ATCM, agreed to arrange a Chair for WG3.

***e. The SCAR Lecture***

(395) Taking into account the valuable series of lectures given by SCAR at a number of ATCMs, the Meeting decided to invite SCAR to give another lecture on scientific issues relevant to ATCM XXXIX.

**Item 19: Any Other Business**

(396) With regard to incorrect references to the territorial status of the Malvinas, South Georgias and South Sandwich Islands made in documents related to this Antarctic Treaty Consultative Meeting, Argentina rejected any reference to these islands as being a separate entity from its national territory, thus giving them an international status they do not have, and affirmed that the Malvinas,

South Georgias and South Sandwich Islands and the surrounding maritime areas are an integral part of the Argentine national territory. Furthermore, Argentina rejected that the illegal Malvinas Islands' flag be granted to vessels by the alleged British authorities and also rejected the use of ports of registry in the said archipelagos, and any other unilateral act undertaken by such colonial authorities which are not recognised and are rejected by Argentina. The Malvinas, South Georgias and South Sandwich Islands and the surrounding maritime areas are an integral part of the Argentine national territory, are under illegal British occupation and are the subject of a sovereignty dispute between the Argentine Republic and the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, recognised by the United Nations.

- (397) In response, the United Kingdom stated that it had no doubt about its sovereignty over the Falkland Islands, South Georgia and the South Sandwich Islands and their surrounding maritime areas, as is well known to all delegates. In that regard, the United Kingdom has no doubt about the right of the government of the Falkland Islands to operate a shipping register for UK and Falkland flagged vessels.
- (398) Argentina rejected the United Kingdom's statement and reaffirmed its well known legal position.

## **Item 20: Adoption of the Final Report**

- (399) The Meeting adopted the Final Report of the 38th Antarctic Treaty Consultative Meeting. The Chair of the Meeting, Ambassador Rayko Raytchev, made closing remarks.

## **Item 21: Close of the Meeting**

- (400) The Meeting was closed on Wednesday, 10 June at 12:50.



## 2. CEP XVIII Report



# Table of contents

<b>Item 1: Opening of the Meeting</b>	115
<b>Item 2: Adoption of the Agenda</b>	116
<b>Item 3: Strategic Discussions on the Future Work of the CEP</b>	117
CEP advice to the ATCM on the Antarctic Environments Portal	118
CEP advice to the ATCM on a symposium on the 25th anniversary of the Environment Protocol	120
<b>Item 4: Operation of the CEP</b>	123
CEP advice to the ATCM on opportunities to strengthen cooperation between the CEP and the ATCM	124
<b>Item 5: Cooperation with other Organisations</b>	125
<b>Item 6: Repair and Remediation of Environment Damage</b>	128
<b>Item 7: Climate Change Implications for the Environment: Strategic approach</b>	130
CEP advice to the ATCM on a CEP Climate Change Response Work Programme	132
CEP advice to the ATCM on Southern Ocean observations and modelling	135
<b>Item 8: Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA)</b>	136
8a) <i>Draft Comprehensive Environmental Evaluations</i>	136
8b) <i>Other EIA Matters</i>	138
CEP advice to the ATCM on the review of the Guidelines for Environmental Impact Assessment in Antarctica	139
CEP advice to the ATCM on unmanned aerial vehicles (UAVs)	144
<b>Item 9: Area Protection and Management Plans</b>	145
9a) <i>Management Plans</i>	145
CEP advice to the ATCM on revised management plans for ASPA and ASMAs:	149
9b) <i>Historic Sites and Monuments</i>	152
CEP advice to the ATCM on additions to the List of Historic Sites and Monuments	153
CEP advice to the ATCM on guidance for the designation of new Historic Sites and Monuments	154
9c) <i>Site Guidelines</i>	155
9d) <i>Marine Spatial Protection and Management</i>	157
9e) <i>Other Annex V Matters</i>	158
CEP advice to ATCM on a prior assessment process for the designation of ASPAs and ASMAs	159
<b>Item 10: Conservation of Antarctic Flora and Fauna</b>	162
10a) <i>Quarantine and Non-native Species</i>	162
10b) <i>Specially Protected Species</i>	166

<i>10c) Other Annex II Matters</i>	166
CEP advice to the ATCM on wildlife disturbance	167
CEP advice to the ATCM on Important Bird Areas in Antarctica	168
<b>Item 11: Environmental Monitoring and Reporting</b>	168
<b>Item 12: Inspection Reports</b>	170
<b>Item 13: General Matters</b>	174
<b>Item 14: Election of Officers</b>	174
<b>Item 15: Preparation for Next Meeting</b>	175
<b>Item 16: Adoption of the Report</b>	175
<b>Item 17: Closing of the Meeting</b>	175
<b>Appendix 1. CEP Five-Year Work Plan</b>	177
<b>Appendix 2. Climate Change Response Work Programme</b>	186
<b>Appendix 3. Guidelines: A prior assessment process for the designation of ASPA and ASMAs</b>	193
<b>Appendix 4. Preliminary Agenda for CEP XIX</b>	194

# **Report of the Committee for Environmental Protection (CEP XVIII)**

**Sofia, Bulgaria, June 1 – 5, 2015**

- (1) Pursuant to Article 11 of the Protocol on Environmental Protection to the Antarctic Treaty, Representatives of the Parties to the Protocol (Argentina, Australia, Belarus, Belgium, Brazil, Bulgaria, Canada, Chile, China, Czech Republic, Ecuador, Finland, France, Germany, India, Italy, Japan, Monaco, Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway, Peru, Poland, Portugal, Republic of Korea, Romania, the Russian Federation, South Africa, Spain, Sweden, Ukraine, the United Kingdom, the United States, Uruguay, and Venezuela) met in Sofia, Bulgaria, from 1 to 5 June 2015, for the purpose of providing advice and formulating recommendations to the Parties in connection with the implementation of the Protocol.
- (2) In accordance with Rule 4 of the CEP Rules of Procedure, the meeting was also attended by representatives of the following Observers:
  - Contracting Parties to the Antarctic Treaty which are not a Party to the Protocol: Malaysia, Mongolia, Switzerland and Turkey;
  - the Scientific Committee on Antarctic Research (SCAR), the Scientific Committee for the Conservation of Antarctic Marine Living Resources (SC-CAMLR), and the Council of Managers of National Antarctic Programs (COMNAP); and
  - scientific, environmental and technical organisations: the Antarctic and Southern Ocean Coalition (ASOC), the International Association of Antarctica Tour Operators (IAATO), International Union for Conservation of Nature (IUCN), the United Nations Environment Programme (UNEP) and the World Meteorological Organization (WMO).

## **Item 1: Opening of the Meeting**

- (3) The CEP Chair, Ewan McIvor (Australia), opened the meeting on Monday 1 June 2015 and thanked Bulgaria for arranging and hosting the meeting in Sofia.
- (4) The Committee expressed sincere condolences to Belgium for the sad loss of Frédéric Chemay, the late Belgian CEP Representative, who passed away in September 2014.

- (5) On behalf of the Committee, the Chair welcomed Venezuela and Portugal as new Members, following their accession to the Protocol on 31 August 2014 and 10 October 2014, respectively. The Chair noted that the CEP now comprised 37 Members.
- (6) The Chair summarised the work undertaken during the intersessional period, noting that all the actions arising from CEP XVII with outcomes anticipated for CEP XVIII had been addressed (IP 121).

## **Item 2: Adoption of the Agenda**

- (7) The Committee adopted the following agenda and confirmed the allocation of 41 Working Papers (WP), 45 Information Papers (IP), 4 Secretariat Papers (SP) and 9 Background Papers (BP) to the agenda items:
  1. Opening of the Meeting
  2. Adoption of the Agenda
  3. Strategic Discussions on the Future Work of the CEP
  4. Operation of the CEP
  5. Cooperation with other Organisations
  6. Repair and Remediation of Environment Damage
  7. Climate Change Implications for the Environment: Strategic approach
  8. Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA)
    - a. Draft Comprehensive Environmental Evaluations
    - b. Other EIA Matters
  9. Area Protection and Management Plans
    - a. Management Plans
    - b. Historic Sites and Monuments
    - c. Site Guidelines
    - d. Marine Spatial Protection and Management
    - e. Other Annex V Matters
  10. Conservation of Antarctic Flora and Fauna
    - a. Quarantine and Non-native Species
    - b. Specially Protected Species
    - c. Other Annex II Matters

11. Environmental Monitoring and Reporting
12. Inspection Reports
13. General Matters
14. Election of Officers
15. Preparation for Next Meeting
16. Adoption of the Report
17. Closing of the Meeting

### **Item 3: Strategic Discussions on the Future Work of the CEP**

- (8) New Zealand introduced WP 21 *Antarctic Environments Portal: Project completion and next steps*, and referred to IP 11 *Antarctic Environmental Portal content development and editorial process*, jointly prepared with Australia, Belgium, Norway, and SCAR. The papers reported on the progress made in completing the development of the Antarctic Environments Portal project since ATCM XXXVII. Intersessional work had included: promotion of the Portal during the 2014 SCAR Open Science Conference, which included the holding of an Association of Polar Early Career Scientists (APECS) workshop on the Portal; the establishment of two advisory groups to provide feedback on aspects of the Portal, and a separate workshop to test and refine the editorial process. New Zealand also noted that an Editor had been contracted and the Portal Editorial Group had been established which was charged with developing, reviewing and keeping up-to-date the Portal content. The Editorial Group was currently overseeing the preparation of 15 articles of direct relevance to the Committee. These articles involve contributions from 50 authors across 15 countries. New Zealand noted that the Portal was in the process of being transferred to Gateway Antarctica, at the University of Canterbury, and that an interim Management Board would be established to oversee the operation of the Portal. New Zealand further noted that a funding proposal had been submitted to an international foundation to support the operation of the Portal for the next three years.
- (9) The co-sponsors of the Working Paper recommended that the Committee: welcome completion of the Antarctic Environments Portal project, and indicate its support for the final product; consider ways in which the Portal could be used to support its discussions, its advice to the ATCM, and its planning of future priority work; consider whether and how it might engage with the Portal

by providing Editorial Group members in the future; and, provide thoughts with regard to the potential future management of the Portal.

- (10) The Committee commended New Zealand, Australia, Belgium, Norway and SCAR for the considerable work undertaken since CEP XVII to further develop and complete the Antarctic Environments Portal. Members remarked on the co-proponents' responsiveness to issues raised in discussions at previous CEP meetings, particularly the development of a rigorous editorial process to ensure the Portal contained the highest quality scientific information, and noted that all content was balanced and politically neutral.
- (11) Regarding opportunities for using the Portal to support the Committee's discussions, it was agreed that Members could draw on the information contained in the Portal to support their work, including: for policy development; as a resource to support environmental impact assessment processes; and as a resource to inform their preparations for meetings and discussions during meetings. The Committee noted that it could suggest issues for future inclusion in the Portal relevant to issues it was addressing.
- (12) A query was raised on how the election of the editorial group would occur in the future, and it was noted that the future governance and management of the Portal were matters the Committee should return to at future meetings. In this regard, caution was noted regarding future funding of the Portal, and the need to ensure that the politically neutral nature of the content and the Portal's management was not compromised. It was suggested that the Secretariat could be the eventual host of the Portal.
- (13) The Committee welcomed the advice that hosting of the Portal was being transferred to the University of Canterbury, and noted that an application for external funding was in progress.
- (14) France offered to contribute to the translation in French providing specific resources.

---

#### **CEP advice to the ATCM on the Antarctic Environments Portal**

- (15) The Committee agreed to advise the ATCM that it: welcomed the completion of the Antarctic Environments Portal project; expressed its support for the final product; and acknowledged the utility of the Antarctic Environments Portal as a voluntary tool to help ensure the Committee was as informed as possible on the state of Antarctic environments.

- (16) The Committee endorsed a draft Resolution on the future use and management of the Antarctic Environments Portal and agreed to forward it to the ATCM for approval.
- 

*25<sup>th</sup> Anniversary of the Environmental Protocol*

- (17) Norway introduced WP 44 *A symposium celebrating the 25th anniversary of the Environmental Protocol to the Antarctic Treaty*, jointly prepared with Australia, Chile, France, New Zealand and the United Kingdom. Following a suggestion by Norway at CEP XVII, WP 44 suggested that a commemorative symposium to celebrate and discuss achievements in relation to the Protocol's role as the framework for environmental protection in Antarctica be held in conjunction with the 39<sup>th</sup> ATCM and the 19<sup>th</sup> meeting of the CEP.
- (18) The paper recommended that the ATCM/CEP: decide to hold a 25<sup>th</sup> anniversary symposium in conjunction with ATCM XXXIX and CEP XIX in Chile, on the Saturday immediately following the conclusion of the CEP meeting; agree to the framework described in WP 44 as a starting point for further symposium programme development; accept the offer of Norway (along with others) to coordinate the planning of and taking responsibility for the practical implementation of the symposium; and agree to use the ATS Discussion Forum as a platform for Members to provide input to the organisers with regard to the agenda of the symposium.
- (19) The Committee considered and agreed that the 25th anniversary of the Protocol was a milestone that provided a timely and relevant opportunity to focus on the Environment Protocol as the environmental management framework for Antarctica, and that a symposium would be a useful and appropriate vehicle to achieve this.
- (20) The Committee agreed that such a commemorative symposium should be held in conjunction with CEP XIX/ATCM XXXIX in Chile, potentially on the Saturday immediately following the meeting of the CEP.
- (21) With respect to scope, many Members expressed the desire that such a commemorative symposium should not be limited only to internal celebrations, but used as an opportunity to reach out and create an external focus. Suggestions ranged from providing a platform for politicians to meet on the issues, to opening the symposium to the general public. A number of Members suggested developing some form of "product" from the symposium as an outreach component, although details as to what this might entail were not explored further. Furthermore, Members expressed desire to use

the opportunity to look at the Protocol from many perspectives, including its historical background, as well as its legal and social context.

- (22) ASOC expressed support for the proposed symposium, which it considered was an excellent opportunity to assess the implementation and effectiveness of the Protocol to date and also an opportunity to think strategically about how the Protocol can address current and future challenges. ASOC suggested that discussions include an examination of inspections conducted under Article 14 of the Protocol, which provided the “ground truth” of how the Protocol was implemented in practice.
- (23) The Committee noted that there also were a number of other initiatives that catered to the external, outreach component of the 25 year celebrations. The 25 year commemorative brochure suggested by Argentina was one such proposal and product. Over the weekend prior to ATCM XXXVIII / CEP XVIII, the Workshop on Education and Outreach had proposed to establish an electronic forum on Education and Outreach that would use the 25<sup>th</sup> anniversary to provide opportunities for joint outreach and education efforts.
- (24) The Committee also noted that the symposium should provide an opportunity to focus both on achievements of the past as well challenges in the future, and that it should include a clear procedure to ensure an appropriate balance in the presentations and presenters invited to talk at the symposium. It was also noted that the symposium should be arranged within the existing budgetary framework of the Secretariat.

---

**CEP advice to the ATCM on a symposium on the 25<sup>th</sup> anniversary of the Environment Protocol**

- (25) The CEP agreed to advise the ATCM that the 25<sup>th</sup> anniversary of the Protocol was a milestone that provided a timely, relevant and desired opportunity to focus on the Environment Protocol as the environmental management framework for Antarctica, and that a symposium would be a useful and appropriate vehicle to achieve this.
- (26) The CEP furthermore agreed to advise the ATCM that such a commemorative symposium should be held in conjunction with CEP XIX/ATCM XXXIX in Chile, potentially on the Saturday immediately following the meeting of the CEP.
- (27) The CEP agreed to recommend that a steering committee, consisting of representatives of the proponent countries, other interested Members and potentially including former CEP Chairs be established. This steering

committee should further develop the symposium programme, taking into account, as appropriate, the ideas raised by CEP Members with regard to potential scope, balanced procedures for presentations and presenters and budgetary frameworks. The steering committee should consider mechanisms to ensure an opportunity for Parties to provide advice to the steering committee in the development of the symposium programme during the intersessional period.

- 
- (28) Argentina introduced WP 47 *Workshop on Education and Outreach - Report of the Informal Discussions on the Development of a Publication on the Occasion of the 25<sup>th</sup> Anniversary of the Madrid Protocol*. The paper presented the outcomes of the informal discussion led by Argentina, including a draft index of subjects for a publication, and possible ways to move forward. Argentina emphasised the importance of informing the general public on the many achievements over the past 25 years. It noted that several positions were expressed during the informal discussion regarding the scope of the publication. Argentina noted that some participants considered the scope should be limited to the work and accomplishments of the Committee to the present, while others suggested the publication should outline future key challenges and objectives. It suggested that the format and design of the publication should be user friendly and interactive. Argentina recommended that the CEP: recognise the progress made during the informal discussions; consider the various options suggested by participants; and analyse the convenience of formalising the publication process for the next intersessional period.
- (29) The Committee thanked Argentina for leading the informal intersessional discussion, and supported the establishment of a formal process with balanced authorship to prepare a publication to reflect the achievements of the Protocol and CEP, as well as future challenges. The Committee agreed that such a publication should be concise, politically neutral and prepared in language accessible to a wide audience.
- (30) The Committee noted that the Workshop on Education and Outreach held prior to ATCM XXXVIII had discussed the idea of a forum to coordinate outreach activities associated with the 25<sup>th</sup> anniversary of the Protocol, and that such a forum could be a useful means of disseminating information on this publication to a wide audience.
- (31) ASOC noted that the 25th anniversary was an important benchmark in the history of Antarctic governance and that it was appropriate to leave a record to reflect on the successes and challenges of the past 25 years and also

evaluate those of coming years. ASOC expressed its willingness to provide input in the process of publication.

- (32) SCAR also expressed its willingness to provide input in the process of publication.
- (33) The Committee decided to establish an intersessional contact group (ICG) on the development of a publication on the 25th anniversary of the Madrid Protocol with the following ToRs:
  - 1. Establish a small Author Group to develop the writing process of the publication, taking into account the geographical balance and diversity of CEP Parties in terms of experience, including former Chairs of the Committee. Also, to establish an Editing Group for the compilation and editing of the text, once the contributions are received;
  - 2. Develop a neutral, brief, concise and web-based publication including visual and dynamic tools, considering the objectives already defined for the publication by the CEP;
  - 3. Identify the different means of outreach for the publication; and
  - 4. Submit to the XIX CEP the draft publication for Parties consideration and approval, prior to its launch on the occasion of the anniversary date by October 2016.
- (34) The Committee gratefully accepted Argentina's offer to convene the ICG and encouraged broad engagement in this work during the upcoming intersessional period. The Committee welcomed the offer from Patricia Ortúzar (Argentina) to act as convener for the ICG.

#### *CEP Five-Year Work Plan*

- (35) The Committee considered the Five-Year Work Plan adopted at CEP XVII (WP 5) and, in keeping with its agreement at CEP XV (2012), briefly considered the work plan at the end of each agenda item.
- (36) The Committee revised and updated its Five-Year Work Plan (Appendix 1). The major changes included updates to reflect actions agreed during the Meeting, including to add a new issue on the protection of outstanding geological values. The Committee also decided to remove a number of issues for which no specific tasks had been identified (specially protected species; emergency response and contingency planning; updating the Protocol and reviewing Annexes; inspections; waste; and energy management), noting that some of these issues were standing items on its agenda and that these

issues, or any new issues, could be readily added to the work plan in the future.

- (37) The Committee agreed that, for future meetings, the Five-Year Work Plan should be submitted in a Secretariat Paper alongside the work plan of the ATCM.

#### **Item 4: Operation of the CEP**

- (38) The Chair referred to SP 2 *Secretariat Report 2014/15*, which summarised the Secretariat's activities over the past year. The Chair thanked the Secretariat for its work in support of the Committee.
- (39) Australia introduced WP 14 *Report of the intersessional contact group established to review information exchange requirements*. The Committee noted at CEP XVII its interest in contributing to discussions on environmental information exchange requirements. ATCM XVII subsequently requested the CEP to provide advice on these matters. Australia summarised the work of the intersessional contact group, which had identified two broad categories of information exchange suggestions. The first were items or categories where relatively simple changes or clarifications were suggested by one or more participants without debate, and which might gain general support by Parties. The second were items or categories where no clear agreement emerged, and where further discussion of suggested changes was likely to be required.
- (40) The paper recommended that the Committee should: consider the report with reference to the exchange of information relating to environmental matters; discuss those categories and items of information where minor changes might obtain general support to conclude changes where possible; and, for those categories where further discussion was likely to be required, determine if work on these categories and items was necessary and propose how to progress the work.
- (41) The Committee thanked Australia for convening the ICG and for the comprehensive report of discussions. The Committee expressed interest in further considering changes to the requirements for exchange of information relating to environmental matters. It noted that the ATCM's discussions on this paper would take into consideration contributions made by CEP representatives during the course of the meeting, and stood ready to provide

further advice to the ATCM, as appropriate, on the exchange of information relating to environmental matters.

- (42) The Chair recalled that ATCM XXXVII had updated the ATCM Multi-Year Strategic Work Plan to include a priority on ‘strengthening cooperation between the CEP and the ATCM’. The Chair noted that the Committee had a good working relationship with the ATCM, but highlighted the value of the Committee identifying opportunities to further enhance the relationship, and sought Members’ views in this regard.
- (43) The Committee welcomed the ATCM’s decision to prioritise consideration of its relationship with the CEP, and expressed support for steps taken by the Chair, including: providing an early briefing to ATCM delegations on matters to be considered by the Committee that might also be of interest and relevance for the ATCM’s own deliberations; using opportunities during the meeting to coordinate with ATCM Working Group Chairs and informally convey the results of relevant CEP discussions; and seeking to focus the presentation of the CEP report on the matters for which Committee had developed specific advice to the ATCM.
- (44) The Committee recalled its role as an advisory body to the ATCM, as outlined in Article 12 of the Protocol, and noted the necessity of an effective dialogue between the ATCM and CEP. The Committee further noted the importance of being responsive to requests for advice from the ATCM, and of being proactive in bringing important issues to its attention.
- (45) The Committee agreed that it would be useful to request the ATCM to provide feedback on how the Committee provides its advice, and on whether the advice is directed to matters of priority to the ATCM. In this regard, the Committee noted that it could be valuable for the ATCM to consider the priorities in the CEP Five-Year Work Plan.

---

**CEP advice to the ATCM on opportunities to strengthen cooperation between the CEP and the ATCM**

- (46) The Committee welcomed the priority assigned by the ATCM to considering its relationship with the CEP, and encouraged the ATCM to provide feedback regarding opportunities to enhance its approach to providing advice, including to more closely align with ATCM priorities.
-

## Item 5: Cooperation with other Organisations

- (47) COMNAP presented IP 8 *The Annual Report for 2014/15 of the Council of Managers of National Antarctic Programs* (COMNAP), which had also been presented to the ATCM. COMNAP advised the Committee that Anoop Tiwari was the new leader of the COMNAP Environment Expert Group and expressed its thanks to the former leader of the Group, Sandra Potter, for her years of service in that role.
- (48) The SC-CAMLR Observer presented IP 12 *Report by the SC-CAMLR Observer*. As in previous years, the paper focused on the five issues of common interest to the CEP and SC-CAMLR as identified in 2009 at the first joint workshop: a) Climate change and the Antarctic marine environment; b) Biodiversity and non-native species in the Antarctic marine environment; c) Antarctic species requiring special protection; d) Spatial marine management and protected areas; and e) Ecosystem and environmental monitoring.
- (49) IP 12 included progress on these five topics and highlighted some important initiatives of SC-CAMLR including: the Commission for the Conservation of Antarctic Marine Living Resources (CCAMLR) Scientific Scholarship Scheme and the work of SC-CAMLR in the fields of Marine Protected Areas (MPAs) and Vulnerable Marine Ecosystems, and the need for further development of the current set of CCAMLR Ecosystem Monitoring Program (CEMP) parameters as part of the development of feedback management approaches for the krill fishery. The full report on the 33rd SC-CAMLR meeting was available on the CCAMLR website: <http://www.ccamlr.org/en/meetings/27>.
- (50) In response to two questions from Turkey, the SC-CAMLR Observer noted that the most recent assessment of the krill population in the Convention Area was calculated from the CCAMLR 2000 synoptic survey. This survey produced a population estimate of 60 million tons of krill and SC-CAMLR acknowledged that this estimate was dated, but there is no evidence from smaller scale annual krill surveys to suggest any trend in krill biomass since that survey. The SC-CAMLR Observer also reported that no non-native marine species had been reported to CCAMLR but noted the agreement that the CEP would take the lead on the issue of non-native species in the Antarctic marine environment.
- (51) SCAR presented IP 19 *The Scientific Committee on Antarctic Research (SCAR) Annual Report 2014/15* and referred to BP 4 *The Scientific Committee on Antarctic Research (SCAR) Selected Science Highlights for 2014/15*. It

highlighted several examples of its activities including the publication of the Biogeographic Atlas of the Southern Ocean, the completion of the SCAR Science Horizon Scan (IP 20) and resulting publications in the journals *Antarctic Science* and *Nature*, and the participation in the development of the Antarctic Environments Portal. SCAR noted the advances in the preparation of a report on Southern Ocean acidification and reminded delegates that this will be the topic of the SCAR Lecture in the XXXVIII ATCM (BP 1). SCAR also informed delegates that the XII International Symposium on Antarctic Earth Sciences (ISAES) 2015 will be held on 13 – 17 July in Goa, India, and the XXXIV SCAR Meetings and Open Science Conference will be held in Kuala Lumpur, Malaysia on 19 to 31 August 2016. SCAR further noted that in 2018, the SCAR Meetings and Open Science Conference would be held 15 – 27 June in Davos, Switzerland. It further noted that it was continuing to develop fellowship programmes for young researchers and to support capacity building.

- (52) SCAR noted that Aleks Terauds had been appointed as the new Chief Officer of the Standing Committee on the Antarctic Treaty System (SCATS) and that several new members had joined SCATS.
- (53) Chile presented IP 106 *Report by the CEP Observer to the XXXIII SCAR Delegates' Meeting*, which presented the most important aspects of the meeting relevant to the Committee. Chile took the opportunity to thank SCATS and Steven Chown for the support given to the Committee in the past, and wished Aleks Terauds the greatest success with his tasks. It also recalled that, during the Open Science Conference of SCAR, SCATS had organised a “flipped symposium” with presentations on the current view of Antarctic researchers about conservation, biodiversity, monitoring, protected sites, local impacts, invasive species and the role of National Antarctic Programmes, as well as with the challenges they presented to the Antarctic Treaty System and the international scientific community. It noted that this information could be helpful for the work of the CEP.
- (54) Malaysia informed the Committee that the next SCAR Open Science Conference would be held 19-31 August, 2016 in Kuala Lumpur and referred the members to the conference webpage (<http://scar2016.com/>) for further details.

*Nomination of CEP Representatives to other organisations*

- (55) The Committee nominated Yves Frenot (France) to represent the CEP at the 27<sup>th</sup> COMNAP Annual General Meeting to be held in Tromsø, Norway,

26 – 28 August 2015, and Polly Penhale (United States) to represent the CEP at the 34<sup>th</sup> SC-CAMLR meeting to be held in Hobart, Australia, 19 – 23 October 2015. The CEP Chair also accepted an invitation from the SC-CAMLR Chair to attend the 2015 meeting of SC-CAMLR.

*CEP SC-CAMLR Workshop*

- (56) The United States introduced WP 6 *Proposed joint CEP/SC-CAMLR workshop (2016) on climate change and monitoring*, jointly prepared with the United Kingdom. The 2014 meetings of the CEP and SC-CAMLR had supported the concept of holding a second joint CEP/SC-CAMLR workshop in 2016. Both committees had agreed that the general scope for the workshop could be to identify effects of climate change that were most likely to impact the conservation of the Antarctic, and to identify existing and potential sources of research and monitoring data relevant to the CEP and SC-CAMLR. Following discussions at SC-CAMLR XVII, a joint steering committee had been established, co-convened by Polly Penhale (CEP Vice-Chair, United States) and Susie Grant (SC-CAMLR Vice-Chair, United Kingdom) and including the Chairs of the CEP (Ewan McIvor, Australia) and SC-CAMLR (Christopher Jones, United States). Additionally, it was noted that So Kawaguchi (Australia) and Anton Van De Putte (Belgium) had been nominated to join the steering committee. The steering committee now sought input from CEP Members regarding the proposed workshop terms of reference, specific items for the agenda, and nominations for additional members of the steering committee.
- (57) The Committee expressed strong support for holding a second joint CEP and SC-CAMLR workshop in 2016.
- (58) The Committee agreed that the proposed ToRs included in WP 6 provide a solid foundation for the workshop, and agreed to prioritise ToR (ii) which focused on a review of current monitoring programmes and the potential development of new approaches and (iii) the development of mechanisms for practical cooperation between the CEP and SC-CAMLR on climate change and monitoring. Furthermore the Committee recognised the need for caution in broadening the ToRs of the workshop and recommended a focus on monitoring of the effects of climate change rather than discussion of climate change mitigation measures.
- (59) The composition of the proposed steering committee was considered appropriate and of an ideal size to work efficiently. It was agreed that the

workshop would be open to all Members of the CEP and all Members of SC-CAMLR, and that all Observers to the CEP and to SC-CAMLR would also be invited to attend. Both SCAR and ASOC indicated their interest in attending the workshop.

- (60) In addition, the Committee agreed that consideration should be given to inviting experts who could share experiences in observational systems and monitoring of climate change, such as those working in the Arctic.
- (61) The Committee agreed that the most convenient timing for CEP Members would be to hold the joint workshop just prior to the 2016 ATCM/CEP meeting in Chile. It was recognised that this venue and timing might be less convenient for SC-CAMLR participants and, therefore, it was recommended that mechanisms for those who could not attend in person to participate remotely should be explored. While there are potential cost and technical issues associated with remote participation, this approach was viewed as worthy of investigation.
- (62) Chile expressed interest in hosting the joint workshop prior in 2016, but noted that a firm commitment could not be made at this time. It expected that a decision could be made in the latter part of 2015 after the review of the overall scope and budget of required support for the ATCM/CEP meeting was completed.
- (63) ASOC stated that the Antarctic environment did not recognise institutional boundaries, particularly with respect to the effects of climate change. Cooperation between various ATS bodies was required and ASOC strongly supported a second joint CEP and SC-CAMLR workshop.
- (64) The following papers were also submitted under this agenda item:
  - BP 4 *The Scientific Committee on Antarctic Research (SCAR) Selected Science Highlights for 2014/15* (SCAR).
  - BP 6 *Submission to the CCAMLR CEMP database of Adélie penguin data from the Ross Sea region* (New Zealand).

## **Item 6: Repair and Remediation of Environment Damage**

- (65) The Chair recalled that the CEP had provided advice to ATCM XXXVI (2013) on repair and remediation of environmental damage, as requested in Decision 4 (2010). The ATCM had considered the advice at its meeting in 2014, thanked the Committee for its valuable work, and decided that no

further advice was required at that time. Noting that ATCM XXXVIII would discuss matters relating to liability for environmental damage, in accordance with Decision 4 (2010), the Committee agreed that it would stand ready to provide advice on this topic as required.

- (66) Brazil introduced WP 49 *Environmental Remediation in Antarctica*, jointly prepared with Argentina, and referred to IP 16 *Bioremediation on the Brazilian Antarctic Station area*. WP 49 presented the results of a bilateral discussion between Brazil and Argentina to share experiences regarding environmental risk and remediation, including bioremediation of Antarctic sites contaminated by hydrocarbons. It outlined the difficulties found in establishing adequate parameters to measure levels of contamination in Antarctica, since some established international parameters were not applicable to the Antarctic environment. On this issue, both Members proposed using previous experience in cooperating on pollution monitoring. The paper also raised the importance of contributing to the Clean-up Manual in order to share information on best practice. Brazil and Argentina recommended that the Committee: note and acknowledge the usefulness of the results and outcomes of bilateral and multilateral workshops that allow for a more thorough exchange of views and experiences; encourage National Antarctic Programmes to cooperate on issues related to remediation experiences; and encourage Members and Observers to include their experiences in the Clean-up Manual in the future.
- (67) Many Members and ASOC noted the high quality work presented by Brazil and Argentina, which could be added to the case studies contained in the Clean-up Manual and improve best practice for repair and remediation. Members also acknowledged the excellent work presented by Australia in BP 12 and BP 13, noting that these papers added further value to an existing body of case studies. New Zealand informed the Committee that the Antarctic Environments Portal would soon release a synthesis report on the current state of knowledge on repair and remediation.
- (68) Several Members noted that non-native species should be considered during repair and remediation efforts. India praised the *in situ* bioremediation efforts made by Brazil, Argentina and Australia as cost-effective, but cautioned that the use of fertiliser without dose optimisation could allow non-native species to establish in the vicinity of the remediated site, hence further research on this issue may be persuaded. Ecuador reminded the Committee that it was important to preferentially work with native communities of microbes and bacteria when undertaking bioremediation.

- (69) ASOC noted that repair and remediation of environmental damage is a requirement of the Protocol relevant to annexes I, III, and VI, and should be carried out to the maximum extent possible, while taking into consideration the adverse environmental effects that repair and remediation could have. There were still instances of no action taken in the face of environmental damage. In this context, ASOC thanked Brazil and Argentina for an interesting paper and supported the suggestions to increase both cooperation as well as knowledge on environmental remediation.
- (70) The Committee endorsed the recommendations contained in WP 49.
- (71) The United States presented IP 41 *Remediation and Closure of Dry Valley Drilling Project Boreholes in Response to Rising lake Levels*. The paper discussed the remediation and closure of two boreholes installed as part of the Dry Valley Drilling Project, to mitigate the risk of contamination of Dry Valley lakes or the environment as a result of rising lake levels. The United States highlighted that environmental change must be considered when reviewing the status of sites of past activity.
- (72) The following papers were also submitted under this agenda item:
- BP 12 *Remediation of fuel-contaminated soil using biopile technology at Casey Station* (Australia).
  - BP 13 *Remediation and reuse of soil from a fuel spill near Lake Dingle, Vestfold Hills* (Australia).

## **Item 7: Climate Change Implications for the Environment: Strategic approach**

- (73) The United Kingdom and Norway introduced WP 37 *Report from ICG on Climate Change*. They reminded the Committee that the ICG on climate change was established at CEP XVI to develop a Climate Change Response Work Programme (CCRWP) for the CEP. The paper noted that, during two years of consultation, a CCRWP had been devised. The CCRWP described the issues facing the CEP as a result of the changing Antarctic climate, the actions/tasks required to address these issues, their prioritisation, and suggestions as to how, when, and by whom the actions would best be delivered. It further noted that an objective statement to accompany the CCRWP had also been agreed and the future governance of the CCRWP considered. The United Kingdom and Norway emphasized that the CCRWP should be viewed as a dynamic document that would need regular review

and revision to keep it relevant. They further noted that such efforts would require broad participation and engagement from Members. They encouraged Members to adopt the CCRWP and focus on the implementation of the identified tasks and actions.

- (74) The Committee thanked the United Kingdom and Norway for convening the ICG, and thanked all ICG participants for their contributions. The Committee welcomed the comprehensive report on discussions contained in WP 37.
- (75) Following minor modifications to accommodate suggestions on references to application of the IUCN red list criteria, and to International Maritime Organization (IMO) biofouling guidelines, the Committee adopted the CCRWP (Appendix 2). In doing so, the Committee noted that the CCRWP identified actions consistent with its roles and functions, specifically focusing on addressing impacts of climate change in Antarctica and not duplicating the climate change mitigation activities which were appropriately the responsibility of other bodies. The Committee agreed to retain the CCRWP as a separate document, to be flexible and dynamic, and to be updated annually as required.
- (76) Concerning the remaining issues identified in WP 37 which had not been incorporated into the CCRWP (black carbon, ozone, short lived climate forcers, energy efficiency, renewable energy), France, supported by the Netherlands, stressed the importance of considering their inclusion in the CCRWP at a later stage.
- (77) Concerning the prioritisation of tasks in the work plan, Argentina noted that implementation would be a challenge but that it would be possible to address this issue over time. It also reemphasised that the focus should be on considering the consequences of climate change, and highlighted the inclusion in the document of a reference to practices on Antarctic stations that have no impact on climate change, and which Argentina had already requested to remove. Referring to governance of the CCRWP, Argentina emphasised the need to find a mechanism to increase Members' participation, including translation into the four official languages, and noted that a subsidiary group might not be the best option to achieve this.
- (78) ASOC suggested that the ATCM/CEP could learn from the experience of addressing climate change in the Arctic where relevant, for instance the work carried out by expert groups such as the Arctic Climate Impact Assessment.
- (79) The Committee also recognised the importance of maximum engagement and participation in this topic, and in the implementation of the CCRWP. In this

regard, the Committee agreed to add an item on the CCRWP to its agenda for future meetings, and encouraged Members to give further consideration in advance of CEP XIX to the best mechanisms for managing and supporting implementation of the CCRWP.

---

**CEP advice to the ATCM on a CEP Climate Change Response Work Programme**

- (80) The Committee endorsed a draft Resolution expressing the intention to implement the Climate Change Response Work Programme as a matter of priority, and agreed to forward the draft Resolution to the ATCM for approval.
- 
- (81) The United Kingdom introduced WP 38 *Application of the RACER (Rapid Assessment of Circum-Arctic Ecosystem Resilience) Conservation Planning Tool to James Ross Island*, and referred to IP 34 *Results of RACER Workshop Focused on James Ross Island*, prepared jointly with the Czech Republic. At CEP XVII the Committee recognised that: resilience should be a key factor in the designation, management and review of protected areas, and further recognised RACER as one possible tool to determine key features important for conferring resilience; and encouraged further collaboration to investigate the applicability of RACER in Antarctica. WP 38 outlined further intersessional activity related to RACER. This included the identification of key features on James Ross Island that were likely to persist under different climate scenarios. The proponents emphasised that this methodology did not intend to replace, change, or conflict with Annex V of the Protocol.
- (82) The Committee was asked to: take note of the RACER analysis of James Ross Island undertaken during the intersessional period, and endorse the outcomes as providing the basis for a new protected area based on resilience criteria; and endorse further work led by the Czech Republic, with support from the United Kingdom and other interested Parties, to bring forward a proposal to CEP to designate initially Torrent Valley and a nearby area, Johnson Mesa and Monolith Lake catchment within a single multi-site Antarctic Specially Protected Area (ASPA) based on resilience criteria.
- (83) The Committee thanked the United Kingdom and Czech Republic for their report on this work in which they had tested the application of the RACER methodology to James Ross Island. The Committee supported the recommendations in WP 38, noting the advice from the United Kingdom and Czech Republic that this work to identify areas for protection on the

basis of resilience was being undertaken within the provisions of Annex V to the Protocol and did not seek to add to those provisions.

- (84) Argentina thanked the Czech Republic and the United Kingdom for their work and presentation. Argentina expressed its interest to participate, noting that several Argentinean scientists have been working at James Ross Island for over 30 years, and have great experience and knowledge of the area, and much data to contribute.
- (85) ASOC also thanked the United Kingdom and the Czech Republic, and strongly supported the recommendation to develop a multi-site ASPA for Ulu Peninsula on James Ross Island, which despite being one of the largest ice-free areas in Antarctica, is currently unrepresented in the protected areas system. ASOC particularly appreciated the expertise of the Czech scientists and other Parties operating in the area, and noted that the designation of protected areas to promote climate resilience is a critical task for the ATCM.
- (86) The Committee looked forward to receiving further details of the proposal to designate a multi-site ASPA on James Ross Island, noting also the usefulness of having had the opportunity to consider and provide comments at an early stage. The United States and Argentina noted the importance of conducting a broad survey of scientific disciplines, to complement the results of the RACER analysis, and expressed interest in participating in the future work. The Czech Republic noted the importance of complementing the RACER analysis with available scientific data and including also sites of outstanding paleontological values in the ASPA proposal.
- (87) The United States introduced WP 39 *Shared Science Priorities and Cooperation: Systemic Observations and Modelling in the Southern Ocean*, prepared jointly with Australia. The paper emphasised the Southern Ocean as an important component of the earth's climate system. Limited observations indicate that the Southern Ocean is changing (warming at certain depths, freshening, circulation and ecological changes and acidification) but processes and rates of change remain poorly understood due to sparse observations, short time-series and uneven spatial and temporal sampling. This knowledge gap has important ramifications for governance and management of this region and beyond.
- (88) The United States and Australia recommended that the Parties note the importance of Southern Ocean observations and modelling to understanding climate change and the need for international cooperation in this area.

Especially valuable would be support for the Southern Ocean Observing System (SOOS), which provides an excellent mechanism to enhance scientific progress.

- (89) The United States noted that it had recently inaugurated the Southern Ocean Climate and Carbon Observations and Modelling (SOCCOM) which aimed to fill in observations gaps using profiling floats with new generation sensors. The United States would welcome participation by other national programmes.
- (90) COMNAP informed that, following a successful SOOS workshop, it had initiated a SOOS Think Tank and welcomed the participation of interested Members.
- (91) ASOC reminded the Committee of the work conducted by CCAMLR in relation to the Southern Ocean and noted that observations and modelling, coupled with suitable environmental protection and management under CCAMLR and the ATCM, should aim to differentiate the effects of environmental change from those that may be caused by fisheries.
- (92) Argentina thanked Australia and the United States for their contribution and strongly supported the document, highlighting its consideration of the Southern Ocean as a scientific description and not a political one. Argentina also considered that it was valuable to continue working to understand the environmental state of oceans and further develop oceanographic knowledge of these areas.
- (93) Members emphasised the importance of collaborative scientific research on the Southern Ocean in the current climate change context, which induces deep changes in the sea ice conditions around the continent and has strong impact on logistical activities of the National Antarctic Programmes.
- (94) SCAR welcomed this paper, noting that it had been a key supporter of SOOS since its inception and remained committed to facilitating ongoing multi-national efforts to undertake monitoring in the Southern Ocean. SCAR noted that similar knowledge gaps exist for terrestrial Antarctic systems and that it welcomed similar cooperative efforts to conduct monitoring and modelling in these areas.
- (95) The Committee warmly thanked the United States and Australia for raising this subject for its attention, and supported the recommendations in WP 39. Several Members expressed their willingness to participate in the ongoing process of monitoring the Southern Ocean and the further development of SOOS.

---

**CEP advice to the ATCM on Southern Ocean observations and modelling**

- (96) The Committee noted the relevance of the matters discussed in WP 39 to the proposed CEP/SC-CAMLR workshop, and to the actions identified in the Climate Change Response Work Programme to support and undertake collaborative long-term monitoring of change in the Antarctic environment. The Committee endorsed the recommendations presented in the paper.
- 
- (97) SCAR presented IP 92 *Antarctic Climate Change and the Environment – 2015 Update*. SCAR reported on updates to the Antarctic Climate Change and the Environment (ACCE) Report related to the understanding of climate change across the Antarctic continent and the Southern Ocean, and the impact on terrestrial and marine biota. SCAR highlighted a number of recent scientific studies that have contributed significantly to the understanding of climate change impacts on both the physical and biological environments. Among these, SCAR noted that ocean acidification would become one of the biggest challenges to the Antarctic ecosystem in the future. SCAR noted that it was undertaking continuous updates of the ACCE report through a wiki. The Committee welcomed this update from SCAR.
- (98) The United Kingdom presented IP 94 *Climate Change in Antarctica*. This paper presented a graphic produced by the British Antarctic Survey showing the patterns and magnitudes of change in the climate of Antarctica and the Southern Ocean.
- (99) ASOC presented IP 110 *Climate Change 2015: A Report Card*, which summarised up-to-date scientific findings about current and future climate change in the Antarctic. ASOC emphasised the importance of Members providing support for scientific research.
- (100) ASOC also presented IP 114 *The Antarctic Treaty System, Climate Change and Strengthened Scientific Interface with Relevant Bodies of the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change* (UNFCCC). It noted that the Antarctic Treaty System had an important role to play in promoting the relevance of climate-related Antarctic research to the climate change community, including the UNFCCC. ASOC suggested that Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (IPCC) scientists be invited to future CEP and ATCM events, and welcomed the involvement of SCAR in an upcoming UNFCCC session.
- (101) France supported the recommendations made in IP 114 and suggested that the UNFCCC CoP 21 could be advised of the development of the CCRWP.

(102) The following papers were also submitted under this agenda item:

- SP 7 *Actions Taken by the CEP and the ATCM Recommendations on Climate Change* (Secretariat).
- BP 1 *Abstract of the SCAR Lecture: Southern Ocean Acidification* (SCAR).

## **Item 8: Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA)**

### ***8a) Draft Comprehensive Environmental Evaluations***

(103) No draft Comprehensive Environmental Evaluations (CEEs) were submitted for consideration by the Committee at the meeting.

(104) Italy introduced WP 30 *Towards the submission of a Draft Comprehensive Environmental Evaluation for the construction and operation of a gravel runway in the area of Mario Zucchelli Station, Victoria Land, Antarctica*. Italy reminded the Committee that this paper followed reports on Italy's intention to build a gravel runway presented at previous CEP meetings (CEP XVII - IP 57, CEP XVI - IP 80 and CEP XV - IP 41). This paper reported on Italy's progress in preparing a draft CEE, and Italy encouraged Members to offer advice on an 'in progress' version of the document. It summarised the rationale for building a gravel runway near Mario Zucchelli Station, specifically to reduce reliance on neighbouring National Antarctic Programmes, to reduce reliance on a biennial ship charter, and to increase flexibility in supporting science in the region. Italy also briefly described the environmental impacts, monitoring efforts, and mitigations considered during the preparation of the informal draft CEE. Italy noted that it intended to formally circulate a draft CEE in accordance with the provisions on Annex I of the Environment Protocol in advance of ATCM XXXIX. Italy invited Parties and Observers to express their views in detailed comments during the upcoming intersessional period.

(105) The Committee thanked Italy for the further update on its plans for a gravel runway at Mario Zucchelli Station as presented in WP 30. Several Members and ASOC noted the benefits of receiving advance notice of the CEE and indicated that they had already conducted a review of the preliminary draft CEE and offered to provide detailed comments directly to Italy. Some Members expressed a desire to receive more details regarding: formal collaboration agreements between the National Antarctic Programmes operating near Mario Zucchelli Station; the relationship of this new gravel

runway to existing runways in Antarctica; the extent to which the operation of a new runway facility may increase air transport in the region; use of the runway by other operators; anticipated types of aircraft to be used; fuel use and handling; meteorological or weather forecasting support; mitigation measures; potential for and mitigation of noise impacts; the potential impacts of the new runway on wilderness values; indirect and cumulative impacts associated with the construction and operation of the runway; additional infrastructure like a gravel road between the new runway and Mario Zucchelli Station; and further consideration of alternatives, including the alternative of not proceeding.

- (106) ASOC thanked Italy for the transparent approach to this proposed activity. While understanding the logistic difficulties Italy was facing, ASOC noted that environmental groups had reservations about the establishment of new airstrips because of the direct, indirect and cumulative impacts. ASOC suggested that the formal draft CEE should consider alternatives including the mandatory alternative of not proceeding, and should consider the reasonable foreseeable use of the runway, including a statement about tourism.
- (107) In response to a question, Italy noted that it could be ready to submit the in progress draft CEE to the CEP forum as early as July 2015. The Committee encouraged any other interested Members to provide further comments to Italy as it continued to prepare a formal draft CEE. The Chair further noted that once the formal draft CEE was circulated by Italy, a formal ICG would be convened to conduct the review, in accordance with the *Procedures for intersessional CEP consideration of draft CEEs*.
- (108) Belarus presented IP 39 *Construction and Operation of Belarussian Antarctic Research Station at Mount Vechernyaya, Enderby Land*. This paper introduced the final CEE, annexed to the paper, which included changes made in response to Members' comments on the draft CEE on the planned construction and operation of the Belarussian Antarctic Research Station, circulated in 2014, in accordance with the provisions of Annex I to the Environment Protocol (ATCM XXXVII - WP 22). Belarus expressed thanks to all the Members who participated in the ICG to review the draft CEE and in the discussion of the draft CEE at CEP XVII, and acknowledged that the CEE was improved by the suggestions received. It highlighted that significant changes were made to the document in the design of the station, monitoring programme, environment protection measures, evaluation of the current status of the environment and other sections of the CEE. It noted that detailed responses to each comment received were provided in the

attachment to the final CEE. Belarus further highlighted its commitment to environmental protection and noted that it had secured funds to conduct environmental monitoring programmes.

- (109) The Committee welcomed the paper from Belarus. It noted that, in circulating the final CEE and presenting this paper, which detailed how it took into account the comments received, Belarus had met its obligation under Annex I of the Environment Protocol. The Committee wished Belarus success in implementing the construction and operation of its station at Mount Vechernyaya, Enderby Land.

### **8b) Other EIA Matters**

- (110) Australia introduced WP 13 *Initial report of the intersessional contact group established to review the Guidelines for Environmental Impact Assessment in Antarctica*, jointly prepared with the United Kingdom. The paper provided an initial report from the ICG established at CEP XVII. It noted that the group had reached general agreement on a number of issues that it considered should be addressed in a revision of the EIA Guidelines, and had commenced work on specific suggested modifications. The ICG had also recorded broader policy or other issues that had arisen during discussion, and that might warrant further consideration by the CEP. It noted that the EIA Guidelines had last been revised in 2005 and that it was important for the CEP to review the guidelines to ensure that they adequately and accurately represented the Committee's current views on the important topics to be covered in an EIA document. The Committee was invited to note the initial report, to provide feedback on the ICG's activities to date, and to support the continuation of the ICG for a further intersessional period.
- (111) The Committee thanked Australia and the United Kingdom for convening the group, and congratulated all ICG participants for the excellent work they had produced. It warmly welcomed this first report of the ICG and noted that good progress had been made. The Committee agreed that the ICG's work to consider climate change in the context of the EIA process should focus on addressing the implications of climate change in Antarctica and not mitigation measures.
- (112) ASOC thanked Australia and the United Kingdom for coordinating the ICG on EIA guidelines, which was essential to the CEP's work. ASOC hoped that this work would continue.

- (113) The Committee endorsed the continuation of the ICG on Review of the Guidelines for Environmental Impact Assessment for a second intersessional period, and noted that the ICG's final report to CEP XIX would contain several items of interest to the ATCM. It also agreed to the following Terms of Reference:
1. Continue revising the Guidelines for Environmental Impact Assessment in Antarctica appended to Resolution 1 (2005) to address issues including those identified in ATCM XXXVII - WP 29 and, as appropriate, suggest modifications to the Guidelines.
  2. Record issues raised during discussions under ToR 1, which relate to broader policy or other issues for the development and handling of EIAs, and which may warrant further discussion by the CEP with a view to strengthening the implementation of Annex I to the Protocol.
  3. Provide a final report to CEP XIX.
- (114) Australia and the United Kingdom agreed to convene the ICG. The Committee welcomed the offers from Phil Tracey (Australia) and Henry Burgess (United Kingdom) to jointly convene the ICG.

---

**CEP advice to the ATCM on the review of the Guidelines for Environmental Impact Assessment in Antarctica**

- (115) The Committee agreed to advise the ATCM that its review of the *Guidelines for Environmental Impact Assessment in Antarctica* would: incorporate new or additional guidance to emphasise the importance of key matters; reflect new and revised CEP procedures and resources for environmental impact assessment; and include references to relevant other guidelines and resources. The review process would also identify broader policy issues relating to environmental impact assessment, including cumulative impacts and environmental repair and remediation. The final report of the review would be presented at CEP XIX, and would likely be of interest to the ATCM.
- 
- (116) The Czech Republic presented IP 15 *Proposed routes for all-terrain vehicles based on impact on deglaciated area of James Ross Island*. This paper complemented information provided by the Czech Republic in ATCM XXXIV - IP 133 on tire tracks made by former expeditions in different parts of James Ross Island. It reported on the use of all-terrain vehicles by the 2015 Czech expedition, as well as a suggestion to monitor the impact on the environment, and presented a preliminary proposal for all-terrain vehicles routes on James Ross Island. It noted that both GPS data layers of the routes and hard copies of the maps were available to interested Members.

- (117) The United States expressed interest in efforts to develop all-terrain vehicle routes on James Ross Island, noting that a diverse scientific community conducted field work on the island and that routes should consider both environmental protection and impacts on scientific projects.
- (118) ASOC presented IP 111 *Cumulative Impact Assessment*. This paper briefly reviewed some of the discussions on cumulative impact assessment as represented in papers presented previously to the ATCM and CEP. It took an environmentally focused approach to cumulative impact assessment and recommended that Members: review earlier recommendations on cumulative impact assessment; complete the review of EIA Guidelines so that it adequately considered cumulative impacts; carry out some case studies of cumulative impacts at particular sites; and augment and improve the consideration of cumulative impacts in the implementation of Annex I.
- (119) Several Members thanked ASOC for raising an important issue and noted that although cumulative impacts were a complicated topic, it was one that merited further attention, such as in the revision of EIA Guidelines.

#### *Unmanned Aerial Vehicles*

- (120) The Committee recalled that, following an initial discussion at CEP XVII (2014) on the use of unmanned aerial vehicles (UAVs) in Antarctica, it had agreed to hold in-depth discussions at CEP XVIII. The Committee had requested: reports by SCAR and COMNAP on the utility and risks of UAV operation in Antarctica; a paper from IAATO on its experiences and current practices relating to UAVs; and additional papers referring to Members' experiences on this matter.
- (121) COMNAP introduced WP 22 *UAV Use in Antarctica – Risks and Benefits*. This paper described the practical benefits of UAVs to National Antarctic Programmes in science support, science, operations and logistics, with a focus on close and medium range Remotely Piloted Aircrafts (RPAs). COMNAP advised that there were obvious benefits of UAVs with respect to safety, and reduction of fossil fuel use and transportation in the region. With benefits such as low operation costs and ease of transportation, there were also potential risks as well, including interference with other air operations. COMNAP's recommendations as listed in the paper included: that National Antarctic Programmes develop programme-specific, equipment-specific and site-specific guidelines for UAV use based on the developing COMNAP UAV code of conduct; and also that National Antarctic Programmes and other operators collect and share data and support research on UAV use.

- (122) SCAR introduced WP 27 *Wildlife Approach Distances in Antarctica*, and referred to BP 22 *A Meta-Analysis of Human Disturbance Impacts on Antarctic Wildlife*. This paper considered more than 60 research studies conducted on 21 species. The meta-analysis clearly indicated that human disturbance has a significant negative impact on Antarctic wildlife. In the case of camping and unmanned aerial vehicles, SCAR noted that little scientific evidence currently existed about the nature or extent of their impacts on Antarctic wildlife. SCAR also noted that research was underway globally to inform understanding of UAV impacts on wildlife, and this may also prove useful in informing Antarctic policy in this area. It recommended that the CEP encourage Members to undertake further research in support of setting evidenced-based guidelines to approach distances to wildlife in Antarctica. It also recommended that the CEP encourage Members using UAVs near wildlife concentrations to support research on UAV impacts; and encourage Members to consider avoiding UAV launches closer than 100 metres to wildlife and to consider avoiding vertical approaches by UAVs until Antarctic-specific information became available.
- (123) Poland presented IP 77 *UAV remote sensing of environmental changes on King George Island (South Shetland Islands): preliminary information on the results of the first field season 2014/2015*. This paper presented preliminary information on the first season of a new joint Polish and Norwegian monitoring programme using fixed-wing UAVs to collect geospatial environmental data. It also reported on observations undertaken to assess potential overflight impacts on breeding penguins. The study focused on species inhabiting ASPA No 128 (Western Shore of Admiralty Bay) and ASPA No 151 (Lions Rump, and Chabrier Rock and Shag Islands / Admiralty Bay).
- (124) South Africa presented IP 80 *South Africa's use of Unmanned Aerial Vehicles (UAV) in Antarctica*. It reported on the use of UAVs by the South African Antarctic Programme during the summer 2013/14, the monitoring of the possible environmental impact associated with this activity, and the preparation of guidelines by the South African Civil Aviation Authority for the use of UAVs within South Africa. It noted that the increased use of UAVs in Antarctica necessitated the development of regulations and, subsequently, guidelines.
- (125) The United States presented IP 82 *A risk-based approach to safe operations of unmanned aircraft systems in the United States Antarctic Program (USAP)* and IP 83 *Guidance on unmanned aerial system (UAS) use in Antarctica*

*developed for applications to scientific studies on penguins and seals.* These papers reported on the use of UAS by the United States Antarctic Program, on the use of operational guidelines, and on a risk assessment of UAS operation performed by the National Science Foundation to validate and inform the evolving guidelines. The United States noted that it had issued a programmatic statement on UAVs for the 2014/15 season prohibiting the unauthorised use of UAVs within the United States Antarctic Program, with permission only following an in-depth safety and environmental review process. It also issued guidelines for pre-flight planning, flight operations, and required certifications (see IP 82). IP 83 presented lessons that the United States had learned while operating UAVs in the Antarctic. It described the work conducted by the United States Antarctic Marine Living Resources (AMLR) programme to advance the work of CCAMLR's ecosystem monitoring programme by using UAVs to study seals and penguins. It noted the rigorous training and UAV selection process undertaken before field operations began. Acknowledging that the focus of the study was limited to population studies of land-based birds and mammals, the United States presented this paper as a useful reference for those considering permitting UAV operations in Antarctica

- (126) IAATO presented IP 88 *IAATO Policies on the use of unmanned Aerial Vehicles (UAVs) in Antarctica*. This paper outlined the discussions and policy evolution within the IAATO membership regarding the use of UAVs during IAATO member operations. A recent statement on the use of UAVs in Antarctica highlighted the agreement of IAATO members to: not allow recreational UAV flights in coastal areas for the 2015/16 season; and allow UAV flights for scientific or commercial purposes or at deep field sites, if conducted with the permission/authorisation from a competent authority. IAATO noted that, during the 2014/15 season, its operators had recorded 68 UAV flights, 44 in coastal areas. It further noted that most flights had been conducted without incident, but that one UAV had been lost in a crevasse.
- (127) The Committee thanked all Members and Observers who submitted papers to inform the discussion on environmental impacts of UAV use in Antarctica. It noted the importance of giving consideration to the safety risks associated with UAV use, and that this aspect would be more fully considered by the ATCM and COMNAP. It recognised the benefits of using UAVs for research and monitoring, including the potential reduction of environmental risks as compared to other means of collecting such data.

- (128) Acknowledging that the ATCM would also consider WP 22, the Committee generally supported the recommendations presented by COMNAP in the paper. The Committee welcomed COMNAP's ongoing work to prepare guidance for the use of UAVs in Antarctica, in the form of a code of conduct, and thanked COMNAP for its offer to report on progress at CEP XIX.
- (129) The Committee also thanked SCAR for the advice given in WP 27 and BP 22 and noted that, although no scientific evidence had been published in the peer reviewed literature on negative impacts of UAVs to wildlife in Antarctica, research was underway both in Antarctica and globally on this topic. With regard to the recommendations presented in WP 27, the Committee agreed to: encourage Members to undertake further research in support of setting evidence-based guidelines on approach distances to wildlife in Antarctica; and to support research into UAV impacts, and means to avoid them. The Committee supported taking a precautionary approach in the absence of scientific data and noted the utility of considering cryptic responses to disturbance when evaluating environmental impacts of UAVs. It noted SCAR's suggestion to consider avoiding UAV launches closer than 100 metres to wildlife until Antarctic-specific information had become available, while noting the importance of considering the different types and sizes of UAVs, and the different site specific environmental conditions. The Committee welcomed SCAR's offer to report back to CEP XX in 2017 on advances in research on the impacts of UAVs on wildlife. The Committee also noted that it would be useful if the Antarctic Environments Portal could provide summaries on the scientific understanding of impacts of UAVs on wildlife as it becomes available.
- (130) Members expressed their concern about a potential overpopulation of UAVs in Antarctica due to their low costs, taking also into account the knowledge of accidents that have already occurred with such aircraft in the past. In this regard, they expressed the view that the use of UAVs should be prioritised for scientific and logistic purposes in accordance with EIA guidelines, and raised concerns about the recreational use of UAVs.
- (131) The Committee thanked all Members who had submitted papers on UAV use in Antarctica. It also thanked IAATO for presenting its draft guidelines and policies on UAV use, and noted that these policies and guidelines represented a conservative approach to managing the use of UAVs.
- (132) Germany informed the Committee that it was currently carrying out a research project on the impacts of micro-UAVs on penguin colonies and that it was planning to present the results at the next meeting of the Committee.

- (133) Spain highlighted the importance of UAVs and underwater unmanned vehicles for scientific research, for improving the safety of navigation in ice-covered waters, and for reducing environmental impacts associated with ship and aircraft operations. France also mentioned the potential use of UAVs for detection of crevasses in the coastal areas of the continent, making traverses safer.
- (134) ASOC noted that UAVs were considered aircraft. It encouraged Members to develop guidelines appropriate for the use of the types of aircraft represented by UAVs. It encouraged National Antarctic Programmes, COMNAP, and IAATO to ensure that any developed guidelines were mutually consistent and expressed a desire that common guidelines for UAV operation in Antarctica be developed.
- (135) The Committee expressed support for developing guidelines for the environmental aspects of UAV use in Antarctica, which could provide guidance on avoiding or minimising wildlife disturbance, and could also consider other environmental values such as wilderness and aesthetic values. It further noted that it may be desirable, in the future, to establish an ICG to advance discussions on this issue, which could take into consideration any further advice from SCAR and COMNAP, as well as valuable information contained in the papers submitted by Members and Observers to the meeting.
- (136) The Committee also noted that it may be useful, at some point, to give consideration to unmanned marine vehicles. It encouraged interested Members to give further consideration to that issue and to bring forward papers for consideration.

---

**CEP advice to the ATCM on unmanned aerial vehicles (UAVs)**

- (137) The Committee discussed the use of unmanned aerial vehicles (UAVs) in Antarctica, recognised the benefits of developing guidance on the environmental aspects of UAV use in Antarctica, and agreed that it would consider at CEP XIX initiating work to develop such guidance.
- 
- (138) The following paper was also submitted under this agenda item:
- *SP 5 Annual list of Initial Environmental Evaluations (IEE) and Comprehensive Environmental Evaluations (CEE) prepared between April 1st 2014 and March 31st 2015 (Secretariat).*

## Item 9: Area Protection and Management Plans

### 9a) Management Plans

- i) *Draft Management Plans which have been reviewed by the Subsidiary Group on Management Plans*
- (139) The convener of the Subsidiary Group on Management Plans (SGMP), Birgit Njåstad (Norway) introduced WP 15 *Subsidiary Group on Management Plans – Report on 2014/15 Intersessional Work*, on behalf of the SGMP. The convener thanked all active participants in the SGMP for their hard work and reminded the Committee that all Members were welcome to join the SGMP. In accordance with terms of reference #1 to #3, the Group had reviewed five draft Antarctic Specially Protected Area (ASPAs) management plans referred by CEP XVI and CEP XVII for intersessional review.
- (140) The SGMP advised the CEP that since the proponent had not been able to progress the review of these management plans during the intersessional period, the SGMP was not able to give further advice and complete the review process. The SGMP anticipated that it would be able to complete its work in the upcoming intersessional period. Accordingly, the SGMP suggested that further intersessional work be conducted with regard to the following management plans:
- ASPA No. 125: Fildes Peninsula, King George Island (Chile)
  - ASPA No. 144: ‘Chile Bay’ (Discovery Bay), Greenwich Island, South Shetland Islands (Chile)
  - ASPA No. 145: Port Foster, Deception Island, South Shetland Islands (Chile)
  - ASPA No. 146: South Bay, Doumer Island, Palmer Archipelago (Chile)
  - ASPA No. 150: Ardley Island (Ardley Peninsula), Maxwell Bay, King George Island (Chile)
- (141) Chile informed the Committee that it anticipated submitting revised versions of the five management plans to the SGMP for review in October 2015.
- (142) The SGMP convener further recalled the long-term goal of having all management plans undergo review in the SGMP or a similar review to ensure that they contain adequate content, and are clear and effective. The SGMP convener drew Members’ attention to the table provided at the end

of WP 15 which detailed progress towards this goal, and noted that only two of the revised management plans presented to the CEP this year had previously been considered by the SGMP.

- (143) The Committee thanked the SGMP and Birgit Njåstad for their work and the report provided. It noted the advice from Chile and looked forward to further consideration of the SGMP's advice on these management plans next year.

*ii) Revised draft Management Plans which have not been reviewed by the Subsidiary Group on Management Plans*

- (144) The Committee considered revised management plans for 17 ASPAs and one Antarctic Specially Managed Area (ASMA) that had not been reviewed by the SGMP. In each case, the proponent(s): summarised the suggested changes to the existing management plan; noted that (for the ASPA management plans) it had been reviewed and revised with reference to the *Guide to the Preparation of Management Plans for Antarctic Specially Protected Areas* (the Guide); and recommended its approval by the Committee and referral to the ATCM for adoption:

- a. WP 1 *Revised Management Plan for Antarctic Specially Protected Area No. 106 Cape Hallett, Northern Victoria Land, Ross Sea* (United States)
- b. WP 2 *Revised Management Plan for Antarctic Specially Protected Area No. 119 Davis Valley and Forlidas Pond Dufek Massif, Pensacola Mountains* (United States)
- c. WP 3 *Revised Management Plan for Antarctic Specially Protected Area No. 152* (United States)
- d. WP 4 *Revised Management Plan for Antarctic Specially Protected Area No. 153 Eastern Dallmann Bay* (United States)
- e. WP 8 *Updated Management Plan and maps for Antarctic Specially Managed Area No. 2 McMurdo Dry Valleys, Southern Victoria Land* (New Zealand and United States)
- f. WP 9 *Revision of the Management Plan for Antarctic Specially Protected Area (ASPA) No. 103 Ardery Island and Odbert Island, Budd Coast, Wilkes Land, East Antarctica* (Australia)
- g. WP 10 *Revision of the Management Plan for Antarctic Specially Protected Area (ASPA) No. 101 Taylor Rookery, Mac.Robertson Land* (Australia)

- h. WP 11 *Revision of the Management Plan for Antarctic Specially Protected Area (ASPAs) No. 164 Scullin and Murray Monoliths, Mac. Robertson Land (Australia)*
  - i. WP 12 *Revision of the Management Plan for Antarctic Specially Protected Area (ASPAs) No. 102 Rookery Islands, Holme Bay, Mac. Robertson Land (Australia)*
  - j. WP 25 *Revision of the Management Plan for Antarctic Specially Protected Area (ASPAs) No. 104 Sabrina Island, Balleny Islands (New Zealand)*
  - k. WP 26 *Revision of the Management Plans for Antarctic Specially Protected Areas (ASPAs) No.105, 155, 157, 158 and 159 (New Zealand)*
  - l. WP 34 *Revised Management Plan for Antarctic Specially Protected Area No. 148, Mount Flora, Hope Bay, Antarctic Peninsula (United Kingdom and Argentina)*
  - m. WP 41 *Revision of the Management Plan for Antarctic Specially Protected Area (ASPAs) No. 168 Mount Harding, Grove Mountains, East Antarctica (China)*
  - n. WP 42 *Review of Management Plan for Antarctic Specially Protected Area (ASPAs) No 163: Dakshin Gangotri Glacier, Dronning Maud Land (India)*
- (145) With respect to WP 1 (ASPAs 106), WP 2 (ASPAs 119), WP 3 (ASPAs 152) and WP 4 (ASPAs 153), the United States noted that only minor changes to the existing management plans were proposed. These included map and text updates, and the addition of classifications under the Antarctic Environmental Domains Analysis (EDA) and the Antarctic Conservation Biogeographic Regions (ACBR). The plans were updated to incorporate recent scientific results.
- (146) With respect to WP 8 (ASMA 2), New Zealand and the United States noted minor changes to the plan and maps involving facilities, camps, landing sites, shorelines and other physical features in the area. In responding to IAATO's query regarding potential additional visitor sites in the McMurdo Dry Valleys, the United States welcomed input from IAATO, as well as ASOC and other interested parties into further work on the ASMA 2 management plan during the next intersessional period.

- (147) In relation to WP 9 (ASPAs 103), WP 10 (ASPAs 101), WP 11 (ASPAs 164) and WP 12 (ASPAs 102), Australia noted that it had proposed minor changes to the description of the Areas, maps and management provisions. Where relevant, these changes included: adding the locations of automatic cameras used for bird surveys; enhanced biosecurity measures; clarification of waste disposal requirements; and updated population estimates for bird species. Australia also noted that minor changes to the boundaries of ASPAs 101 and ASPAs 164 were proposed for clarification and improved mapping based on satellite imagery.
- (148) Introducing WP 25 (ASPAs 104) and WP 26 (ASPAs 105, 155, 157, 158 and 159), New Zealand advised that only minor amendments to the management plans and maps were proposed. It pointed out a minor suggested change to the boundary of ASPAs 157, to reflect the change made in 2014 to the shared boundary with ASPAs 121, and noted that there were no changes to the boundaries of the other Areas.
- (149) With respect to WP 34 (ASPAs 148), the United Kingdom and Argentina explained that the proposed changes included: the addition of an introduction; references to the EDA and ACBR; an updated description of the Area; amendments to provisions for access to the Area and sampling of geological specimens; and inclusion of an improved geological map. The United Kingdom and Argentina also recommended that Argentina be recognised as a co-managing Party, with the United Kingdom, for ASPAs 148. Argentina thanked the United Kingdom for its invitation to work on the development and update of the management plan.
- (150) The Committee supported the proposal in WP 48 that the United Kingdom and Argentina be recognised as co-managing Parties for ASPAs 148.
- (151) With respect to WP 41 (ASPAs 168), China explained that the suggested changes to the management plan included: updated details of CHINARE visits to the Area; improvements to the aims and objectives for consistency with provisions regarding the prevention of non-native species introductions; and updated details of support documentation.
- (152) With respect to WP 42 (ASPAs 163), India noted that minor changes to the plan had been proposed, including to: reflect recent observations of the retreat of Dakshin Gangotri Glacier; update the restrictions on materials and organisms to be brought into the Area to reflect the provisions of the CEP Non-Native Species Manual; and provide better resolution maps and updated figures.

(153) The Committee approved all of the revised management plans that had not been reviewed by the SGMP.

*iii) New draft management plans for protected/managed areas*

(154) No new draft management plans for protected/managed areas were submitted.

---

**CEP advice to the ATCM on revised management plans for ASPA and ASMAs**

(155) The Committee agreed to forward the following revised management plans to the ATCM for approval by means of a Measure:

#	Name
ASPAs 101	Taylor Rookery, Mac.Robertson Land
ASPAs 102	Rookery Islands, Holme Bay, Mac.Robertson Land
ASPAs 103	Arderly Island and Odberly Island, Budd Coast, Wilkes Land, East Antarctica
ASPAs 104	Sabrina Island, Balleny Islands
ASPAs 105	Beaufort Island, McMurdo Sound, Ross Sea
ASPAs 106	Cape Hallett, Northern Victoria Land, Ross Sea
ASPAs 119	Davis Valley and Forlidas Pond Dufek Massif, Pensacola Mountains
ASPAs 148	Mount Flora, Hope Bay, Antarctic Peninsula
ASPAs 152	Western Bransfield Strait
ASPAs 153	Eastern Dallmann Bay
ASPAs 155	Cape Evans, Ross Island
ASPAs 157	Backdoor Bay, Cape Royds, Ross Island
ASPAs 158	Hut Point, Ross Island
ASPAs 159	Cape Adare, Borchgrevink Coast
ASPAs 163	Dakshin Gangotri Glacier, Dronning Maud Land
ASPAs 164	Scullin and Murray Monoliths, Mac.Robertson Land
ASPAs 168	Mount Harding, Grove Mountains, East Antarctica
ASMA 2	McMurdo Dry Valleys, Southern Victoria Land

---

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

(156) The SGMP convener, Birgit Njåstad (Norway), introduced the elements of WP 15 *Subsidiary Group on Management Plans – Report on 2014/15 Intersessional Work* that reported on the SGMP’s intersessional work in accordance with terms of reference #4 and #5. The paper reported on discussions led by SGMP member, Polly Penhale (United States), on initiating work to develop guidance for preparing and reviewing ASMA management plans, *inter alia* by developing a work plan for the process. The paper recalled the agreed long-term goal aimed at ensuring all ASPA

and ASMA management plans contained adequate content and were clear, consistent and likely to be effective, as stated in term of reference #5. It therefore suggested that Members consider the updated overview of the status of ASPA and ASMA management plans and any actions that may be needed to ensure an appropriate level of review and consideration.

- (157) The SGMP advised the CEP that: the work plan for 2015/16 should include the development of guidance on determining whether an area should be designated as an ASMA; and that, after completing this work, the SGMP should in the next instance include on its work plan the preparation of a document, with checklists, similar to the ‘Guide to the Preparation of Management Plans for Antarctic Specially Protected Areas’. With regard to early consultation with the CEP on proposed new ASMAs, the SGMP noted the Committee’s separate discussion on Norway’s initiative on a process of pre-assessment of ASPAs and ASMAs (WP 29) would provide input to this topic.
- (158) The Committee thanked the SGMP for its advice, and agreed to adopt the SGMP’s proposed work plan for 2015/16:

Terms of Reference	Suggested tasks
ToR 1 to 3	Review draft management plans referred by CEP for intersessional review and provide advice to proponents (including the five postponed plans from the 2014/15 intersessional period)
ToR 4 and 5	Work with relevant Parties to ensure progress on review of management plans overdue for five-yearly review
	Continue the work to develop guidance for preparing and reviewing ASMA management plan in according with agreed work plan for the process, i.e. initiate work on developing guidance on determining whether an area should be designated as an ASMA.
	Review and update SGMP work plan
Working Papers	Prepare report for CEP XIX against SGMP ToR 1 to 3
	Prepare report for CEP XIX against SGMP ToR 4 and 5

- (159) China introduced WP 48 *Report of the Informal Discussions for Another Intersessional Period on the Proposal for a New Antarctic Specially Managed Area at Chinese Antarctic Kunlun Station, Dome A*. Following the Committee’s consideration at CEP XVI of China’s proposal to designate an ASMA at the Chinese Antarctic Kunlun Station, Dome A, and informal intersessional discussion during the 2013/14 intersessional period, this paper reported on further informal discussions held during the 2014/15 intersessional period. The paper included an attachment summarising China’s responses to various concerns previously expressed by Members.

China gave a brief introduction to the scientific research work carried out in the area including the international cooperation projects. With concerns that the environment in the area is vulnerable to damage and impossible for this to be remedied once damaged, and the environmental capacity is extremely low there, China, in 2013, presented the proposal for a new Antarctic Specially Managed Area in accordance with the Protocol. The proposal had been through three rounds of discussion over two years. With the co-endeavours of the international colleagues, the legal and technical issues raised had been fully discussed. During the third round of discussion, Argentina kindly offered to share its experience. China thanked Argentina for its comments during the intersessional period, and asked the Committee to move the proposal to the SGMP.

- (160) Argentina thanked China for taking into account its contributions during the discussion, noting its openness to discussion and debate regarding the management plan. Argentina noted that, if there was agreement to refer the proposal to the SGMP for review, it would have some further recommendations regarding the management plan.
- (161) Germany expressed doubts as to the necessity of an ASMA in this area, and stated it was not in favour of referring this proposal to the SGMP.
- (162) China responded that the core spirit of an ASMA is not to calculate how many countries are carrying out activities, but to evaluate how much impact is caused by the human activities to the area. What concerns China is to build a kind of standard and effective environmental protection system in the Dome A area, so as to contribute to Antarctic environmental protection with a high standard. Considering the fact that the environmental capacity is extremely low and the international scientific cooperation is becoming more frequent there, under the framework of the Protocol and its annexes, China hopes and would like to communicate and cooperate with Parties as far as the issue of Dome A ASMA establishment and operation is concerned.
- (163) The Chair summarised that the Committee had not reached the consensus to forward the draft ASMA management plan to the SGMP.
- (164) New Zealand expressed its agreement with the Chair's summary.
- (165) The Committee thanked China for conducting further informal intersessional discussions and for providing the report on those discussions. The Committee recognised China's openness to discussion and to considering comments received from CEP Members. It noted that Members had also generally recognised the value of having sound management arrangements in place for

this scientifically important area and had congratulated China for its work to lead discussions in this regard. Noting that it had not reached a consensus on China's proposal, the Committee decided not to refer the ASMA proposal to the SGMP for review at this time.

- (166) The Committee welcomed China's offer to lead a fourth round of informal intersessional discussion on the proposal in 2015/16 and encouraged interested Members to participate.

**9b) Historic Sites and Monuments**

- (167) Bulgaria introduced WP 17 *Proposal to Add the Lame Dog Hut at the Bulgarian base St. Kliment Ohridski on Livingston Island to the List of Historic Sites and Monuments*. It also gave an informative presentation of the same title that included many photographs of the hut. It noted that the hut was the first permanent building established in Antarctica by Bulgaria, and that it had laid the foundations for Bulgaria's systematic scientific research in the Livingston Island area. It proposed that, if adopted, the new Historic Site and Monument (HSM) be named Lame Dog Hut at the Bulgarian base St. Kliment Ohridski on Livingston Island, South Shetland Islands. It noted that the Lame Dog Hut was erected in April 1988, and had been the main building of St. Kliment Ohridski base until 1998. It was currently the oldest preserved building on Livingston Island. The paper detailed several reasons, in accordance with Resolution 8 (1995) and the Appendix to Resolution 3 (2009), for the site meriting listing as an HSM. These included the hut's importance to the history of science as the first Bulgarian building to support science in Antarctica, the unique materials and methods of construction, and its cultural values as the oldest preserved building on Livingston Island.
- (168) In response to questions from Belgium, Bulgaria expressed a preference for keeping the building *in situ* rather than moving it to a more controlled museum environment outside Antarctica. It noted that there is a replica of the hut in the Bulgarian national history museum. In response to questions regarding the future conservation of the building, Bulgaria further noted that it was currently in very good condition and it saw no difficulties in maintaining it into the future.
- (169) The Committee noted that the reasons outlined in WP 17 were the basis for the proposed designation, in accordance with Resolution 3 (2009), and agreed to forward the proposal to the ATCM for adoption.

- (170) The Russian Federation introduced WP 31 *Proposal on inclusion of the oversnow heavy tractor “Kharkovchanka” that was used in Antarctica from 1959 to 2010 to the List of Historical Sites and Monuments*. It noted that the tractor was the first non-serial transport vehicle of Soviet machine-building produced exclusively for operations in Antarctica and was a unique historical sample of engineering technology developments made for the exploration of Antarctica. The Russian Federation highlighted the historic significance of the “Kharkovchanka” tractor and its commemorative and emotional value to all who would visit it in Antarctica. It further noted that the tractor had been purged of all its liquids and the doors hermitically sealed to keep out snow in preparation for its long-term display in Antarctica.
- (171) In response to questions from Members, the Russian Federation indicated its preference to preserve the tractor *in situ*, noting that the tractor’s historical significance would be best appreciated by expeditioners and other visitors to Antarctica. The Russian Federation also advised that it had taken steps to preserve the tractor, including sealing it to prevent snow ingress, and would report back to the Committee in the future on the effectiveness of these measures. It encouraged other Members to do the same for HSMs for which they are responsible.
- (172) The Committee noted that the reasons outlined in WP 31 were the basis for the proposed designation, in accordance with Resolution 3 (2009), and agreed to forward the proposal to the ATCM for adoption.

---

**CEP advice to the ATCM on additions to the List of Historic Sites and Monuments**

- (173) The Committee agreed to forward two proposals for additions to the List of Historic Sites and Monuments to the ATCM for approval by means of a Measure.

#	Name
HSM #	Lame Dog Hut, St. Kliment Ohridski, Livingston Island
HSM #	Oversnow heavy tractor “Kharkovchanka”

- (174) Norway, following up on a discussion initiated at CEP XVI, suggested that it now could be timely to initiate further discussion on HSM designations in the broader sense. Norway recalled earlier discussions where it had pointed to the challenge arising from the fact that as many buildings or other items in Antarctica might be considered to have historical value, this could lead to the designation of a large number of HSMs in the future, which again

might be seen to contradict the Environment Protocol's provision regarding clean-up of past activities in Antarctica. Norway noted in this context that the current management philosophy and understanding focusing on alternative ways to preserve such values, instead of maintaining such values physically in their original place, could be informative for such a broader discussion.

- (175) Noting the importance of having some guidance on the issue of potential conflicts between Annex V and Annex III provisions, Norway offered to do preparatory work in advance of CEP XIX in order to provide the Committee with a basis for further discussions, initially focusing on inter alia collating information on approaches and methods discussed, used and accepted as alternatives to *in situ* preservation of historic and cultural remains.
- (176) The Committee welcomed Norway's offer, noting also that it would be useful to seek advice from expert organisations such as the International Polar Heritage Committee (IPHC). Norway suggested that future proposals for new designations of HSM be put on hold until some further guidance had been established in this regard.

---

**CEP advice to the ATCM on guidance for the designation of new Historic Sites and Monuments**

- (177) The Committee agreed that future proposals for new designations of HSM should be put on hold until some further guidance has been established in this regard.
- 
- (178) Argentina welcomed both presentations and Members' commitment to patrimony conservation. It also recalled that the debates held during two intersessional periods (2010-2011) referred to the patrimony concept and the different protection mechanisms for these values. Regarding some considerations about their transfer outside the Antarctic Treaty area, Argentina considered that, once the elements are designated as HSMs, they become part of the list, allowing any person interested to visit them, and transfers would impair access.
- (179) ASOC remarked that, in its view, aspects of the relationship between Annex III and Annex V (8) merited further examination.
- (180) New Zealand introduced WP 23 *Ross Sea Heritage Restoration Project: A Model for conserving heritage values in Antarctic Specially Protected Areas*, and referred to IP 13 *Supporting Images for Working Paper: Ross Sea Heritage Restoration Project: A model for conserving heritage values in Antarctic Specially Protected Areas*. These papers reported on the New

Zealand Antarctic Heritage Trust's decade-long programme of heritage conservation of the buildings and artefact collections from ASPAs 155, 157 and 158 on Ross Island. New Zealand noted that the Project had recently reached a significant milestone and was unprecedented in its scale and complexity in respect of heritage conservation in the polar regions. It informed the Committee of intentions to continue the work, noting that funding had already been secured to support the next 25 years of maintenance efforts.

- (181) The Committee thanked New Zealand for these papers and congratulated the New Zealand Antarctic Heritage Trust for its comprehensive work to protect historical sites in the Ross Sea region. Members highlighted the significant education and outreach efforts carried out in the course of this project, and noted that the restored sites would have value to future generations.
- (182) There was strong support for the recommendations presented in WP 23. The Committee recognised the approach followed by the New Zealand Antarctic Heritage Trust as a helpful model for others conducting preservation work in Antarctica, while at the same time recognising the importance of conservation management practices being tailored to the characteristics of the historic sites in question. The Committee further noted that the Antarctic Heritage Trust is meeting the provisions of the relevant ASPA management plans, which place an obligation on National Antarctic Programmes to consult together with a view to ensuring that management activities within the ASPAs, including conservation, are implemented.
- (183) The following paper was also submitted under this agenda item:
- IP 50 *Damage to the Observation Hill Cross (HSM 20)* (New Zealand).

### **9c) Site Guidelines**

- (184) No new or revised Site Guidelines were submitted for the Committee's consideration.
- (185) IAATO presented IP 85 *Report on IAATO Operator Use of Antarctic Peninsula Landing Sites and ATCM Visitor Site Guidelines, 2013-14 and 2014-15 Season*. The paper presented data collected from its members' Post Visit Report Forms, noting that no non-IAATO visits had been included in the analysis. IAATO informed the Committee that: tourism levels were still depressed from the peak season of 2007-08, but were recovering slightly; the increase in air cruise tourism had resulted in a disproportionate increase in

the numbers of voyages and, to a lesser extent, in landings made; and almost all the landing sites in the top twenty landing sites on the Peninsula, apart from the Yalour Islands, were managed by ATCM Visitor Site Guidelines or through National Programme Management guidelines. IAATO invited assistance from interested parties in developing guidelines for this site. It also informed the Committee that it would continue to provide information annually to the CEP and ATCM on its members' activities.

- (186) The Committee noted IAATO's useful contribution and appreciated being updated regularly by IAATO. The CEP welcomed and appreciated the report on visitor site guidelines and acknowledged the utility of the reports in understanding management and monitoring activities at the most frequently visited sites. The United Kingdom offered to engage with IAATO on its suggestion to develop guidelines for Yalour Island.
- (187) New Zealand presented IP 102 *Antarctic Site Inventory: Results from long-term monitoring*, prepared jointly with the United States. The Antarctic Site Inventory (ASI) had collected biological data and site-descriptive information in the Antarctic Peninsula region since 1994. New Zealand noted the ASI would continue to monitor the rapid change in the relative populations of gentoo, chinstrap, and Adélie penguins throughout the western Antarctic Peninsula. It noted that the ASI monitoring results had recorded that gentoo penguin populations were increasing rapidly and expanding their range southward, and the other two species were declining significantly.
- (188) The Committee noted its appreciation of the information and data contained in the paper.
- (189) The United Kingdom presented IP 119 *National Antarctic Programme use of locations with Visitor Site Guidelines in 2014-15* prepared jointly with Argentina, Australia and the United States. This paper provided an overview of information provided by Parties on visits by their National Antarctic Programme personnel of locations with ATCM Site Guidelines in place, during the 2014/15 season.
- (190) The Committee noted its appreciation of the information provided.
- (191) Argentina presented IP 131 *Tourism Management Policy for Brown Scientific Station*. Recalling discussion on its paper ATCM XXXVI - WP 49, Argentina noted that many Parties had supported its proposal that stations should have written regulations related to visitors. IP 131 presented guidelines for Brown Scientific Station. Argentina requested that these guidelines be included in the IAATO "Field Operations Manual".

- (192) The Committee thanked Argentina for the paper and accompanying guidelines for visitation to its Brown Scientific Station. The Committee noted that IAATO intended to include the guidelines in its operations manual, and further noted the intention of nearby stations to inform their visitors about the guidelines if they intended to visit Brown Scientific Station.

**9d) Marine Spatial Protection and Management**

- (193) Belgium introduced WP 20 *The concept of “outstanding values” in the marine environment under Annex V of the Protocol*, and referred to IP 10 *The concept of “outstanding values” in the Antarctic marine environment under Annex V of the Protocol*. This paper presented a summary of the discussions of the ICG established by CEP XVII to consider the concept of outstanding values in the marine environment. ICG participants had reached general agreement that: presently no further work was required on definitions and criteria for protecting ‘outstanding values’ in the marine environment, because Annex V and the *Guidelines for implementation of the Framework for Protected Areas set forth in Article 3, Annex V of the Environmental Protocol* (Resolution 1 (2000)) provided sufficient guidance; and they wished to proceed case by case and step by step, the greatest need for spatial protection being given by the combination, in a given area, of a value (in this case, an outstanding marine value) and a situation or activity that threatens that value. This threat may be an actual threat or a potential one that could affect the value in the future. The CEP should consider outstanding values in the marine environment when proposing new ASPAs or revising existing ASPA management plans; and the CEP’s efforts to advance the provisions of Annex V should complement rather than duplicate the ongoing work by CCAMLR to consider the designation of MPAs. The ICG further recommended that the CEP endorse the continuation of an ICG, which would report to CEP XIX regarding this second round of discussions.
- (194) China raised concerns that the designation of marine ASPAs could potentially limit access to areas by national programme vessels and logistical support.
- (195) In response to these concerns, the United States noted that the management plans for marine ASPAs 152 and 153 specifically allow essential operational activities of vessels that will not jeopardise the values of the Areas, such as transit through, or stationing within, the Areas in order to facilitate science or other activities, including tourism, or for access to sites outside of the Areas.

- (196) ASOC noted that some ASPAs, including those with a marine component, had been established to facilitate research, and that ASPAs established for conservation purposes did not unduly interfere with research.
- (197) The Committee thanked Belgium for convening the ICG and supported the key outcomes of the intersessional discussion. Members gave particular emphasis to the recommendation that Parties and the CEP should consider outstanding values in the marine environment under Annex V of the Protocol when proposing new ASPAs or revising the management plans for existing ASPAs, and should make use of the 2000 Guidelines.
- (198) The Committee agreed to continue discussions on these matters, and established an ICG led by Belgium to work during the 2015/16 intersessional period with the following terms of reference:
- 1) Discussing next steps in the implementation of Annex V, Art. 3 of the Protocol regarding the concept of “outstanding values” applied to the marine environment, including any actual or potential threats to that environment, with respect to activities covered by Art. 3 (4) of the Protocol;
  - 2) Identifying further mechanisms for the CEP, within the existing framework and tools of the Treaty and the Protocol, to consider “outstanding values” of the marine environment, when establishing and/or reviewing ASPAs, and ASMAs as appropriate;
  - 3) Understanding the work of CCAMLR on systematic conservation planning, in order to avoid duplication of efforts, complement it and maintain separate roles, while using the appropriate tools available to the CEP’s work to implement Article 3 (2) of Annex 5 to the Protocol;
  - 4) Providing a final report to CEP XIX.
- (199) The Committee welcomed the offer from François André (Belgium) to act as ICG convener.

***9e) Other Annex V Matters***

- (200) Norway introduced WP 29 *A Suggested ASPA/ASMA Prior Assessment Process*. Norway noted that intersessional discussions had shown that there was a general interest amongst Members to develop preliminary assessment procedures for ASPA and ASMA proposals, noting that such procedures could engage all Parties in the process of designating new Areas, allow Members to receive early feedback on proposals, help achieve greater coherence in areas selected

for ASPA/ASMA designation, and facilitate the process of management plan adoption. The paper presented draft guidelines for ‘A prior assessment process for the designation of ASPAs and ASMAs’. It also suggested that the Committee: emphasise the merit of the CEP having the opportunity to undertake prior assessment of any new ASPA and ASMA designations; encourage proponents of a new ASPA or ASMA to bring plans of such a designation to the attention of the CEP as early as possible to allow for a prior assessment of the area; and agree to the proposed guidelines as a desired, but not mandatory, procedure to be used to enable prior assessment of new designations.

- (201) The Committee thanked Norway for leading the discussions and noted the benefits of a prior assessment process for proposed new ASMAs and ASPAs, including: engaging all Parties in the process of designating new sites, recognising that all ASPAs and ASMAs are internationally designated; aiding Members in preparing management plans by allowing for feedback and comments from other Members earlier in the process; and facilitating consideration of the further systematic development of the protected areas system in accordance with Article 3 of Annex V to the Protocol, and with consideration of climate change implications.
- (202) China emphasised that, during the process of discussion, the procedure of an ASPA or ASMA which has already been proposed shall not be interrupted or delayed by any new process.
- (203) Argentina agreed with the adoption of these guidelines. It also supported the comments made by China that this procedure should not apply to ASMA/ASPA proposals already in course.
- (204) ASOC noted that such a prior assessment process may be a useful contribution to a more strategic approach in the development of a representative network of protected areas as long as this does not discourage the submission of draft management plans.
- (205) The Committee supported the idea of establishing a non-mandatory procedure and, following some comments from Members and minor modifications to the wording presented in WP 29, agreed to adopt the *Guidelines: A Prior Assessment process for the designation of ASPAs and ASMAs* (Appendix 3).

---

**CEP advice to ATCM on a prior assessment process for the designation of ASPAs and ASMAs**

- (206) The Committee encouraged Members to utilize the *Guidelines: A Prior Assessment process for the designation of ASPAs and ASMAs* in future ASMA

and ASPA designation processes. The Committee noted that the procedure for prior assessment of ASPAs or ASMAs should not apply to any areas that had already been proposed as an ASPA or an ASMA.

---

- (207) New Zealand introduced WP 35 *Code of Conduct for Activities within Terrestrial Geothermal Environments in Antarctica*, and referred to IP 24 *Code of Conduct for Activities within Terrestrial Geothermal Environments in Antarctica*, both of which were jointly prepared with Spain, the United Kingdom, and the United States. The co-authors of these papers highlighted the high scientific value of terrestrial geothermal environments in Antarctica, and suggested that a code of conduct was needed to help maintain the unique environmental and scientific values of terrestrial geothermal sites. They further noted that such a code would serve as a non-mandatory guide to best practice within geothermal environments. The proponents recommended that the Committee: provide any comments on the draft of the code of conduct; invite SCAR in consultation with COMNAP to review the draft code of conduct with a view to endorsing it as a SCAR code of conduct; and invite SCAR to re-submit a final version of the code of conduct for consideration at CEP XIX.
- (208) The Committee thanked New Zealand and the United States for convening the workshop and expressed strong support for the proposed recommendations, particularly noting the value of having SCAR and COMNAP involved. The Committee welcomed SCAR's offer to review the draft code of conduct and to submit a final version to CEP XIX for consideration by the Committee. The Committee asked Members to encourage their own relevant specialists to participate in the intersessional review process.
- (209) Argentina introduced WP 50 *Findings from ad hoc Surveys Related to the Protection of Fossils in Antarctica: Potential Courses of Action for Further Discussion*. Argentina reminded the Committee that this matter was raised at CEP XVII, where Argentina undertook to lead informal intersessional discussions. Following these discussions and a survey of relevant Parties, Argentina identified possible courses of action that could assist in achieving additional protective measures related to fossils in Antarctica, including: that all Parties take note of the various mechanisms and procedures informed by each survey participant; that various modes of information exchange be considered; and that SCAR, through its Action Group on Geological Heritage and Conservation, could be requested to provide technical advice on identifying appropriate management and protection measures for geological sites, including those containing fossils.

- (210) The Committee thanked Argentina for reporting on the outcomes of the intersessional discussions. It noted the value of fossils to scientific understanding of the history and evolution of the Antarctic continent, and recognised the importance of ensuring protection of fossils and fossil sites through enhanced information exchange and the possible development of best practice management guidance.
- (211) The Committee welcomed SCAR's advice that the SCAR Action Group on Geological Heritage and Conservation would be considering matters related to the scientific understanding of fossils, as part of the group's broader work, and thanked SCAR for its offer to provide advice to a future meeting. The Committee also welcomed IAATO's offer to support the Committee's work on this matter as appropriate. Members expressed support for considering a Resolution similar to Resolution 3 (2001) on Protection of Meteorites, but noted that such a resolution would best be developed at a future meeting following further discussion of these matters.
- (212) The Committee noted with concern the collection of Antarctic fossils and other geological material for commercial sale. The Committee urged all Parties, national programmes and IAATO to take appropriate actions to ensure that the collection of fossils and other geological material was only undertaken for scientific research and that such material was appropriately archived for ongoing research purposes.
- (213) ASOC presented IP 109 *Antarctic Tourism and Protected Areas*, and emphasised the connection between area protection and tourism regulation. It recommended that Members consider examining, from a regional perspective, the intersection of current tourism activities with protected and managed areas, as well as area protection and management needs. It further suggested that Members provide clear statements about tourism policies at their facilities and consider the spatial expansion of tourism in the process of developing a representative network of protected areas.
- (214) ASOC also presented IP 112 *Expanding Antarctica's Protected Areas System*, which highlighted the importance of strengthening the protected areas system, given the exposure of the changing Antarctic environment to threats such as invasive species. It recommended that the Committee critically review the scope of ASPA coverage in Antarctica and initiate an integrated, region-wide planning process that enacted the obligations set out in Article 3 of Annex V to the Protocol.

- (215) Belgium recalled its Working Paper 39 presented to CEP XVI, co-sponsored by the United Kingdom and South Africa, and stressed the importance of Annex V as a tool for the protection of microbial habitats, especially in pristine areas, where anthropogenic impacts could destroy future scientific values.
- (216) The Committee thanked ASOC for the papers, and noted that they contained a range of information and views that may be useful for the Committee's further discussions on the systematic development of the protected areas system, including actions identified in the Climate Change Response Work Programme.

## **Item 10: Conservation of Antarctic Flora and Fauna**

### ***10a) Quarantine and Non-native Species***

- (217) The United Kingdom introduced WP 28 *Revision of the CEP Non-native Species Manual (Edition 2011)*, jointly prepared with France and New Zealand. The United Kingdom reminded the Committee that the CEP Non-Native Species Manual was adopted under Resolution 6 (2011), which also encouraged the Committee to continue to develop the Manual. The paper highlighted the growing body of scientific work and developments in practical methods for addressing non-native species issues, as well as the additional work on non-native species by the Committee and recent ICGs, and suggested that consideration be given to the revision of the Manual.
- (218) The Committee thanked the United Kingdom, France and New Zealand for the paper, which addressed an issue identified as the highest priority in both the CEP Five-Year Work Plan and the CCRWP. The Committee also welcomed the detailed summary of relevant developments and results since the adoption of Resolution 6 (2011). It noted that relevant information available from the Antarctic Environments Portal and the other papers submitted under this agenda item would also be useful for the work of the ICG. Many Members expressed interest in participating in the ICG. The Committee also welcomed the offers of assistance from SCAR and IAATO.
- (219) The Committee noted the recommendation within Resolution 6 (2011) that Parties 'encourage the Committee for Environmental Protection to continue to develop the Non-Native Species Manual with the input of the Scientific Committee on Antarctic Research and the Council of Managers of National Antarctic Programmes on scientific and practical matters, respectively', recognised recent scientific and practical environmental management

developments regarding non-native species issues, and noted also that a review of the manual had been identified as a prioritised action in the Climate Change Response Work Programme.

- (220) The Committee welcomed the proposal and agreed to establish an ICG to:
- 1) Review and/or reconfirm the ‘Overall Objectives’ and ‘Key Guiding Principles’ for Parties’ actions to address non-native species, contained within the CEP Non-Native Species Manual;
  - 2) Revise, and supplement with new information, the section of the Manual concerning ‘Guidelines and resources to support prevention of the introduction of non-native species including the transfer of species between sites in the Antarctic’;
  - 3) Review and revise the Annex ‘Guidelines and resources requiring further attention or development’ to identify particular aspects of Antarctic operations for which further work might be required in order to develop specific guidance. Furthermore, give consideration to issues relating to the natural introduction pathways for species;
  - 4) Report to CEP XIX on progress with the above.
- (221) The United Kingdom agreed to convene the ICG. The Committee welcomed the offer from Kevin Hughes (United Kingdom) to act as ICG convener.
- (222) Argentina introduced WP 46 *Study to determine the occurrence of non-native species introduced into Antarctica through natural pathways*. This paper discussed the results of studies conducted on two specimens of the vagrant bird *Netta peposaca* found dead in the South Shetland Islands. An autopsy carried out on both specimens suggested that they may have died of hunger, tiredness and dehydration. Laboratory tests had showed no apparent parasitic disease, no signs of bacterial disease and no presence of influenza virus. The paper highlighted the need to advance studies on the pathways of introduction of new species in the Antarctic. It further noted the need to distinguish between natural and anthropogenic pathways. Argentina encouraged interested Members and SCAR to conduct research on potential pathways for natural introductions to the Antarctic and to collect data on occurrence and distribution of microorganisms in Antarctica.
- (223) France stated that it had been confronted with two cases of albatross’ epizooties in sub-Antarctic islands. In both cases, viruses had been detected and had affected populations in isolated areas. It was very likely that these viruses had been introduced through natural pathways. France noted that it had undertaken bio-security measures to prevent any spread to neighbouring populations.

- (224) SCAR highlighted that introduction of non-native species remains an important issue and that, according to recent studies, human introductions of non-native species were becoming more frequent. SCAR also noted recent works, including one on the detection of distinct avian influenza viruses in Adelie Penguins, and a second which lists several bird dispersal events to Elephant Island, King George Island and Nelson Island. SCAR also drew attention to several recent microbiological reviews, indicating much endemism in elements of the continent's microbiota. These works also indicate that differentiation of incoming species by natural means, such as wind, from those introduced by humans is feasible. SCAR also noted that much of the wind-borne microbial diversity is indigenous to the continent. SCAR further noted that the SCAR groups AntEco and AnT-ERA were undertaking work on these questions. SCAR supported Argentina's encouragement of Members to support terrestrial biodiversity research in the region indicating such work will improve understanding of the risks of introductions from elsewhere, and those from transfers among the continent's Conservation Biogeographic regions.
- (225) Chile thanked Argentina for its document and supported the recommendations presented in it, mentioning that this issue could be relevant mainly in the Antarctic Peninsula region, where Chilean researchers have informed the record of live non-Antarctic birds and also pathogen microorganisms.
- (226) The Committee welcomed the paper from Argentina, noting that it addressed a subject identified as a high priority for the CEP's work. The Committee supported the recommendation that Parties be encouraged to conduct similar studies as those described in WP 48. With regard to the second recommendation, the Committee noted SCAR's advice regarding ongoing research within the Antarctic science community. The Committee noted that the issues raised in the paper could be considered further in the review of the Non-native Species Manual, which could also include the experiences of other Members. It also noted the relevance of the publications mentioned by SCAR, which should serve as a useful reference for the work of the ICG when reviewing the Non-native Species Manual.
- (227) Spain presented IP 29 *The successful eradication of Poa pratensis from Cierva Point, Danco Coast, Antarctic Peninsula*, jointly prepared with the United Kingdom and Argentina. This paper reported on collaborative efforts by the co-authors to protect native biodiversity by eradicating the non-native grass *Poa pratensis*, which had been inadvertently introduced to the Cierva Point area in 1954.

- (228) The Committee thanked the authors of the paper, noting its usefulness as a resource for the intersessional work to include in the Non-native Species Manual during its revision.
- (229) The United Kingdom presented IP 46 *Colonisation status of known non-native species in the Antarctic terrestrial environment: a review*, jointly prepared with Chile and Spain. The paper summarised a recent academic review paper that detailed non-native species distribution and eradications within the Treaty area and discussed pertinent legislative and management issues.
- (230) The Committee welcomed the paper and noted that it would be a useful reference for the ICG's work to review the Non-native Species Manual.
- (231) Poland presented IP 78 *Eradication of a non-native grass Poa annua L. from ASPA No. 128 Western Shore of Admiralty Bay, King George Island, South Shetland Islands*. This paper reported on a research project undertaken during the 2014/15 season at Arctowski station and ASPA 128, which aimed to eradicate the non-native grass *Poa annua*.
- (232) The Committee thanked the authors of the paper, and welcomed the efforts made by Poland. The Committee encouraged further updates from Poland on the eradication of non-native grass from ASPA 128, and on any lessons learned.
- (233) SCAR presented IP 93 *Monitoring biological invasion across the broader Antarctic: a baseline and indicator framework*. SCAR reported on some recent published research that has developed a framework (the Antarctic Biological Invasion Indicator - ABII), which applies global best practice to the problem of understanding, monitoring and managing biological invasions in Antarctica. The research shows that: invasion drivers are prevalent across the Antarctic and are increasing; plants and insects make up most of the non-native species present in the Antarctic region; and the conservation status of threatened species impacted by non-native species is declining. SCAR suggested that the indicator framework not only provides a comprehensive baseline on the current status of biological invasions in Antarctica, but also provides a mechanism to facilitate information exchange across the broader Antarctic region. SCAR recommended that the CEP consider the potential value of the ABII for helping to address one of its key priorities and drew attention to the relevance of this framework in the review of the Non-native Species Manual.

- (234) The Committee thanked SCAR for bringing to its attention the ABII, and noted that further consideration could be given to this framework during the planned review of the Non-native Species Manual.
- (235) COMNAP presented IP 101 *COMNAP Practical Training Modules: Module 2 – Non-native Species*. This paper presented a training module developed by the COMNAP Training Expert Group entitled “Non-native Species”. The module was created from training presentations developed by the National Antarctic Programmes of Argentina, Australia, China, India, New Zealand and Spain. COMNAP thanked those programmes and also thanked IAATO, who had provided input into the training module. The paper noted that the training module would be made freely available in various file formats from the COMNAP website.
- (236) The Committee commended COMNAP for its work to develop the training materials, noting that the Non-native Species Manual highlighted the importance of raising awareness of non-native species risks.

***10b) Specially Protected Species***

- (237) No papers were submitted under this agenda item.

***10c) Other Annex II Matters***

- (238) The Committee considered elements of WP 27 *Wildlife Approach Distances in Antarctica* (SCAR) that had not been discussed under Agenda Item 8b.
- (239) SCAR noted that its recommendations in WP 27 were intended to emphasise the importance of taking into account cryptic, negative responses of wildlife. It noted that this element was not reflected in existing guidelines, and therefore warranted consideration.
- (240) The Committee thanked SCAR for presenting the paper and for its comprehensive review of scientific publications and evidence relating to an understating of wildlife disturbance. The Committee agreed that the management of human activities to avoid disturbance of wildlife should be based on the best available science. The Committee strongly encouraged Members to conduct more research in this area, as suggested by SCAR, and agreed that matters related to wildlife disturbance should be reconsidered in the future as new scientific data became available.

---

**CEP advice to the ATCM on wildlife disturbance**

(241) On the basis of information provided by SCAR, the Committee agreed to advise the ATCM that:

- approach distances in existing ATCM guidelines should be regularly reviewed on the basis of emerging scientific research;
- precautionary approaches are urged in all circumstances when operating in the vicinity of wildlife; and
- further research should be undertaken to ensure management decisions are taken on the basis of the best available knowledge.

---

(242) The United States introduced WP 40 *Important Bird Areas (IBAs) in Antarctica and IP 27 Important Bird Areas (IBAs) in Antarctica*, jointly prepared with Australia, New Zealand, Norway and the United Kingdom. It reported on the recently completed analysis of Important Bird Areas based on the consistent application of global criteria for bird population assessment worldwide. It noted that until now there was a significant gap in coverage of the terrestrial environment in continental Antarctica. The effort to compile an IBA inventory for Antarctica was initiated by BirdLife International and SCAR in 1998, and had been aided by support from Members in recent years. It further noted that all IBA sites were identified using a standardised set of thresholds and IBAs now covered five per cent of the world area, with 204 IBAs located in Antarctica. IBA was neither a formal designation, nor had a protected area status associated with it, but designation of an IBA emphasised the area's importance for the preservation of biodiversity. The paper recommended that the Committee consider the IBA analysis as an important tool to be used for assessment and monitoring.

(243) The Committee thanked the co-authors of these papers. It also thanked Birdlife International and the various contributors to the report, including many members of the scientific community. The Committee recognised the value of the IBA report, which represented a substantial product and was of considerable relevance to its deliberations on the protection and management of Antarctica. Members noted further potential applications for the IBA report, including as a resource for preparing and assessing EIAs, reviewing protected area management plans, and preparing for policy and management discussions at the annual ATCM and CEP meetings.

### **CEP advice to the ATCM on Important Bird Areas in Antarctica**

(244) The Committee agreed to forward a draft Resolution on Important Bird Areas in Antarctica to the ATCM for adoption.

---

(245) Spain presented IP 69 *Update of the status of the rare moss formations on Caliente Hill (ASPAs 140 – site C)*. This paper drew attention to damage caused by inadvertent cumulative trampling on the endemic moss *Schistidium deceptionense* in the sensitive area of Deception Island. It provided an update to CEP XVII - IP 58, which had reported on new damage detected on Deception Island. It highlighted some elements of this damage and the related difficult issues. It also mentioned that it was necessary to work from different perspectives in order to assess this damage properly. Damage was sometimes due to recreational activities, but it was not automatically attributable to IAATO vessels, and could come from elsewhere. Spain also noted that the duplication of research was likely to put the environment under pressure. It mentioned that it had developed an internal code of conduct for field activities, which was suggested as a useful example for other Members. It concluded by expressing interest in supporting and managing the ASPA, noting that it operated a research station nearby and that a Geothermal Code of Conduct could potentially be of great use.

(246) The Committee thanked Spain for this paper and noted the steps Spain had taken to improve protection for these important sites on Deception Island. The United Kingdom noted that it was interested in working closely with Spain and the Deception Island Management Group to consider opportunities to improve protection and management of ASPA 140.

(247) The following paper was also submitted under this agenda item:

- BP 22 *A meta-analysis of human disturbance impacts on Antarctic wildlife* (SCAR).

### **Item 11: Environmental Monitoring and Reporting**

(248) The United States introduced IP 42 *EIA Field Reviews of Science, Operations, and Camps*. The paper reported on the monitoring of United States Antarctic Program projects in Antarctica through an EIA field review process. The process was designed to compare each project's planned and actual activities and impacts. The United States informed the Committee that prior to the field season, projects were identified as candidates for an EIA Field Review using one or more of the following attributes as selection criteria: use of large

quantities of hazardous materials or generation of large quantities of waste; use of undisturbed or minimally disturbed areas (operational activities); establishment and use of large field camps or new tent camps; located in or near sensitive areas; located where other projects were on-going or may be initiated; and use of emerging technology.

- (249) The Committee commended the United States for its comprehensive approach to follow-up of EIAs, and noted that the information presented in IP 42 could be a useful resource for the ICG on EIA matters.
- (250) The Republic of Korea introduced IP 71 *Environmental Monitoring at Jang-Bogo Station, Terra Nova Bay*, which reported on a comprehensive environmental monitoring programme aimed to assess the impacts of the operation of Jang-Bogo Station on the Antarctic environment. It noted that the process also aimed to devise effective mitigation measures and that the level of environmental impact of the station was generally in compliance with the levels expressed in the CEE.
- (251) India congratulated the Republic of Korea for conducting comprehensive environmental monitoring, selecting various environmental indicators, and noticed that this experience may be useful for Parties conducting environmental monitoring with reference to indicators suggested by COMNAP and SCAR.
- (252) The Committee welcomed the advice that monitoring at Jang-Bogo Station had shown that the environmental impacts associated with operating the station were generally in compliance with the levels expressed in the CEE.
- (253) SCAR presented IP 98 *Report on the 2014-2015 activities of the Southern Ocean Observing System (SOOS)*. It noted that, in 2014, SOOS clarified its mission and objectives, and developed Implementation Structures to support implementation activities. It highlighted SOOS sponsorship and endorsement as well as activities planned for the 2015/16 season along with its key objectives.
- (254) The Committee welcomed the update and noted the value and relevance of SOOS to CEP interests, as had been recognised in its earlier discussions of WP 39 and the CCRWP.
- (255) New Zealand presented IP 103 *A Methodology to Assess Site Sensitivity at Visitor Sites: Progress Report*, prepared jointly with Australia, Norway, the United Kingdom and the United States. The paper reported on work

conducted in collaboration with Oceanites and Stony Brook University to identify opportunities to use the long-term data set of the Antarctic Site Inventory. It provided a progress report and outcomes of field work undertaken during the 2014/15 season and set out further work to be undertaken ahead of CEP XIX.

- (256) IAATO considered that the methodology employed a good mix of qualitative and quantitative approaches, noting its involvement in the expert survey. France noted the potential bias in the results due to more information on birds and mammals and expressed the wish that other components of the ecosystem will be more covered in the future. ASOC stated that environmental monitoring was essential and encouraged Members to continue developing this kind of work.
- (257) The Committee recalled its discussion at CEP XVII of this work, and noted that it related to recommendations arising from the 2012 CEP Tourism Study. The Committee thanked IAATO and its member operators for the significant support in facilitating the expert survey. It looked forward to a further update during the next meeting, including a discussion of the anticipated site sensitivity methodology.

## **Item 12: Inspection Reports**

- (258) The United Kingdom introduced WP 19 rev. 1 *General Recommendations From the Joint Inspections Undertaken by the United Kingdom and the Czech Republic Under Article VII of the Antarctic Treaty and Article 14 of the Environmental Protocol*, and referred to IP 57 *Report of the Joint Inspections Undertaken by the United Kingdom and the Czech Republic under Article VII of the Antarctic Treaty and Article 14 of the Environmental Protocol*, jointly prepared with the Czech Republic. It reported on the joint Antarctic Treaty inspections undertaken between December 2014 and January 2015, which involved 12 research stations, one non-governmental facility, one refuge, six cruise vessels and five yachts. The United Kingdom thanked all Parties and vessel operators who were inspected for their cooperation during the inspection process. The United Kingdom noted that inspections necessarily reflected the position at a point in time. They welcomed all Parties who indicated that they would consider the individual station or vessel recommendations. No significant breaches of the Treaty or its Environment Protocol were observed.

- (259) The United Kingdom drew the attention of the Committee to the recommendations in WP 19 rev. 1 that in its and the Czech Republic's opinion addressed environmental issues (Recommendations 4, 11, 13, 14, 17, 18, 19, 20, 21, and 26), and asked the meeting to welcome and endorse them.
- (260) The Czech Republic noted that the paper reported on the first inspections carried out by a Czech inspector. It noted the importance of international cooperation during the inspection process, and highlighted the value of multi-national inspection teams.
- (261) The Committee thanked the United Kingdom and the Czech Republic for the detailed report on inspections undertaken during 2014-2015, and generally focused its discussions on the environmental elements of the inspection report and the recommendations arising. The Committee noted the value of inspections, including as a means of verifying compliance with the Protocol and highlighting good practice. The Committee welcomed the inspection team's observations regarding the generally high level of awareness of the provisions of the Environment Protocol, and the significant examples of good practice, as highlighted in the full inspection report.
- (262) Some Members provided comments, clarifications and updates on issues raised in the inspection report as it related to their operations.
- (263) China noted that the Chinese emergency refuge listed in Table 1 of the inspection report was scheduled for removal in two years and that appropriate mitigation measures would be taken to reduce the environmental impact of the removal.
- (264) Bulgaria commented that the Bulgarian Antarctic Institute (BAI) was not "mainly reliant on hosting visiting scientists at the station" for funding the national scientific research. The scientific operations of BAI and its Antarctic base St. Kliment Ohridski were funded through the National Research Fund, which approved scientific projects on a competitive basis, and by other national sources such as the Ministry of Environment. It further noted that Ohridski base did not rely on the Spanish station for medical support. Each of the two stations had its own doctor and basic health care facilities, so there was no essential interdependence as far as medical support was concerned. As for the possible complex medical emergencies that would require evacuation from the island, it would only delay the process and pose additional risks for the patient if transported first to the Spanish station. Such evacuation was carried out by helicopters to the Chilean airport on

King George Island, the flying conditions at the two stations would be most likely similar, and the flight distances were the same, obviating the need for evacuation by way of the Spanish station. Bulgaria highlighted that the station was operated by a mixture of volunteers and non-volunteers. Indeed, paid BAI employees such as its director, programme manager and secretary who regularly participate in the annual Bulgarian Antarctic campaigns and work at the base in various capacities (campaign leadership, logistics or other support) were not volunteers. Bulgarian scientists working at the station also took part in the operation of the station, and they were usually remunerated under their respective scientific projects and thus were not volunteers either. The volunteers included non-scientific personnel such as construction, mechanical or electrical engineers, doctors, cooks, etc. However, “volunteers” should not be interpreted as “amateurs”. These were skilled professionals in their field, usually with several (more than ten in some cases) seasons of previous Antarctic experience.

- (265) Germany reiterated its feedback that the German Antarctic Receiving Station (GARS) O’Higgins did not process data for military purposes.
- (266) Canada informed the Committee that it had noted the concerns raised regarding observations at HSM 61 and that it would be working with its authorised tour operators, particularly those inspected, to improve compliance with the Treaty and the Environment Protocol.
- (267) Ukraine informed the Committee that it had taken note of the recommendations relevant to its station and had already commenced work on improvements.
- (268) Several Members recognised the general character and the interests of the recommendations resulting from inspections but urged the Committee to only consider the recommendations related to environmental issues.
- (269) Argentina welcomed the inspections carried out under Article 7 of the Antarctic Treaty; it further noted that they were very useful for future decision-making and it agreed with the Chair that the Committee should focus strictly on environment-related inspections only. In this regard, Argentina drew attention to the fact that the document contained all recommendations and not just those related to the environment. It also stated that since the recommendations were made by individual Parties, Argentina did not share the view that the Committee include the general recommendations in any final report of the CEP meeting.

- (270) Brazil thanked the work done by the United Kingdom and the Czech Republic, whose findings about the Brazilian station were very positive. Brazil recognised the usefulness of inspections insofar as they aim at reinforcing the objectives of the Antarctic Treaty and Madrid Protocol. Brazil highlighted the recommendatory nature of the inspection reports which reflect the view of its proponents and could be taken into account as appropriate by the inspected Parties.
- (271) Belgium highlighted the importance of addressing the environmental repair and remediation issues associated with Eco Base Nelson. It suggested that the station posed a significant risk to safety and the environment and should be removed as soon as possible.
- (272) With regard to recommendation 13, SCAR informed the Committee that it does not have a research group focused on the impact of climatic or environmental changes on facilities or infrastructure.
- (273) IAATO noted that its members welcomed inspections under the Treaty on its members' activities, highlighting that such inspections were seen as an opportunity for operators to showcase their environmentally-responsible operations and further educate their visitors about the Treaty. IAATO noted that their members remained strongly committed to biosecurity best practice. They requested that, if issues should arise, concerned Parties approach IAATO directly so that issues could be dealt with promptly.
- (274) Norway noted that many of the recommendations provided in the report covered issues important to the Committee. It suggested that, if the recommendations could not be adopted at this stage, then the Committee could consider these, as appropriate, when advancing the work of the CEP. It noted that for example recommendation 13 was particularly relevant in the context of the implementation of the CCRWP.
- (275) The Committee noted the paper introduced by the United Kingdom and the Czech Republic with general recommendations presented in WP 19 rev. 1. Members noted that recommendations arising from inspections were useful for the consideration of the inspected Parties, as appropriate. It was noted that the recommendations presented in the inspection report are the recommendations of the Parties who conducted the inspection, but not recommendations by the Committee. Some Members indicated the usefulness of the recommendations for their own use when appropriate.
- (276) Several Members and ASOC noted the usefulness of reporting back to the Committee on progress made to implement recommendations

contained in inspection reports. They cited India's follow-up report to the recommendations made by an inspection of Maitri Station as a good example of this (BP 14). The Russian Federation noted that such follow-up reports could also allow the inspected National Antarctic Programmes to fully articulate their position regarding recommendations received.

(277) The following paper was also submitted under this agenda item:

- BP 14 *Follow-up to the Recommendations of the Inspection Teams to Maitri Station* (India).

### **Item 13: General Matters**

(278) SCAR presented IP 20 *Outcomes of the 1st SCAR Antarctic and Southern Ocean Science Horizon Scan*. The Horizon Scan had focused on the most compelling and important scientific questions, both in and from Antarctica and the Southern Ocean, to be addressed over the next two decades and beyond. It identified 80 high-priority scientific questions divided into six areas. These included: 1) defining the global reach of the Antarctic atmosphere and Southern Ocean; 2) understanding how, where and why ice sheets lose mass; 3) revealing Antarctica's history; 4) learning how Antarctic life evolved and survived; 5) observing space and the Universe; and 6) recognising and mitigating human influences.

(279) The Committee congratulated SCAR for undertaking the Horizon Scan and for the report on key outcomes. It noted that one of the priorities identified related to the recognition of mitigation of human impacts, and looked forward to drawing on the results of research prioritised in the Horizon Scan for its future work.

(280) The following papers were also submitted under this agenda item:

- IP 74 *Waste Water Management in Antarctica COMNAP Workshop* (COMNAP).
- BP 17 *Manejo de residuos sólidos en la XIX Expedición Ecuatoriana* (Ecuador).

### **Item 14: Election Officers**

(281) The Committee elected Polly Penhale from the United States as Vice-Chair for a second two-year term and congratulated her on her appointment to the role.

**Item 15: Preparation for the Next Meeting**

(282) The Committee adopted the Preliminary Agenda for CEP XIX (Appendix 4).

**Item 16: Adoption of the Report**

(283) The Committee adopted its Report.

**Item 17: Closing of the Meeting**

(284) The Chair closed the Meeting on Friday 5<sup>th</sup> June 2015.



## Appendix 1

## CEP Five-Year Work Plan

<b>Issue / Environmental Pressure: Introduction of non-native species</b>	
<b>Priority: 1</b>	
<b>Actions:</b>	
1. Continue developing practical guidelines & resources for all Antarctic operators.	
2. Implement related actions identified in the Climate Change Response Work Programme.	
3. Consider the spatially explicit, activity-differentiated risk assessments to mitigate the risks posed by terrestrial non-native species.	
4. Develop a surveillance strategy for areas at high risk of non-native species establishment.	
5. Give additional attention to the risks posed by intra-Antarctic transfer of propagules.	
Intersessional period 2015/16	ICG to review Non-Native Species Manual
CEP XIX 2016	Consider ICG report
Intersessional period 2016/17	
CEP XX 2017	
Intersessional period 2017/18	
CEP XXI 2018	
Intersessional period 2018/19	
CEP XXII 2019	
Intersessional period 2019/20	
CEP XXIII 2020	

<b>Issue / Environmental Pressure: Tourism and NGO activities</b>	
<b>Priority: 1</b>	
<b>Actions:</b>	
1. Provide advice to ATCM as requested.	
2. Advance recommendations from ship-borne tourism ATME.	
Intersessional period 2015/16	
CEP XIX 2016	Consider the outcomes of the development of the site sensitivity methodology [recommendation 3 of the tourism study].
Intersessional period 2016/17	
CEP XX 2017	
Intersessional period 2017/18	
CEP XXI 2018	
Intersessional period 2018/19	
CEP XXII 2019	
Intersessional period 2019/20	
CEP XXIII 2020	

<b>Issue / Environmental Pressure: Climate Change Implications for the Environment</b>	
<b>Priority: 1</b>	
<b>Actions:</b>	
<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Consider implications of climate change for management of Antarctic environment.</li> <li>2. Advance recommendations from climate change ATME.</li> <li>3. Implement the Climate Change response work programme.</li> </ol>	
Intersessional period 2015/16	Discuss mechanisms for reviewing and updating the CCRWP.
CEP XIX 2016	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Standing agenda item</li> <li>• SCAR provides update</li> </ul>
Intersessional period 2016/17	
CEP XX 2017	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Standing agenda item</li> <li>• SCAR provides update</li> </ul>
Intersessional period 2017/18	
CEP XXI 2018	
Intersessional period 2018/19	
CEP XXII 2019	
Intersessional period 2019/20	
CEP XXIII 2020	

<b>Issue / Environmental Pressure: Processing new and revised protected / managed area management plans</b>	
<b>Priority: 1</b>	
<b>Actions:</b>	
<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Refine the process for reviewing new and revised management plans.</li> <li>2. Update existing guidelines.</li> <li>3. Advance recommendations from climate change ATME.</li> <li>4. Develop guidelines to ASMAs preparation.</li> </ol>	
Intersessional period 2015/16	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• SGMP / conducts work as per agreed work plan</li> <li>• Continue the work on developing guidelines to ASMAs preparation.</li> </ul>
CEP XIX 2016	Consideration of SGMP / report
Intersessional period 2016/17	
CEP XX 2017	
Intersessional period 2017/18	
CEP XXI 2018	
Intersessional period 2018/19	
CEP XXII 2019	
Intersessional period 2019/20	
CEP XXIII 2020	

<b>Issue / Environmental Pressure: Marine spatial protection and management</b>	
<b>Priority: 1</b>	
<b>Actions:</b>	
<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Cooperation between the CEP and SC-CAMLR on common interest issues.</li> <li>2. Cooperate with CCAMLR on Southern Ocean bioregionalisation and other common interests and agreed principles.</li> <li>3. Identify and apply processes for spatial marine protection.</li> <li>4. Advance recommendations from climate change ATME.</li> </ol>	
Intersessional period 2015/16	ICG on outstanding marine values
CEP XIX 2016	Consider ICG report
Intersessional period 2016/17	
CEP XX 2017	
Intersessional period 2017/18	
CEP XXI 2018	
Intersessional period 2018/19	
CEP XXII 2019	
Intersessional period 2019/20	
CEP XXIII 2020	

<b>Issue / Environmental Pressure: Operation of the CEP and Strategic Planning</b>	
<b>Priority: 1</b>	
<b>Actions:</b>	
<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Keep the 5 year plan up to date based on changing circumstances and ATCM requirements.</li> <li>2. Identify opportunities for improving the effectiveness of the CEP.</li> <li>3. Consider long-term objectives for Antarctica (50-100 years time).</li> <li>4. Consider opportunities for enhancing the working relationship between the CEP and the ATCM.</li> </ol>	
Intersessional period 2015/16	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Prepare publication for 25<sup>th</sup> anniversary of the Protocol.</li> <li>• As required, plan for 25<sup>th</sup> anniversary symposium.</li> </ul>
CEP XIX 2016	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 25<sup>th</sup> anniversary of Protocol. Review and revise work plan as appropriate.</li> <li>• Consider draft publication prepared by ICG.</li> </ul>
Intersessional period 2016/17	
CEP XX 2017	
Intersessional period 2017/18	
CEP XXI 2018	
Intersessional period 2018/19	
CEP XXII 2019	
Intersessional period 2019/20	
CEP XXIII 2020	

<b>Issue / Environmental Pressure: Repair or Remediation of Environmental Damage</b>	
<b>Priority: 2</b>	
<b>Actions:</b>	
<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Respond to further request from the ATCM related to repair and remediation, as appropriate</li> <li>2. Monitor progress on the establishment of Antarctic-wide inventory of sites of past activity.</li> <li>3. Consider guidelines for repair and remediation.</li> <li>4. Members develop practical guidelines and supporting resources for inclusion in the Clean-up Manual</li> <li>5. Continue developing bioremediation and repair practices for inclusion in the Clean-up Manual.</li> </ol>	
Intersessional period 2015/16	
CEP XIX 2016	
Intersessional period 2016/17	
CEP XX 2017	Consider review of the Clean-up Manual.
Intersessional period 2017/18	
CEP XXI 2018	
Intersessional period 2018/19	
CEP XXII 2019	
Intersessional period 2019/20	
CEP XXIII 2020	

<b>Issue / Environmental Pressure: Human footprint / wilderness management</b>	
<b>Priority: 2</b>	
<b>Actions:</b>	
<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Develop methods for improved protection of wilderness under Annexes I and V.</li> </ol>	
Intersessional period 2015/16	Consider how wilderness aspects could be taken into account in the EIA guidelines
CEP XIX 2016	
Intersessional period 2016/17	
CEP XX 2017	
Intersessional period 2017/18	
CEP XXI 2018	
Intersessional period 2018/19	
CEP XXII 2019	
Intersessional period 2019/20	
CEP XXIII 2020	

<b>Issue / Environmental Pressure: Monitoring and state of the environment reporting</b>	
<b>Priority: 2</b>	
<b>Actions:</b>	
<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Identify key environmental indicators and tools.</li> <li>2. Establish a process for reporting to the ATCM.</li> <li>3. SCAR to support information to COMNAP and CEP.</li> </ol>	
Intersessional period 2015/16	
CEP XIX 2016	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Report from COMNAP and SCAR on the use of unmanned aerial vehicles (UAVs).</li> <li>• Consider establishing an ICG to develop UAV guidance.</li> </ul>
Intersessional period 2016/17	
CEP XX 2017	
Intersessional period 2017/18	
CEP XXI 2018	
Intersessional period 2018/19	
CEP XXII 2019	
Intersessional period 2019/20	
CEP XXIII 2020	

<b>Issue / Environmental Pressure: Biodiversity knowledge</b>	
<b>Priority: 3</b>	
<b>Actions:</b>	
<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Maintain awareness of threats to existing biodiversity.</li> <li>2. Advance recommendations from climate change ATME</li> <li>3. CEP to consider further scientific advice on wildlife disturbance.</li> </ol>	
Intersessional period 2015/16	
CEP XIX 2016	
Intersessional period 2016/17	
CEP XX 2017	Discussion of SCAR update on underwater noise.
Intersessional period 2017/18	
CEP XXI 2018	
Intersessional period 2018/19	
CEP XXII 2019	
Intersessional period 2019/20	
CEP XXIII 2020	

<b>Issue / Environmental Pressure: Site specific guidelines for tourist-visited sites</b>	
<b>Priority: 2</b>	
<b>Actions:</b>	
<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Periodically review the list of sites subject to site guidelines and consider whether development of guidelines should be needed for additional sites.</li> <li>2. Provide advice to ATCM as required.</li> <li>3. Review the format of the site guidelines</li> </ol>	
Intersessional period 2015/16	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• UK to coordinate an informal process to seek and collate information on National Operators' recreational use of site guidelines</li> <li>• Develop visitor site guideline for the Yalour Island.</li> </ul>
CEP XIX 2016	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Standing agenda item; Parties to report on their reviews of site guidelines</li> <li>• Report to the CEP with Barrientos Island, Aitcho Islands, monitoring results.</li> </ul>
Intersessional period 2016/17	
CEP XX 2017	Standing agenda item; Parties to report on their reviews of site guidelines
Intersessional period 2017/18	
CEP XXI 2018	
Intersessional period 2018/19	
CEP XXII 2019	
Intersessional period 2019/20	
CEP XXIII 2020	

<b>Issue / Environmental Pressure: Overview of the protected areas system</b>	
<b>Priority: 2</b>	
<b>Actions:</b>	
<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Apply the Environmental Domains Analysis (EDA) and Antarctic Conservation Biogeographic Regions (ACBR) to enhance the protected areas system.</li> <li>2. Advance recommendations from climate change ATME.</li> <li>3. Maintain and develop Protected Area database.</li> <li>4. Assess the extent to which Antarctic IBAs are or should be represented within the series of ASPAs.</li> </ol>	
Intersessional period 2015/16	
CEP XIX 2016	
Intersessional period 2016/17	
CEP XX 2017	
Intersessional period 2017/18	
CEP XXI 2018	
Intersessional period 2018/19	
CEP XXII 2019	
Intersessional period 2019/20	
CEP XXIII 2020	

<b>Issue / Environmental Pressure: Outreach and education</b>	
<b>Priority: 2</b>	
<b>Actions:</b>	
<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Review current examples and identify opportunities for greater education and outreach.</li> <li>2. Encourage Members to exchange information regarding their experiences in this area.</li> <li>3. Establish a strategy and guidelines for exchanging information between Members on Education and Outreach for long term perspective.</li> </ol>	
Intersessional period 2015/16	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Prepare publication on 25<sup>th</sup> anniversary</li> <li>• As appropriate, contribute to ATCM ICG on Education and Outreach.</li> </ul>
CEP XIX 2016	Consider and adopt publication
Intersessional period 2016/17	
CEP XX 2017	
Intersessional period 2017/18	
CEP XXI 2018	
Intersessional period 2018/19	
CEP XXII 2019	
Intersessional period 2019/20	
CEP XXIII 2020	

<b>Issue / Environmental Pressure: Implementing and Improving the EIA provisions of Annex I</b>	
<b>Priority: 2</b>	
<b>Actions:</b>	
<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Refine the process for considering CEEs and advising the ATCM accordingly.</li> <li>2. Develop guidelines for assessing cumulative impacts.</li> <li>3. Review EIA guidelines and consider wider policy and other issues.</li> <li>4. Consider application of strategic environmental assessment in Antarctica.</li> <li>5. Advance recommendations from climate change ATME</li> </ol>	
Intersessional period 2015/16	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Establish ICG to review draft CEEs as required</li> <li>• Continue ICG on EIA guidelines review, as required</li> </ul>
CEP XIX 2016	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Consideration of ICG reports on draft CEE, as required</li> <li>• Consideration of ICG review of the EIA guidelines</li> </ul>
Intersessional period 2016/17	Establish ICG to review draft CEEs as required
CEP XX 2017	Consideration of ICG reports on draft CEE, as required
Intersessional period 2017/18	
CEP XXI 2018	
Intersessional period 2018/19	
CEP XXII 2019	
Intersessional period 2019/20	
CEP XXIII 2020	

<b>Issue / Environmental Pressure: Designation and management of Historic Sites and Monuments</b>	
<b>Priority: 3</b>	
<b>Actions:</b>	
1. Maintain the list and consider new proposals as they arise.	
2. Consider strategic issues as necessary, including issues relating to designation of HSM versus clean-up provisions of the Protocol.	
3. Review the presentation of the HSM list with the aim to improve information availability.	
Intersessional period 2015/16	Secretariat update list of HSMs
CEP XIX 2016	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Standing item</li> <li>• Start discussions on issues relating to designation of HSM versus clean-up provisions of the Protocol.</li> </ul>
Intersessional period 2016/17	Secretariat update list of HSMs
CEP XX 2017	Standing item
Intersessional period 2017/18	
CEP XXI 2018	
Intersessional period 2018/19	
CEP XXII 2019	
Intersessional period 2019/20	
CEP XXIII 2020	

<b>Issue / Environmental Pressure: Exchange of Information</b>	
<b>Priority: 3</b>	
<b>Actions:</b>	
1. Assign to the Secretariat.	
2. Monitor and facilitate easy use of the EIES.	
3. Review environmental reporting requirements	
Intersessional period 2015/16	Contribute to further work as necessary on environmental aspects of information exchange.
CEP XIX 2016	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Secretariat Report</li> <li>• Consider ICG report, as appropriate</li> </ul>
Intersessional period 2016/17	
CEP XX 2017	Secretariat Report
Intersessional period 2017/18	
CEP XXI 2018	
Intersessional period 2018/19	
CEP XXII 2019	
Intersessional period 2019/20	
CEP XXIII 2020	

<b>Issue / Environmental Pressure: Protection of outstanding geological values</b>	
<b>Priority: 3</b>	
<b>Actions:</b>	
1. Consider further mechanisms for protection of outstanding geological values.	
Intersessional period 2015/16	Assess possible environmental protection mechanisms for the geological values.
CEP XIX 2016	
Intersessional period 2016/17	
CEP XX 2017	
Intersessional period 2017/18	
CEP XXI 2018	Consider advice from SCAR.
Intersessional period 2018/19	
CEP XXII 2019	
Intersessional period 2019/20	
CEP XXIII 2020	

## **Climate Change Response Work Programme**

**CCRWP Vision:** Taking into account the conclusions and recommendations from the ATME on Climate Change in 2010, the CCRWP provides a mechanism for identifying and revising goals and specific actions by the CEP to support efforts within the Antarctic Treaty System to prepare for, and build resilience to, the environmental impacts of a changing climate and the associated implications for the governance and management of Antarctica.

Climate related issue	Gaps/needs	Response area	Action/Task	Priority	Who	IP	CEP 2016	CEP 2017	IP	CEP 2018	IP	CEP 2019	IP	CEP 2020	
1) Enhanced potential for non-native species establishment	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Framework for surveillance for non-native species establishments (NNS) in terrestrial and freshwater environment</li> <li>Response strategy for supported NNS</li> <li>Assessment of whether existing regimes for preventing NNS introductions and management tools applied in other areas.</li> </ul>	Management	<p>a. Continue to develop the NNS manual consistent with Resolution 6 (2011), ensuring that the manual includes, specifically in the approaches (p. 21)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Response strategy (p. 22)</li> <li>Assessment of whether NNS (p. 18)</li> </ul>	1.3	CEP		Ensure climate change implications are sufficiently considered and appropriately addressed in the manual development as listed in CEP 5-year work plan	Initiate ISW to develop a NNS surveillance and response strategy, including the highest risk habitats/bioregion	ISW	Receive report of ISW and take action accordingly					
			<p>b. Review of IMO biofouling guidelines to check adequacy for Southern Ocean and vessels moving from region to region</p>	2.6	Interested Parties, Experts and Observers					Receive IMO report on biofouling guidelines.	Report from IAATO on the application of the biofouling guidelines by their members.				
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Improved understanding of risks associated with relocation of native terrestrial species</li> <li>Mapping of aquatic habitats at risk of invasion</li> </ul>	Management/ Research	<p>c. Undertake a risk assessment: identification of native species at risk of relocation, and pathways for intra-continental transfer, including developing a map of the risk of invasion</p>	1.2	CEP Interested Parties, Experts and Observers	ISW	Initiate ISW to undertake an assessment of risks of relocation of native Amnatic species and identify relevant management actions	Receive report of ISW and take action accordingly							
			<p>d. Undertake risk assessment: identification of size habitats at risk of invasion and pathways for introduction</p>	1.8	CEP Interested Parties, Experts and Observers									Initiate ISW to assess risk of marine NNS introd.	ISW
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Ongoing surveillance programme to identify status of NNS in light of climate change</li> </ul>	Monitoring	<p>e. Progress actions identified under "Response" in NNS manual (p. 22-23)</p>	1.6	NAPs, SCAR										
			<p>f. Implement marine and terrestrial monitoring in accordance with established surveillance framework (pt. a) once developed</p>	1.9	NAPs, SCAR	CEP to encourage national programmes and SCAR to support and facilitate new and on-going research activities, especially with respect to highly visited sites with high risk potential.	Request for summary of regional and funded research projects						Members to report on measures taken to implement surveillance and response actions	Members to report on measures taken to implement surveillance and response actions	

Climate related issue	Gaps/needs	Respon- se area	Action/Task	Pri- ority	Who	IP	CEP 2016	IP	CEP 2017	IP	CEP 2018	IP	CEP 2019	IP	CEP 2020		
2) Changes in the quantity and quality of biotic and abiotic environment due to climate change	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Understand how biotic and abiotic environments will respond to a changing climate and the impacts of these changes</li> <li>Understand as to how the abiotic terrestrial environment will change and the impacts of these changes</li> </ul>	Research	a. Support and undertake research on current and future climate change and to inform response	1.9	NAPs, SCAR		CEP to encourage national research programmes and SCAR to support and facilitate new and on-going research activities CEP to equate SCAR to provide a similar level of knowledge updates on climate impacts on terrestrial biota.		Ongoing. Update reports to be provided, including through the Portal.		Ongoing. Update reports to be provided, including through the Portal.		Ongoing. Update reports to be provided, including through the Portal.		Ongoing. Update reports to be provided, including through the Portal.		
			b. Support and undertake long term monitoring of changes, including collaborative efforts (eg. ANTOS).	1.8	NAPs, SCAR		CEP to encourage national programmes and SCAR to support and facilitate new and on-going research activities CEP to request regular updates from relevant long term monitoring programmes			Ongoing. Update reports to be provided, including through the Portal.		Consider obvious gaps in monitoring network and encourage SCAR where such gaps exist, eg. through the LTER framework					
			c. Continue develop biogeographic tools (EDA and ACBR) to provide a sound basis for informing Antarctic area management at regional and continental scales in light of climate change, including identifying the need to set aside reference areas for monitoring of climate change areas resilient to climate change	2.1	Initiated by interested Parties and CEP				Plan for a joint SCAR/ CEP workshop on Antarctic biogeography, including to identify practical applications of management tools and future research needs								
			d. Identify and prioritize Antarctic biogeographic areas vulnerable to climate change	1.6	Initiated by interested Parties and CEP												
		e. Review and revise where necessary existing management tools to consider if they afford the best practical adaptation measure to areas at risk from climate change	1.9	CEP	EIA ICC?		EIA ICC?		Ensure EIA ICC (if 5-year work plan) considers and incorporates implications of climate change								
		f. Evaluate review of existing Protected Areas and the process for designation of such areas to ensure they take into account climate change impacts and consider how we might respond.	1.8	CEP	SGMP?		SGMP work on ASMA (if 5-year work plan) considers and incorporates appropriately the implication of climate change		Plan for intersectoral workshop on the status of the protected areas system	WS?							
		g. Initiate action with the aim to protect representative areas of biogeographic diversity in areas likely to provide refuges to species and ecosystems at risk	2.3	CEP													
				Management													

Climate related issue	Gaps/needs	Respon- se area	Action/Task	Pri- ority	Who	IP	CEP 2016	IP	CEP 2017	IP	CEP 2018	IP	CEP 2019	IP	CEP 2020			
3) Change to marine near-shore abiotic and biotic systems (including OA) <sup>1</sup>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Understanding and have the ability to predict near-shore marine abiotic and biotic changes</li> <li>Have a broader understanding of what monitoring data can tell us about changes to the marine environment</li> <li>Assess climate driven changes to the marine environment</li> </ul>	Research	a. Encourage research by national programmes and SCAR and seek state of knowledge updates on marine biota	2.0	NAPs, SCAR		CEP to encourage national programmes and SCAR to support and facilitate new and on-going research activities incl. through the Portal.		Update reports to be provided, incl. through the Portal.		Ongoing	Update reports to be provided, incl. through the Portal.	Ongoing	Update reports to be provided, incl. through the Portal.	Ongoing	Update reports to be provided, incl. through the Portal.		
			b. Support and undertake collaborative, long term monitoring of change (eg. SOOS and ANTOX) and seek regular state of knowledge reports from such programmes	2.0	NAPs, SCAR		CEP to encourage national programmes and SCAR to support and facilitate new and on-going monitoring activities incl. through the Portal.		Update reports to be provided, incl. through the Portal.		Update reports to be provided, incl. through the Portal.		Ongoing	Update reports to be provided, incl. through the Portal.	Ongoing	Update reports to be provided, incl. through the Portal.	Ongoing	Update reports to be provided, incl. through the Portal.
			c. Review and revise where necessary existing management tools to consider if they afford the best practical adaptation measure to species or geographic areas at risk from climate change in SO	2.0	CEP													
4) Ecosystems change due to ocean acidification	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Understanding of the impact of OA to marine biota and ecosystems</li> </ul>	Management	d. Continue to work with CCAMLR to identify the best practical adaptation measure for reference areas for future research	2.5	CEP, SCAR, SC-CAMLR													
			e. Maintain regular dialogue (or sharing of information) with SC-CAMLR, CCAMLR and the Southern Ocean in particular on actions being taken	1.5	CEP, CCAMLR						Hold workshop as noted in CEP 5- year work plan							
			a. As required, undertake further research and assessment on impact of OA, informed by the SCAR report	1.9	NAPs, SCAR		CEP to encourage national programmes and SCAR to support and facilitate new and on-going research activities Preliminary consideration of SCAR report		Update reports to be provided, incl. through the Portal.		Ongoing	Update reports to be provided, incl. through the Portal.		Ongoing	Update reports to be provided, incl. through the Portal.	Ongoing	Update reports to be provided, incl. through the Portal.	
		Management	b. Consider forthcoming SCAR report and set accordingly (unbinding) some actions may be best advanced by ATCM)	1.6	CEP, CCAMLR <sup>2</sup>													
			c. Review and revise where necessary existing relevant management tools to consider if they afford the best practical adaptation measure to species or geographic areas at risk from ocean acidification	2.4	CEP, CCAMLR <sup>2</sup>													

Climate related issue	Gaps/needs	Respon- se area	Action/Task	Pri- ority	Who	CEP 2016	IP	CEP 2017	IP	CEP 2018	IP	CEP 2019	IP	CEP 2020		
5) Climate change impact to the abiotic terrestrial environment resulting in impacts on environmental and heritage values	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Understanding how the abiotic terrestrial environment will be impacted and how this might impact result in impacts on environmental or heritage values</li> <li>Understanding what the effects of climate change on contaminated sites and implications for species/ecosystems will be</li> <li>Understanding what changes will increase mobilization and exposure of species/ecosystems to contaminants</li> <li>Understanding how species/ecosystems will respond to exposure to such contaminants</li> <li>Understanding what interventions might be applicable to counteract these impacts</li> </ul>	Research	a. National operators to assess risk of change in climate infrastructure and environmental consequences	3.0	NAPs, COMNAP					Encourage COMNAP to consider implications of climate change to NAP infrastructure				Receive report from COMNAP on climate change assessment accordingly		
			b. Assess risk of changes in climate change to HSM/heritage ASPA	2.9	Proponents and interested Parties											Initiate risk assessment for HSMs
			c. Identify and specify research needs and communicate them to the research community	3.3	CEP											
				Management	d. Update the EIA guidelines to take into account the impacts of cc, eg ensuring proposed activities are climate resilient to cc and will not have an impact on species or habitats at risk.	1.9	CEP	Ensure EIA ICG (cf. 5-year works plan) considers and incorporates implications of climate change	EIA ICG	Ensure EIA ICG (cf. 5-year works plan) considers and incorporates implications of climate change						
			e. Further development of the Clean Up Manual (ref. Resolution 2,(2013))		2.0	CEP	Ensure clean up manual revisions (referred to in 5 year plan) consider implications of climate change									
			f. Encourage national programmes to assess which sites of their past activities (not yet cleaned up or remediated) are more likely to be affected by climate change in order to prioritize their work.	2.3	NAPs					Members to provide a status report to CEP on which sites of their past activities (not yet cleaned up or remediated) are more likely to be affected by climate change and plans to clean up or remediate those sites		Ongoing		Ongoing		Ongoing

Climate related issue	Gaps/needs	Respon- se area	Action/Task	Pri- ority	Who	IP	CEP 2016	IP	CEP 2017	IP	CEP 2018	IP	CEP 2019	IP	CEP 2020		
6) Marine and ter- restrial species at risk due to climate change	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Understand population status, trends, vulner- ability and distribution of key Antarctic species</li> <li>Understand the impact and cascading effect on climate on species at risk, including critical thresholds that would be exceeded</li> <li>Framework for mon- itoring to ensure the effects on key species are understood</li> <li>Understand relationship between species and climate change impacts in important location/ areas</li> </ul>	Research	<p>a. Encourage research by national programmes and SCAR, sp. through programmes such as AntEco and AntERA</p>	1.6	NAPs, SCAR-		CEP to encourage national programmes and SCAR to support and facilitate new and on-going research activities through programmes such as AntEco and AntERA. Provide trends reports on Antarctic terrestrial and marine species from SCAR, ACAP and others										
		Management	<p>b. Consider if and how the IUCN red list criteria can be applied on a regional basis for the Antarctic in the context of climate change</p>	2.4	SCAR			Facilitate a programme of work with SCAR, SC-CAMLR, ACAP and IUCN to: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Progress assessments on Antarctic species not yet assessed</li> <li>Initiate a programme to provide information on the status of Antarctic species</li> <li>Develop an approach to applying the IUCN Red List criteria on a regional basis in Antarctica</li> </ol>									
			<p>c. Begin a rolling programme of assessments of Antarctic species focusing particularly on those species not currently assessed in the IUCN Red List</p>	1.7	CEP, SCAR, ACAP				See 6 a above								Provide update reports to IUCN on trends and vulnerability of Antarctic species
			<p>d. Review and revise where necessary existing management plans to ensure they are the best technical advice measure to species at risk of climate change</p>	1.6	CEP CCAMLR comisd.				See 6 a above								
			<p>e. Where necessary develop management actions to maintain or improve the conservation status of species threatened by climate change, eg. through SPS action plans</p>	2.0	CEP, SCAR CCAMLR comisd.				Ongoing	Ongoing					Ongoing		

Climate related issue	Gap/needs	Respon- se area	Action/Task	Pri- ority	Who	CEP 2016	IP	CEP 2017	IP	CEP2018	IP	CEP 2019	IP	CEP 2020
7) Marine, terrestrial and freshwater habitats at risk due to climate change	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Understand habitat status, trends, vulnerability and distribution</li> <li>Improve understanding of the extent of climate change on habitat e.g. sea ice extent and duration, snow cover, ground water, etc.</li> <li>Understand changing melt flows and consequences to lake systems</li> <li>Improve understanding of the potential expansion of human presence in Antarctica as a result of changes resulting from climate change and e.g. changes to sea ice distribution; collapse of ice shelves; expansion of ice free area).</li> </ul>	<p>Research</p> <p>Management</p>	<p>a. Encourage research by national programmes and SCAR</p> <p>b. Review and revise where necessary existing management plans to consider if they afford the best possible measure to habitats at risk of climate change.</p>	2.4	NAFs, SCAR	CEP to encourage national programmes and SCAR to support and facilitate new and on-going research activities		Ongoing. Update reports to be provided, incl. through the Portal		Ongoing. Update reports to be provided, incl. through the Portal		Ongoing. Update reports to be provided, incl. through the Portal		Ongoing. Update reports to be provided, incl. through the Portal

- 1 ISW = Interseasonal work (could be ICG, workshop, interested members, etc).
- 2 Ensure EIA ICG (cf. CEP Five-Year Work Plan) considers and incorporates appropriately the implications of climate change
- 3 Ensure SGMP work on ASMA guidelines (cf. SGMP work plan) considers and incorporates appropriately the implication of climate change
- 4 Workshop
- 5 Noting the importance of CCAMLR consideration of climate change issues in the Southern Ocean
- 6 Including in context of proposed joint workshop (pt. 3e)
- 7 Note that the IUCN criteria cover many aspects besides climate change, and does not necessarily identify the effects solely due to climate change. The benefit of using IUCN criteria in our response to climate change will be assessed prior to its use.

## Appendix 3

### **Guidelines: A prior assessment process for the designation of ASPAs and ASMAs**

- 1) The proponent should submit information about planned ASMAs and ASPAs at the first possible CEP meeting after they have identified an area as a potential new ASPA or ASMA, irrespective of whether a decision to start working on a management plan has been taken or not. It would be useful if the proponent submitted this information at the latest one year before intending to submit a management plan to the CEP for consideration.
- 2) The information submitted to the CEP should include:
  - the proposed location of the ASMA/ASPA;
  - the initial rationale behind the plans for proposing the designation<sup>1</sup>, including specifying the legal basis for the designation found in Annex V; and how the area would complement the Antarctic protected area system as a whole;
  - consistency with relevant CEP guidelines and resources, including the ACBR planning tool; and results of consultations with other relevant parties; and
  - other relevant information relating to the development of a management plan that the proponent country has available at the time of submission to the CEP meeting.
- 3) The proponent country is encouraged to facilitate further discussions and questions on the preliminary plans through e.g. informal discussions/exchanges on the CEP forum or directly with Member countries.

<sup>1</sup> In this context it is relevant to point to “Guidelines for implementation of the Framework for Protected Areas set forth in Article 3 of Annex V of the Environmental Protocol” (held under Resolution 1 (2000)) which includes guidance for such assessment processes.

## Preliminary Agenda for CEP XIX

1. Opening of the Meeting
2. Adoption of the Agenda
3. Strategic Discussions on the Future Work of the CEP
4. Operation of the CEP
5. Cooperation with other Organisations
6. Repair and Remediation of Environment Damage
7. Climate Change Implications for the Environment
  - a. Strategic approach
  - b. Implementation and Review of the Climate Change Response Work Programme
8. Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA)
  - a. Draft Comprehensive Environmental Evaluations
  - b. Other EIA Matters
9. Area Protection and Management Plans
  - a. Management Plans
  - b. Historic Sites and Monuments
  - c. Site Guidelines
  - d. Marine Spatial Protection and Management
  - e. Other Annex V Matters
10. Conservation of Antarctic Flora and Fauna
  - a. Quarantine and Non-native Species
  - b. Specially Protected Species
  - c. Other Annex II Matters
11. Environmental Monitoring and Reporting
12. Inspection Reports
13. General Matters
14. Election of Officers
15. Preparation for Next Meeting
16. Adoption of the Report
17. Closing of the Meeting

### 3. Appendices



## Outcomes of the Intersessional Contact Group on Information Exchange Requirements

Item or Category	Decision of the ATCM
<b>Environmental information</b>	
Placing some items of information into the 'permanent' category.	<p>The Parties agreed to change the list to move the following items into the permanent category, while retaining them in the annual category to allow for updates to be recorded:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Compliance with the Protocol (notification of measures adopted in the past year);</li> <li>• Contingency plans for oil spills and other emergencies (other than 'implementation report' details);</li> <li>• Procedures relating to EIAs;</li> <li>• Waste management plans;</li> <li>• Prevention of marine pollution (sovereign immunity);</li> <li>• Measures taken to implement the provisions of Annex V.</li> </ul>
Contact information	The Parties requested the Secretariat to make changes to allow contact points to be recorded as 'position and organisation', rather than an individual.
Items of information where more than a single 'location' needs to be specified	The Parties requested the Secretariat to include multiple locations and an open text field for notes to allow Parties to describe 'routes', for items of information where more than a single 'location' needs to be specified.
Compliance with the Protocol (notification of measures adopted during the past year)	<p>The Parties agreed to describe the item in the list relating to 'Compliance with the Protocol' as follows, for the purposes of clarity:</p> <p>'Compliance with the Protocol (notification of measures adopted during the past year), including the adoption of laws and regulations, administrative actions and enforcement measures.'</p>
Monitoring activities	The Parties agreed to describe the section relating to 'Monitoring activities' as follows, for the purposes of clarity: 'Monitoring activities connected with activities subject to initial and comprehensive environmental evaluations (referred to in Protocol Annex I, Art. 6.1 c)'

<p>Conservation of Antarctic Flora and Fauna – introduction of non-native species</p>	<p>With reference to information exchange on introduction of non-native species, the Parties agreed to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• change ‘purpose’ of introduction of non-native species, for clarity, to: ‘purpose with reference to Article 4 of Annex II of the Protocol’;</li> <li>• request the Secretariat to make permit number and dates ‘required’ information,;</li> <li>• add an item to the list of information to be exchanged: ‘Removal or disposal of the plant or animal with reference to Article 4 (4) of Annex II of the Protocol’</li> </ul>
<p>Measures taken to implement the provisions of Annex V</p>	<p>The Parties agreed to describe the item relating to ‘Measures taken to implement the provisions of Annex V’ as follows, for the purposes of clarity:</p> <p>“Information on measures taken to implement Annex V including site inspections and any steps taken to address instances of activities in contravention of the provisions of ASPA or ASMA management plans.</p>
<p><b>Other information</b></p>	
<p>Relevant national legislation</p>	<p>The Parties agreed to describe the item in the list relating to ‘Relevant national legislation’ as follows, for the purposes of clarity:</p> <p>‘Relevant national legislation other than measures associated with compliance with the Protocol (reported as environmental information)’.</p> <p>The Parties agreed to move this item to the ‘permanent’ category, and remove it from ‘annual’.</p>
<p>Relevant national legislation - contact information</p>	<p>The Parties agreed to request the Secretariat to make changes to allow contact points to be position and organisation, rather than an individual</p>
<p>Activities undertaken in case of emergencies</p>	<p>The Parties agreed to remove ‘activities undertaken in case of emergencies’ from this list, noting COMNAP’s role regarding information on emergencies and emergency response.</p> <p>The Parties further requested the Secretariat to archive the information.</p>
<p>Inspection reports</p>	<p>The Parties noted that the inspections database supported by the Secretariat maintains information about inspection activities and reports, and the meeting agreed that it should no longer be required to exchange this information via the information exchange system on inspections. The Parties decided to remove this section from the list of information exchange requirements.</p>

<b>Scientific information</b>	
Automatic recording stations	The Parties requested the Secretariat to consult with SCAR, to identify relevant options for a list for ‘parameters recorded’ by automatic recording stations, and implement this list in the EIES.
Science activities in previous year – ‘discipline’	The Parties requested the Secretariat to consult with SCAR, to identify relevant options for a list for ‘scientific disciplines’, and implement this list in the EIES.
Suggestion that some ‘optional’ items be ‘required’	The Parties requested the Secretariat change the following items from ‘optional’ to ‘required’, with reference to science activities in the previous year: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Project name/number</li> <li>• Discipline</li> <li>• Main activity/remarks</li> </ul>
<b>Operational information – national expeditions</b>	
Operational: national expeditions – vessels	With regard to information on vessels used by national Antarctic programs, the Parties requested the Secretariat to make the items ‘crew (maximum)’ and ‘passengers (maximum)’ ‘required’ rather than ‘optional’.
Operational: national expeditions – aircraft	The Parties agreed that information on ‘national expeditions – aircraft’, should be requested according to the categories of ‘intercontinental flights’, ‘intracontinental flights’, and ‘local helicopter flights’. The list of information exchange was modified to read: “Aircraft: for the categories intercontinental, intracontinental, and local helicopter operations: quantity of each aircraft type, planned number of flights, period of flights or planned departure dates, routes and purpose’.
Number (of each aircraft type)	See above
Communications facilities	The Parties noted that information on communications facilities is currently curated by COMNAP, and decided to remove the item ‘communications facilities and frequencies’ from the list of information to be exchanged.
<b>Operational information – non-Governmental expeditions</b>	

*ATCM XXXVIII Final Report*

Vessel-based operations - Name of operator	The meeting noted that an item of information to identify the head of expedition or expedition leader would be valuable, and agreed to include ‘expedition leader’, per voyage, as an optional item of information in the list of information to be exchanged.
Vessel-based operations - Includes landing (yes/no)	The Parties agreed that for non-governmental vessel based expeditions, the item of information on whether the activity ‘includes landing (yes/no)’ should be required rather than optional.
Vessel-based operations: Crew (max); Passengers (max); Contact address; Email address	For non-governmental vessel based expeditions, the Parties agreed to require (rather than have as optional) information on: ‘crew (maximum)’, ‘passengers (maximum)’, ‘contact address’ and ‘email address’.
Land-based operations – type of activity / adventure	For land-based and vessel-based non-governmental operations, the Parties agreed that the list of activities should include ‘media activity’ and ‘art activity’, and requested the Secretariat to implement this change. The Secretariat was further requested to add new activities to the list, as required, where they are identified as occurring frequently on the basis of the ‘other’ option in the EIES.
Land-based operations - Name of operator	The Parties agreed that for land-based operations, the ‘name of operator’ should be required (rather than optional).
Denial of authorisations	For the information item on ‘Denial of authorisations’ the Parties agreed to modify the requirement ‘name of vessel’ to include expeditions, so that the item reads ‘name of vessel and/or expedition’.

# Preliminary Agenda for ATCM XXXIX, Working Groups and Allocation of Items

### Plenary

1. Opening of the Meeting
2. Election of Officers and Creation of Working Groups
3. Adoption of the Agenda and Allocation of Items
4. Operation of the Antarctic Treaty System: Reports by Parties, Observers and Experts
5. Report of the Committee on Environmental Protection

### Working Group 1: (*Policy, Legal, Institutional*)

6. Operation of the Antarctic Treaty System: General matters
7. Operation of the Antarctic Treaty System: Matters related to the Secretariat
8. Liability
9. Biological Prospecting in Antarctica
10. Exchange of Information
11. Education Issues
12. Multi-year Strategic Work Plan

### Working Group 2: (*Science, Operations, Tourism*)

13. Safety and Operations in Antarctica
14. Inspections under the Antarctic Treaty and Environmental Protocol
15. Science Issues, Scientific Cooperation and Facilitation
16. Implications of Climate Change for Management of Antarctic Treaty Area
17. Tourism and Non-governmental Activities in the Antarctic Treaty Area, including Competent Authorities Issues

### Special Working Group (as required)

18. 25<sup>th</sup> Anniversary of the Protocol on Environmental Protection

### Plenary

19. Preparation for the XL Meeting
20. Any other Business

*ATCM XXXVIII Final Report*

21. Adoption of the Final Report
22. Close of the Meeting

### Host Country Communique

The XXXVIII Antarctic Treaty Consultative Meeting (ATCM) and the XVIII Meeting of the Committee on Environmental Protection (CEP) were held in Sofia, Bulgaria from 1 to 10 June 2015. The Meetings were held under the patronage of the President of the Republic of Bulgaria and were jointly organized by the Bulgarian Ministry of Foreign Affairs and the Bulgarian Antarctic Institute.

Over 400 participants from the Antarctic Treaty Parties, experts, representatives of civil society and international observers attended the Meeting with the common goal to reaffirm their commitment to preserve the uniqueness of Antarctica as a natural reserve devoted to peace, scientific research and international cooperation. The Meeting welcomed Mongolia and Kazakhstan as parties to the Antarctic Treaty, taking to 52 the number of Parties and the accession of Portugal and Venezuela to the Protocol for Environmental Protection bringing the number of Parties to 37.

The following outcomes were among the highlights of this year Meeting.

The ATCM continued to focus on enhancing the understanding of the implications of global climate change for Antarctica, promoting scientific research and consolidating the culture of international collaboration. Addressing future environmental, management and operational challenges by further enhancing the internationally agreed framework for managing Antarctica was at the core of the Meeting's agenda. There was a substantive exchange of information on globally significant science activities conducted in Antarctica.

Promoting broader Antarctic cooperation remained at the center of discussions with the aim of facilitating more efficient and substantive exchange on Antarctic cooperation including strengthening the interaction between the ATCM and the CEP. The Meeting updated the guiding principles for the implementation and development of the Multi-Year Strategic Plan for the ATCM outlining the priorities for the next Meeting.

Tourism continued to be a particular point of attention. Special emphasis was put on the importance of addressing the environmental aspects and the impact of tourism in Antarctica by working towards a strategic approach to environmentally managed tourism and non-governmental activities. Related discussions with a focus on competent authorities were conducted in the Special Working Group on Competent Authorities.

The following topics were at the core of discussions in the CEP: wise management of Antarctica by making best available science readily accessible via the Environments Portal; identifying steps to better understand and address the implications of climate change for the protection of the Antarctic environment and review of the Guidelines for Environmental Impact Assessment in Antarctica. The Parties also discussed updates and improved arrangements for 17 Antarctic Protected Areas.

*ATCM XXXVIII Final Report*

The Meeting held a full day Workshop on Education and Outreach Activities.

Consistent with the Parties' commitment to protect the Antarctic environment, host country arrangements for the ATCM included actions to reduce its environmental impact, such as paper and waste minimization.

Parties expressed their gratitude to the Bulgarian government and their appreciation for the excellent facilities provided for the Meeting.

The next ATCM will be hosted by Chile, tentatively from 6 to 15 June 2016.

## PART II

# **Measures, Decisions and Resolutions**



# 1. Measures



**Antarctic Specially Protected Area No 101  
(Taylor Rookery, Mac.Robertson Land):  
Revised Management Plan**

**The Representatives,**

*Recalling* Articles 3, 5 and 6 of Annex V to the Protocol on Environmental Protection to the Antarctic Treaty, providing for the designation of Antarctic Specially Protected Areas (“ASPA”) and the approval of Management Plans for those Areas;

*Recalling*

- Recommendation IV-1(1966), which designated Taylor Rookery, Mac. Robertson Land as Specially Protected Area (“SPA”) No 1;
- Recommendation XVII-2 (1992), which adopted a Management Plan for the Area;
- Decision 1 (2002), which renamed and renumbered SPA 1 as ASPA 101;
- Measures 2 (2005) and 1 (2010), which adopted revised Management Plans for ASPA 101;

*Recalling* that Recommendation XVII-2 (1992) has not become effective and was withdrawn by Measure 1 (2010);

*Noting* that the Committee for Environmental Protection has endorsed a revised Management Plan for ASPA 101;

*Desiring* to replace the existing Management Plan for ASPA 101 with the revised Management Plan;

**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:

1. the revised Management Plan for Antarctic Specially Protected Area No 101 (Taylor Rookery, Mac.Robertson Land), which is annexed to this Measure, be approved; and
2. the Management Plan for Antarctic Specially Protected Area 101 annexed to Measure 1 (2010) be revoked.

**Antarctic Specially Protected Area No 102  
(Rookery Islands, Holme Bay, Mac.Robertson Land):  
Revised Management Plan**

**The Representatives,**

*Recalling* Articles 3, 5 and 6 of Annex V to the Protocol on Environmental Protection to the Antarctic Treaty, providing for the designation of Antarctic Specially Protected Areas (“ASPA”) and the approval of Management Plans for those Areas;

*Recalling*

- Recommendation IV-2 (1966), which designated Rookery Islands, Holme Bay as Specially Protected Area (“SPA”) No 2;
- Recommendation XVII-2 (1992), which adopted a Management Plan for the Area;
- Decision 1 (2002), which renamed and renumbered SPA 2 as ASPA 102;
- Measures 2 (2005) and 2 (2010), which adopted revised Management Plans for ASPA 102;

*Recalling* that Recommendation XVII-2 (1992) has not become effective and was withdrawn by Measure 1 (2010);

*Noting* that the Committee for Environmental Protection has endorsed a revised Management Plan for ASPA 102;

*Desiring* to replace the existing Management Plan for ASPA 102 with the revised Management Plan;

**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:

1. the revised Management Plan for Antarctic Specially Protected Area No 102 (Rookery Islands, Holme Bay, Mac.Robertson Land), which is annexed to this Measure, be approved; and
2. the Management Plan for Antarctic Specially Protected Area No 102 annexed to Measure 2 (2010) be revoked.

**Antarctic Specially Protected Area No 103  
(Ardery Island and Odbert Island, Budd Coast,  
Wilkes Land, East Antarctica): Revised Management Plan**

**The Representatives,**

*Recalling* Articles 3, 5 and 6 of Annex V to the Protocol on Environmental Protection to the Antarctic Treaty, providing for the designation of Antarctic Specially Protected Areas (“ASPA”) and the approval of Management Plans for those Areas;

*Recalling*

- Recommendation IV-3 (1966), which designated Ardery Island and Odbert Island, Budd Coast as Specially Protected Area (“SPA”) No 3;
- Recommendation XVII-2 (1992), which adopted a Management Plan for the Area;
- Decision 1 (2002), which renamed and renumbered SPA 3 as ASPA 103;
- Measures 2 (2005) and 3 (2010), which adopted revised Management Plans for ASPA 103;

*Recalling* that Recommendation XVII-2 (1992) has not become effective and was withdrawn by Measure 1 (2010);

*Noting* that the Committee for Environmental Protection has endorsed a revised Management Plan for ASPA 103;

*Desiring* to replace the existing Management Plan for ASPA 103 with the revised Management Plan;

**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:

1. the revised Management Plan for Antarctic Specially Protected Area No 103 (Arderly Island and Odbert Island, Budd Coast, Wilkes Land, East Antarctica), which is annexed to this Measure, be approved; and
2. the Management Plan for Antarctic Specially Protected Area No 103 annexed to Measure 3 (2010) be revoked.

**Antarctic Specially Protected Area No 104  
(Sabrina Island, Balleny Islands):  
Revised Management Plan**

**The Representatives,**

*Recalling* Articles 3, 5 and 6 of Annex V to the Protocol on Environmental Protection to the Antarctic Treaty providing for the designation of Antarctic Specially Protected Areas (“ASPAs”) and approval of Management Plans for those Areas;

*Recalling*

- Recommendation IV-4 (1966), which designated Sabrina Island, Balleny Islands, as Specially Protected Area (“SPA”) No 4 and annexed a map for the Area;
- Decision 1 (2002), which renamed and renumbered SPA 4 as ASPA No 104;
- Measure 3 (2009), which adopted a revised Management Plan for ASPA 104;

*Recalling* that Recommendation IV-4 (1966) was designated as no longer effective by Measure 3 (2009);

*Noting* that the Committee for Environmental Protection has endorsed a revised Management Plan for ASPA 104;

*Desiring* to replace the existing Management Plan for ASPA 104 with the revised Management Plan;

**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:

1. the revised Management Plan for Antarctic Specially Protected Area No 104 (Sabrina Island, Balleny Islands), which is annexed to this Measure, be approved; and
2. the Management Plan for Antarctic Specially Protected Area No 104 annexed to Measure 3 (2009) be revoked.

## **Antarctic Specially Protected Area No 105 (Beaufort Island, McMurdo Sound, Ross Sea): Revised Management Plan**

### **The Representatives,**

*Recalling* Articles 3, 5 and 6 of Annex V to the Protocol on Environmental Protection to the Antarctic Treaty, providing for the designation of Antarctic Specially Protected Areas (“ASPA”) and the approval of Management Plans for those Areas;

### *Recalling*

- Recommendation IV-5 (1966), which designated Beaufort Island, Ross Sea as Specially Protected Area (“SPA”) No 5;
- Measure 1 (1997), which annexed a Management Plan for the Area;
- Decision 1 (2002), which renamed and renumbered SPA 5 as ASPA 105;
- Measures 2 (2003) and 4 (2010), which adopted revised Management Plans for ASPA 105;

*Recalling* that Recommendation IV-5 (1966) was designated as no longer effective by Measure 4 (2010);

*Recalling* that Measure 1 (1997) has not become effective and was withdrawn by Measure 4 (2010);

*Noting* that the Committee for Environmental Protection has endorsed a revised Management Plan for ASPA 105;

*Desiring* to replace the existing Management Plan for ASPA 105 with the revised Management Plan;

**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:

1. the revised Management Plan for Antarctic Specially Protected Area No 105 (Beaufort Island, McMurdo Sound, Ross Sea), which is annexed to this Measure, be approved; and
2. the Management Plan for Antarctic Specially Protected Area No 105 annexed to Measure 4 (2010) be revoked.

**Antarctic Specially Protected Area No 106  
(Cape Hallett, Northern Victoria Land, Ross Sea):  
Revised Management Plan**

**The Representatives,**

*Recalling* Articles 3, 5 and 6 of Annex V to the Protocol on Environmental Protection to the Antarctic Treaty, providing for the designation of Antarctic Specially Protected Areas (“ASPA”) and the approval of Management Plans for those Areas;

*Recalling*

- Recommendation IV-7 (1966), which designated Cape Hallett, Victoria Land as Specially Protected Area (“SPA”) No 7;
- Recommendation XIII-13 (1985), which revised the description and boundaries of SPA 7;
- Decision 1 (2002), which renamed and renumbered SPA 7 as ASPA 106;
- Measures 1 (2002) and 5 (2010), which adopted Management Plans for the Area;

*Recalling* that Recommendations IV-7 (1966) and XIII-13 (1985) were designated as no longer effective by Measure 5 (2010);

*Noting* that the Committee for Environmental Protection has endorsed a revised Management Plan for ASPA 106;

*Desiring* to replace the existing Management Plan for ASPA 106 with the revised Management Plan;

**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:

1. the revised Management Plan for Antarctic Specially Protected Area No 106 (Cape Hallett, Northern Victoria Land, Ross Sea), which is annexed to this Measure, be approved; and
2. the Management Plan for Antarctic Specially Protected Area No 106 annexed to Measure 5 (2010) be revoked.

## **Antarctic Specially Protected Area No 119 (Davis Valley and Forlidas Pond, Dufek Massif, Pensacola Mountains): Revised Management Plan**

### **The Representatives,**

*Recalling* Articles 3, 5 and 6 of Annex V to the Protocol on Environmental Protection to the Antarctic Treaty, providing for the designation of Antarctic Specially Protected Areas (“ASPA”) and the approval of Management Plans for those Areas;

### *Recalling*

- Recommendation XVI-9 (1991), which designated Forlidas Pond and Davis Valley Ponds as Specially Protected Area (“SPA”) No 23 and annexed a Management Plan for the Area;
- Decision 1 (2002), which renamed and renumbered SPA 23 as ASPA 119;
- Measures 2 (2005) and 6 (2010), which adopted revised Management Plans for ASPA 119;

*Recalling* that Recommendation XVI-9 (1991) has not become effective and was withdrawn by Measure 6 (2010);

*Noting* that the Committee for Environmental Protection has endorsed a revised Management Plan for ASPA 119;

*Desiring* to replace the existing Management Plan for ASPA 119 with the revised Management Plan;

**Recommend** to 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:

1. the revised Management Plan for Antarctic Specially Protected Area No 119 (Davis Valley and Forlidas Pond, Dufek Massif, Pensacola Mountains), which is annexed to this Measure, be approved; and
2. the Management Plan for Antarctic Specially Protected Area No 119 annexed to Measure 6 (2010) be revoked.

**Antarctic Specially Protected Area No 148  
(Mount Flora, Hope Bay, Antarctic Peninsula):  
Revised Management Plan**

**The Representatives,**

*Recalling* Articles 3, 5 and 6 of Annex V to the Protocol on Environmental Protection to the Antarctic Treaty, providing for the designation of Antarctic Specially Protected Areas (“ASPAs”) and the approval of Management Plans for those Areas;

*Recalling*

- Recommendation XV-6 (1989), which designated Mount Flora, Hope Bay, Antarctic Peninsula as Site of Special Scientific Interest (“SSSI”) No 31 and annexed a Management Plan for the Site;
- Decision 1 (2002), which renamed and renumbered SSSI 31 as ASPA 148;
- Measure 1 (2002), which adopted a revised Management Plan for ASPA 148;

*Recalling* that Recommendation XV-6 (1989) was designated as no longer current by Decision 1 (2011);

*Noting* that the Committee for Environmental Protection has endorsed a revised Management Plan for ASPA 119;

*Desiring* to replace the existing Management Plan for ASPA 148 with the revised Management Plan;

**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:

1. the revised Management Plan for Antarctic Specially Protected Area No 148 (Mount Flora, Hope Bay, Antarctic Peninsula), which is annexed to this Measure, be approved; and
2. the Management Plan for Antarctic Specially Protected Area No 148 annexed to Measure 1 (2002) be revoked.

## **Antarctic Specially Protected Area No 152 (Western Bransfield Strait): Revised Management Plan**

### **The Representatives,**

*Recalling* Articles 3, 5 and 6 of Annex V to the Protocol on Environmental Protection to the Antarctic Treaty providing for the designation of Antarctic Specially Protected Areas (“ASPAs”) and approval of Management Plans for those Areas;

### *Recalling*

- Recommendation XVI-3 (1991), which designated Western Bransfield Strait, off Low Island, South Shetland Islands, as Site of Special Scientific Interest (“SSSI”) No 35 and annexed a Management Plan for the Site;
- Measure 3 (2001), which extended the expiry date of SSSI 35 from 31 December 2001 to 31 December 2005;
- Decision 1 (2002), which renamed and renumbered SSSI 35 as Antarctic Specially Protected Area No 152;
- Measures 2 (2003) and 10 (2009), which adopted revised Management Plans for ASPA 152;

*Recalling* that Recommendation XVI-3 (1991) has not become effective and was withdrawn by Measure 10 (2009);

*Noting* that the Committee for Environmental Protection has endorsed a revised Management Plan for ASPA 152;

*Desiring* to replace the existing Management Plan for ASPA 152 with the revised Management Plan;

**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:

1. the revised Management Plan for Antarctic Specially Protected Area No 152 (Western Bransfield Strait), which is annexed to this Measure, be approved; and
2. the Management Plan for Antarctic Specially Protected Area No 152 annexed to Measure 10 (2009) be revoked.

## **Antarctic Specially Protected Area No 153 (Eastern Dallmann Bay): Revised Management Plan**

### **The Representatives,**

*Recalling* Articles 3, 5 and 6 of Annex V to the Protocol on Environmental Protection to the Antarctic Treaty providing for the designation of Antarctic Specially Protected Areas (“ASPAs”) and approval of Management Plans for those Areas;

### *Recalling*

- Recommendation XVI-3 (1991), which designated East Dallmann Bay, off Brabant Island as Site of Special Scientific Interest (“SSSI”) No 36 and annexed a Management Plan for the Site;
- Measure 3 (2001), which extended the expiry date of SSSI 36 from 31 December 2001 to 31 December 2005;
- Decision 1 (2002), which renamed and renumbered SSSI 36 as ASPA No 153;
- Measures 2 (2003) and 11 (2009), which adopted revised Management Plans for ASPA 153;

*Recalling* that Recommendation XVI-3 (1991) has not become effective and was withdrawn by Measure 10 (2009);

*Noting* that the Committee for Environmental Protection has endorsed a revised Management Plan for ASPA 153;

*Desiring* to replace the existing Management Plan for ASPA 153 with the revised Management Plan;

**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:

1. the revised Management Plan for Antarctic Specially Protected Area No 153 (Eastern Dallmann Bay), which is annexed to this Measure, be approved; and
2. the Management Plan for Antarctic Specially Protected Area No 153 annexed to Measure 11 (2009) be revoked.

## **Antarctic Specially Protected Area No 155 (Cape Evans, Ross Island): Revised Management Plan**

### **The Representatives,**

*Recalling* Articles 3, 5 and 6 of Annex V to the Protocol on Environmental Protection to the Antarctic Treaty providing for the designation of Antarctic Specially Protected Areas (“ASPA”) and approval of Management Plans for those Areas;

### *Recalling*

- Measure 2 (1997), which designated the Cape Evans Historic Site and its environs as a Specially Protected Area (“SPA”) No 25 and annexed a Management Plan for the Area;
- Decision 1 (2002), which renamed and renumbered SPA 25 as ASPA 155;
- Measures 2 (2005), 12 (2008) and 8 (2010), which adopted revised Management Plans for ASPA 155;

*Recalling* that Measure 2 (1997) has not become effective and was withdrawn by Measure 8 (2010);

*Noting* that the Committee for Environmental Protection has endorsed a revised Management Plan for ASPA 155;

*Desiring* to replace the existing Management Plan for ASPA 155 with the revised Management Plan;

**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:

1. the revised Management Plan for Antarctic Specially Protected Area No 155 (Cape Evans, Ross Island), which is annexed to this Measure, be approved; and
2. the Management Plan for Antarctic Specially Protected Area No 155 annexed to Measure 8 (2010) be revoked.

**Antarctic Specially Protected Area No 157  
(Backdoor Bay, Cape Royds, Ross Island):  
Revised Management Plan**

**The Representatives,**

*Recalling* Articles 3, 5 and 6 of Annex V to the Protocol on Environmental Protection to the Antarctic Treaty, providing for the designation of Antarctic Specially Protected Areas (“ASPA”) and the approval of Management Plans for those Areas;

*Recalling*

- Measure 1 (1998), which designated the Cape Royds site as Specially Protected Area (“SPA”) No 27 and annexed a Management Plan for the Area;
- Decision 1 (2002), which renamed and renumbered SPA 27 as ASPA 157;
- Measure 1 (2002), which adopted a revised Management Plan for ASPA 157;
- Measures 2 (2005) and 9 (2010), which adopted revised Management Plans for ASPA 157;

*Recalling* that Measure 1 (1998) had not become effective and was withdrawn by Measure 9 (2010);

*Noting* that the Committee for Environmental Protection has endorsed a revised Management Plan for ASPA 157;

*Desiring* to replace the existing Management Plan for ASPA 157 with the revised Management Plan;

**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:

1. the revised Management Plan for Antarctic Specially Protected Area No 157 (Backdoor Bay, Cape Royds, Ross Island), which is annexed to this Measure, be approved; and
2. the Management Plan for Antarctic Specially Protected Area No 157 annexed to Measure 9 (2010) be revoked.

## **Antarctic Specially Protected Area No 158 (Hut Point, Ross Island): Revised Management Plan**

### **The Representatives,**

*Recalling* Articles 3, 5 and 6 of Annex V to the Protocol on Environmental Protection to the Antarctic Treaty, providing for the designation of Antarctic Specially Protected Areas (“ASPA”) and the approval of Management Plans for those Areas;

### *Recalling*

- Measure 1 (1998), which designated the Hut Point Historic Site as Specially Protected Area (“SPA”) No 28 and annexed a Management Plan for the Area;
- Decision 1 (2002), which renamed and renumbered SPA 28 as ASPA 158;
- Measures 2 (2005) and 10 (2010), which adopted revised Management Plans for ASPA 158;

*Recalling* that Measure 1 (1998) has not become effective and was withdrawn by Measure 9 (2010);

*Noting* that the Committee for Environmental Protection has endorsed a revised Management Plan for ASPA 158;

*Desiring* to replace the existing Management Plan for ASPA 158 with the revised Management Plan;

**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:

1. the revised Management Plan for Antarctic Specially Protected Area No 158 (Hut Point, Ross Island), which is annexed to this Measure, be approved; and
2. the Management Plan for Antarctic Specially Protected Area No 158 annexed to Measure 10 (2010) be revoked.

**Antarctic Specially Protected Area No 159  
(Cape Adare, Borchgrevink Coast):  
Revised Management Plan**

**The Representatives,**

*Recalling* Articles 3, 5 and 6 of Annex V to the Protocol on Environmental Protection to the Antarctic Treaty, providing for the designation of Antarctic Specially Protected Areas (“ASPA”) and the approval of Management Plans for those Areas;

*Recalling*

- Measure 1 (1998), which designated the Cape Adare Historic Site and its environs as Specially Protected Area (“SPA”) No 29 and annexed a Management Plan for the Area;
- Decision 1 (2002), which renamed and renumbered SPA 29 as ASPA 159;
- Measures 2 (2005) and 11 (2010), which adopted revised Management Plans for ASPA 159;

*Recalling* Measure 1 (1998) has not become effective and was withdrawn by Measure 9 (2010);

*Noting* that the Committee for Environmental Protection has endorsed a revised Management Plan for ASPA 159;

*Desiring* to replace the existing Management Plan for ASPA 159 with the revised Management Plan;

**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:

1. the revised Management Plan for Antarctic Specially Protected Area No 159 (Cape Adare, Borchgrevink Coast), which is annexed to this Measure, be approved; and
2. the Management Plan for Antarctic Specially Protected Area No 159 annexed to Measure 11 (2010) be revoked.

**Antarctic Specially Protected Area No 163  
(Dakshin Gangotri Glacier, Dronning Maud Land):  
Revised Management Plan**

**The Representatives,**

*Recalling* Articles 3, 5 and 6 of Annex V to the Protocol on Environmental Protection to the Antarctic Treaty, providing for the designation of Antarctic Specially Protected Areas (“ASPAs”) and the approval of Management Plans for those Areas;

*Recalling*

- Measure 2 (2005), which designated Dakshin Gangotri Glacier, Dronning Maud Land as ASPA 163 and annexed a Management Plan for the Area;
- Measure 12 (2010), which adopted a revised Management Plan for ASPA 163;

*Noting* that the Committee for Environmental Protection has endorsed a revised Management Plan for ASPA 163;

*Desiring* to replace the existing Management Plan for ASPA 163 with the revised Management Plan;

**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:

1. the revised Management Plan for Antarctic Specially Protected Area No 163 (Dakshin Gangotri Glacier, Dronning Maud Land), which is annexed to this Measure, be approved; and

2. the Management Plan for Antarctic Specially Protected Area No 163 annexed to Measure 12 (2010) be revoked.

**Antarctic Specially Protected Area No 164  
(Scullin and Murray Monoliths, Mac.Robertson Land):  
Revised Management Plan**

**The Representatives,**

*Recalling* Articles 3, 5 and 6 of Annex V to the Protocol on Environmental Protection to the Antarctic Treaty, providing for the designation of Antarctic Specially Protected Areas (“ASPAs”) and the approval of Management Plans for those Areas;

*Recalling*

- Measure 2 (2005), which designated Scullin and Murray Monoliths, Mac.Robertson Land, East Antarctica as ASPA 164 and annexed a Management Plan for the Area;
- Measure 13 (2010), which adopted a revised Management Plan for ASPA 164;

*Noting* that the Committee for Environmental Protection has endorsed a revised Management Plan for ASPA 164;

Desiring to replace the existing Management Plan for ASPA 164 with the revised Management Plan;

**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:

1. the revised Management Plan for Antarctic Specially Protected Area No 164 (Scullin and Murray Monoliths, Mac.Robertson Land), which is annexed to this Measure, be approved; and
2. the Management Plan for Antarctic Specially Protected Area No 164 annexed to Measure 13 (2010) be revoked.

**Antarctic Specially Protected Area No 168  
(Mount Harding, Grove Mountains, East Antarctica):  
Revised Management Plan**

**The Representatives,**

*Recalling* Articles 3, 5 and 6 of Annex V to the Protocol on Environmental Protection to the Antarctic Treaty, providing for the designation of Antarctic Specially Protected Areas (“ASPA”) and the approval of Management Plans for those Areas;

*Recalling* Measure 2 (2008), which designated Mount Harding, Grove Mountains, East Antarctica as ASPA 168 and annexed a Management Plan for the Area;

*Noting* that the Committee for Environmental Protection has endorsed a revised Management Plan for ASPA 168;

*Desiring* to replace the existing Management Plan for ASPA 168 with the revised Management Plan;

**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:

1. the revised Management Plan for Antarctic Specially Protected Area No 168 (Mount Harding, Grove Mountains, East Antarctica), which is annexed to this Measure, be approved; and
2. the Management Plan for Antarctic Specially Protected Area No 168 annexed to Measure 2 (2008) be revoked.



**Antarctic Specially Managed Area No 2  
(McMurdo Dry Valleys, Southern Victoria Land):  
Revised Management Plan**

**The Representatives,**

*Recalling* Articles 4, 5 and 6 of Annex V to the Protocol on Environmental Protection to the Antarctic Treaty, providing for the designation of Antarctic Specially Managed Areas (“ASMA”) and the approval of Management Plans for those Areas;

*Recalling*

- Measure 1 (2004), which designated McMurdo Dry Valleys, Southern Victoria Land as ASMA 2 and annexed a Management Plan for the Area;
- Measure 10 (2011), which adopted a revised Management Plan for ASMA 2;

*Noting* that the Committee for Environmental Protection has endorsed a revised Management Plan for ASMA 2;

*Desiring* to replace the existing Management Plan for ASMA 2 with the revised Management Plan;

**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:

1. the revised Management Plan for Antarctic Specially Managed Area No 2 (McMurdo Dry Valleys, Southern Victoria Land), which is annexed to this Measure, be approved; and

2. the Management Plan for Antarctic Specially Managed Area No 2 annexed to Measure 10 (2011) be revoked.

**Revised List of Antarctic Historic Sites and Monuments:  
Lame Dog Hut at the Bulgarian base St. Kliment Ohridski,  
Livingston Island and Oversnow heavy tractor “Kharkovchanka”  
that was used in Antarctica from 1959 to 2010**

**The Representatives,**

*Recalling* the requirements of Article 8 of Annex V to the Protocol on Environmental Protection to the Antarctic Treaty to maintain a list of current Historic Sites and Monuments, and that such Sites and Monuments shall not be damaged, removed or destroyed;

*Recalling* Measure 3 (2003), which revised and updated the List of Historic Sites and Monuments, as subsequently amended;

*Desiring* to add two further Historic Sites and Monuments to the List of Historic Sites and Monuments;

**Recommend** to their Governments the following Measure for approval in accordance with paragraph 2 of Article 8 of Annex V to the Protocol on Environmental Protection to the Antarctic Treaty:

That:

1. the following be added to the List of Historic Sites and Monuments:

“No 91: Lame Dog Hut at the Bulgarian base St. Kliment Ohridski, Livingston Island.

The Lame Dog Hut was erected in April 1988, and had been the main building of St. Kliment Ohridski base until 1998. It is presently the oldest preserved building on Livingston Island, used as radio shack and post office,

and hosting a museum exhibition of associated artefacts from the early Bulgarian science and logistic operations in Antarctica.”

Location: 62° 38' 29" S, 60 ° 21' 53" W

Original proposing Party: Bulgaria

Party undertaking management: Bulgaria

“No 92: Oversnow heavy tractor “Kharkovchanka” that was used in Antarctica from 1959 to 2010.

The oversnow heavy tractor “Kharkovchanka” was designed and produced at the Malyshev Transport Machine-Building Plant in Kharkov specially for organizing inland sledge-tractor traverses in Antarctica. This was the first non-serial transport vehicle of the Soviet machine-building produced exclusively for operations in Antarctica. This tractor was not used outside Antarctica. Thus, the STT “Kharkovchanka” is a unique historical sample of engineering-technical developments made for exploration of Antarctica.”

Location: 69°22'41,0" S, 76°22'59,1" E

Original proposing Party: the Russian Federation

Party undertaking management: the Russian Federation

2. the revised and updated List of Historic Sites and Monuments be annexed to this Measure.

## Revised List of Historic Sites and Monuments

No.	Description	Location	Designation/ Amendment
1.	<p>Flag mast erected in December 1965 at the South Geographical Pole by the First Argentine Overland Polar Expedition.</p> <p>Original proposing Party: Argentina Party undertaking management: Argentina</p>	90°S	Rec. VII-9
2.	<p>Rock cairn and plaques at Syowa Station in memory of Shin Fukushima, a member of the 4th Japanese Antarctic Research Expedition, who died in October 1960 while performing official duties. The cairn was erected on 11 January 1961, by his colleagues. Some of his ashes repose in the cairn.</p> <p>Original proposing Party: Japan Party undertaking management: Japan</p>	69°00'S, 39°35'E	Rec. VII-9
3.	<p>Rock cairn and plaque on Proclamation Island, Enderby Land, erected in January 1930 by Sir Douglas Mawson. The cairn and plaque commemorate the landing on Proclamation Island of Sir Douglas Mawson with a party from the British, Australian and New Zealand Antarctic Research Expedition of 1929-31.</p> <p>Original proposing Party: Australia Party undertaking management: Australia</p>	65°51'S, 53°41'E	Rec. VII-9
4.	<p>Pole of Inaccessibility Station building. Station building to which a bust of V.I. Lenin is fixed, together with a plaque in memory of the conquest of the Pole of Inaccessibility by Soviet Antarctic explorers in 1958. As of 2007 the station building was covered by snow. The bust of Lenin is erected on the wooden stand mounted on the building roof at about 1.5 m high above the snow surface.</p> <p>Original proposing Party: Russia Party undertaking management: Russia</p>	82°06'42"S, 55°01'57"E	Rec. VII-9 Measure 11(2012)

No.	Description	Location	Designation/ Amendment
5.	<p>Rock cairn and plaque at Cape Bruce, Mac. Robertson Land, erected in February 1931 by Sir Douglas Mawson. The cairn and plaque commemorate the landing on Cape Bruce of Sir Douglas Mawson with a party from the British, Australian and New Zealand Antarctic Research Expedition of 1929-31.</p> <p>Original proposing Party: Australia Party undertaking management: Australia</p>	67°25'S, 60°47'E	Rec. VII-9
6.	<p>Rock cairn at Walkabout Rocks, Vestfold Hills, Princess Elizabeth Land, erected in 1939 by Sir Hubert Wilkins. The cairn houses a canister containing a record of his visit.</p> <p>Original proposing Party: Australia<sup>1</sup> Party undertaking management: Australia</p>	68°22'S, 78°33'E	Rec. VII-9
7.	<p>Ivan Khmara's Stone. Stone with inscribed plaque erected at Buromsky island in memory of Ivan Khmara, driver-mechanic, the member of the 1<sup>st</sup> Complex Antarctic Expedition of the USSR (1<sup>st</sup> Soviet Antarctic Expedition) who perished on fast ice in the performance of duties on 21.01.1956. Initially the stone was erected at Mabus Point, Mirny observatory. In 1974, 19<sup>th</sup> SAE, the stone was moved to Buromsky Island because of construction activity</p> <p>Original proposing Party: Russia Party undertaking management: Russia</p>	66°32'04"S, 92°59'57"E	Rec. VII-9 Measure 11(2012)
8.	<p>Anatoly Shcheglov's Monument. Metal stele with plaque in memory of Anatoly Shcheglov, driver-mechanic who perished in the performance of duties, erected on sledge on the Mirny – Vostok route, at 2 km from Mirny station.</p> <p>Original proposing Party: Russia Party undertaking management: Russia</p>	66°34'43"S, 92°58'23"E	Rec. VII-9 Measure 11(2012)
9.	<p>Buromsky Island Cemetery. Cemetery on Buromsky Island, near Mirny Observatory in which are buried citizens of the USSR (Russian Federation), Czechoslovakia, GDR and Switzerland (members of the Soviet and Russian Antarctic Expeditions) who perished in the performance of their duties.</p> <p>Original proposing Party: Russia Party undertaking management: Russia</p>	66°32'04"S, 93°00'E	Rec. VII-9 Measure 11(2012)

*Revised List of Historic Sites and Monuments*

No.	Description	Location	Designation/ Amendment
10.	<p>Soviet Oasis Station Observatory. Magnetic observatory building at Dobrowolsky station (a part of the former Soviet station Oasis transferred to Poland) at Bunger Hills with a plaque in memory of the opening of Oasis station in 1956.</p> <p>Original proposing Party: Russia Party undertaking management: Russia</p>	66°16'30"S, 100°45'03"E	Rec. VII-9 Measure 11(2012)
11.	<p>Vostok Station Tractor. Heavy tractor ATT 11 at Vostok station which participated in the first traverse to the Earth Geomagnetic Pole, with plaque in memory of the opening of the Station in 1957.</p> <p>Original proposing Party: Russia Party undertaking management: Russia</p>	78°27'48"S, 106°50'06"E	Rec. VII-9 Measure 11(2012)
12.	<i>Cross and plaque at Cape Denison, George V Land. (Removed from the Antarctic Treaty list of Historic Sites and Monuments subsumed with HSM 13 into HSM 77)</i>		
13.	<i>Hut at Cape Denison, George V Land, (Removed from the Antarctic Treaty list of Historic Sites and Monuments subsumed with HSM 12 into HSM 77)</i>		
14.	<p>Site of ice cave at Inexpressible Island, Terra Nova Bay, constructed in March 1912 by Victor Campbell's Northern Party, British Antarctic Expedition, 1910-13. The party spent the winter of 1912 in this ice cave. A wooden sign, plaque and seal bones remain at the site.</p> <p>Original proposing Party: New Zealand Parties undertaking management: New Zealand/Italy/ UK</p>	74°54'S, 163°43'E	Rec. VII-9 Measure 5(1995)
15.	<p>Hut at Cape Royds, Ross Island, built in February 1908 by the British Antarctic Expedition of 1907-09, led by Sir Ernest Shackleton. Restored in January 1961 by the Antarctic Division of New Zealand Department of Scientific and Industrial Research.</p> <p>Site incorporated within ASPA 157</p> <p>Original proposing Parties: New Zealand/UK Parties undertaking management: New Zealand/UK</p>	77°33'S, 166°10'E	Rec. VII-9

No.	Description	Location	Designation/ Amendment
16.	<p>Hut at Cape Evans, Ross Island, built in January 1911 by the British Antarctic Expedition of 1910-1913, led by Captain Robert F. Scott. Restored in January 1961 by the Antarctic Division of New Zealand Department of Scientific and Industrial Research.</p> <p>Site incorporated within ASPA 155</p> <p>Original proposing Parties: New Zealand /UK Parties undertaking management: New Zealand/UK</p>	77°38'S, 166°24'E	Rec. VII-9
17.	<p>Cross on Wind Vane Hill, Cape Evans, Ross Island, erected by the Ross Sea Party, led by Captain Aeneas Mackintosh, of Sir Ernest Shackleton's Imperial Trans-Antarctic Expedition of 1914-1916, in memory of three members of the party who died in the vicinity in 1916.</p> <p>Site incorporated within ASPA 155</p> <p>Original proposing Parties: New Zealand/UK Parties undertaking management: New Zealand/UK</p>	77°38'S, 166°24'E	Rec. VII-9
18.	<p>Hut at Hut Point, Ross Island, built in February 1902 by the British Antarctic Expedition of 1901-04, led by Captain Robert F. Scott. Partially restored in January 1964 by the New Zealand Antarctic Society, with assistance from the United States Government. Site incorporated within ASPA 158</p> <p>Original proposing Parties: New Zealand/UK Parties undertaking management: New Zealand/UK</p>	77°50'S, 166°37'E	Rec. VII-9
19.	<p>Cross at Hut Point, Ross Island, erected in February 1904 by the British Antarctic Expedition of 1901-04, in memory of George Vince, a member of the expedition, who died in the vicinity.</p> <p>Original proposing Parties: New Zealand/UK Parties undertaking management: New Zealand/UK</p>	77°50'S, 166°37'E	Rec. VII-9
20.	<p>Cross on Observation Hill, Ross Island, erected in January 1913 by the British Antarctic Expedition of 1910-13, in memory of Captain Robert F. Scott's party which perished on the return journey from the South Pole in March 1912.</p> <p>Original proposing Parties: New Zealand/UK Parties undertaking management: New Zealand/UK</p>	77°51'S, 166°41'E	Rec. VII-9

Revised List of Historic Sites and Monuments

No.	Description	Location	Designation/ Amendment
21.	<p>Remains of stone hut at Cape Crozier, Ross Island, constructed in July 1911 by Edward Wilson's party of the British Antarctic Expedition (1910-13) during the winter journey to collect Emperor penguin eggs.</p> <p>Original proposing Party: New Zealand Parties undertaking management: New Zealand/UK</p>	77°31'S, 169°22'E	Rec. VII-9
22.	<p>Three huts and associated historic relics at Cape Adare. Two were built in February 1899 during the British Antarctic (<i>Southern Cross</i>) Expedition, 1898-1900, led by Carsten E. Borchgrevink. The third was built in February 1911 by Robert F. Scott's Northern Party, led by Victor L.A.Campbell.</p> <p>Scott's Northern Party hut has largely collapsed with only the porch standing in 2002.</p> <p>Site incorporated within ASPA 159.</p> <p>Original proposing Parties: New Zealand/UK Parties undertaking management: New Zealand/UK</p>	71°18'S, 170°12'E	Rec. VII-9
23.	<p>Grave at Cape Adare of Norwegian biologist Nicolai Hanson, a member of the British Antarctic (<i>Southern Cross</i>) Expedition, 1898-1900, led by Carsten E. Borchgrevink. A large boulder marks the head of the grave with the grave itself outlined in white quartz stones. A cross and plaque are attached to the boulder.</p> <p>Original proposing Parties: New Zealand/ UK Parties undertaking management: New Zealand/Norway</p>	71°17'S, 170°13'E	Rec. VII-9
24.	<p>Rock cairn, known as 'Amundsen's cairn', on Mount Betty, Queen Maud Range erected by Roald Amundsen on 6 January 1912, on his way back to <i>Framheim</i> from the South Pole.</p> <p>Original proposing Party: Norway Party undertaking management: Norway</p>	85°11'S, 163°45'W	Rec. VII-9
25.	<i>De-listed</i>		
26.	<p>Abandoned installations of Argentine Station 'General San Martin' on Barry Island, Debenham Islands, Marguerite Bay, with cross, flag mast, and monolith built in 1951.</p> <p>Original proposing Party: Argentina Party undertaking management: Argentina</p>	68°08'S, 67°08'W	Rec. VII-9

No.	Description	Location	Designation/ Amendment
27.	<p>Cairn with a replica of a lead plaque erected on Megalestris Hill, Petermann Island, in 1909 by the second French expedition led by Jean-Baptiste E. A. Charcot. The original plaque is in the reserves of the Museum National d'Histoire Naturelle (Paris).</p> <p>Original proposing Parties: Argentina/France/UK Parties undertaking management: France /UK</p>	65°10'S, 64°09'W	Rec. VII-9
28.	<p>Rock cairn at Port Charcot, Booth Island, with wooden pillar and plaque inscribed with the names of the first French expedition led by Jean-Baptiste E. A. Charcot which wintered here in 1904 aboard <i>Le Français</i>.</p> <p>Original proposing Party: Argentina Parties undertaking management: Argentina/France</p>	65°03'S, 64°01'W	Rec. VII-9
29.	<p>Lighthouse named 'Primero de Mayo' erected on Lambda Island, Melchior Islands, by Argentina in 1942. This was the first Argentine lighthouse in the Antarctic.</p> <p>Original proposing Party: Argentina Party undertaking management: Argentina</p>	64°18'S, 62°59'W	Rec. VII-9
30.	<p>Shelter at Paradise Harbour erected in 1950 near the Chilean Base 'Gabriel Gonzalez Videla' to honour Gabriel Gonzalez Videla, the first Head of State to visit the Antarctic. The shelter is a representative example of pre-IGY activity and constitutes an important national commemoration.</p> <p>Original proposing Party: Chile Party undertaking management: Chile</p>	64°49'S, 62°51'W	Rec. VII-9
31.	<i>De-listed</i>		
32.	<p>Concrete monolith erected in 1947, near Capitán Arturo Prat Base on Greenwich Island, South Shetland Islands. Point of reference for Chilean Antarctic hydrographic surveys. The monolith is representative of an important pre-IGY activity and is currently preserved and maintained by personnel from Prat Base.</p> <p>Original proposing Party: Chile Party undertaking management: Chile</p>	62°28'S, 59°40'W	Rec. VII-9

Revised List of Historic Sites and Monuments

No.	Description	Location	Designation/ Amendment
33.	<p>Shelter and cross with plaque near Capitán Arturo Prat Base (Chile), Greenwich Island, South Shetland Islands. Named in memory of Lieutenant-Commander González Pacheco, who died in 1960 while in charge of the station. The monument commemorates events related to a person whose role and the circumstances of his death have a symbolic value and the potential to educate people about significant human activities in Antarctica.</p> <p>Original proposing Party: Chile Party undertaking management: Chile</p>	62°29'S, 59°40'W	Rec. VII-9
34.	<p>Bust at Capitán Arturo Prat Base (Chile), Greenwich Island, South Shetland Islands, of the Chilean naval hero Arturo Prat, erected in 1947. The monument is representative of pre-IGY activities and has symbolic value in the context of Chilean presence in Antarctica.</p> <p>Original proposing Party: Chile Party undertaking management: Chile</p>	62°50'S, 59°41'W	Rec. VII-9
35.	<p>Wooden cross and statue of the Virgin of Carmen erected in 1947 near Capitán Arturo Prat Base (Chile), Greenwich Island, South Shetland Islands. The monument is representative of pre-IGY activities and has a particularly symbolic and architectural value.</p> <p>Original proposing Party: Chile Party undertaking management: Chile</p>	62°29'S, 59°40'W	Rec. VII-9
36.	<p>Replica of a metal plaque erected by Eduard Dallmann at Potter Cove, King George Island, to commemorate the visit of his German expedition on 1 March, 1874 on board <i>Grönland</i>.</p> <p>Original proposing Parties: Argentina/UK Parties undertaking management: Argentina/Germany</p>	62°14'S, 58°39'W	Rec. VII-9

No.	Description	Location	Designation/ Amendment
37.	<p>O'Higgins Historic Site located on Cape Legoupil, Antarctic Peninsula and comprising the following structures of historical value:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• “Capitán General Bernardo O’Higgins Riquelme” Bust, erected in 1948 opposite the Base known under the same name. General O’Higgins was the first ruler of Chile to recognise the importance of Antarctica. It has a symbolic meaning in the history of Antarctic exploration since it was during his government that the vessel Dragon landed on the coast of the Antarctic Peninsula in 1820. This monument is also representative of pre-IGY activities in Antarctica. (63°19’14.3” S / 57°53’53.9”W)</li> <li>• Former “Capitán General Bernardo O’Higgins Riquelme” Antarctic Base, unveiled on 18th February, 1948 by the President of the Republic of Chile, Gabriel González Videla, the first President in the world to visit Antarctica. It is considered as a model pioneering base in the modern period of Antarctic exploration. (63°19’ S, 57°54’W)</li> <li>• Plaque in memory of Lieutenants Oscar Inostroza Contreras and Sergio Ponce Torrealba, who perished in the Antarctic Continent for the sake of peace and science, on 12th August, 1957. (63°19’15.4” S / 57°53’52.9”W)</li> </ul> <p>Virgen del Carmen Grotto, located in the surroundings of the base, built approximately forty years ago. It has served as a place of spiritual withdrawal for the staff of the different Antarctic stations and expeditions. (63°19’15.9” S / 57°54’03.2”W).</p> <p>Original proposing Party: Chile Party undertaking management: Chile</p>	63°19’S, 57°54’W	Rec. VII-9 Measure 11(2012)
38.	<p>Wooden hut on Snow Hill Island built in February 1902 by the main party of the Swedish South Polar Expedition led by Otto Nordenskjöld.</p> <p>Original proposing Parties: Argentina/ UK Parties undertaking management: Argentina/Sweden</p>	64°22’S, 56°59’W	Rec. VII-9
39.	<p>Stone hut at Hope Bay, Trinity Peninsula, built in January 1903 by a party of the Swedish South Polar Expedition.</p> <p>Original proposing Parties: Argentina/UK Parties undertaking management: Argentina/Sweden</p>	63°24’S, 56°59’ W	Rec. VII-9

*Revised List of Historic Sites and Monuments*

No.	Description	Location	Designation/ Amendment
40.	<p>Bust of General San Martin, grotto with a statue of the Virgin of Lujan, and a flag mast at Base 'Esperanza', Hope Bay, erected by Argentina in 1955; together with a graveyard with stele in memory of members of Argentine expeditions who died in the area.</p> <p>Original proposing Party: Argentina Party undertaking management: Argentina</p>	63°24'S, 56°59'W	Rec. VII-9
41.	<p>Stone hut on Paulet Island built in February 1903 by survivors of the wrecked vessel <i>Antarctic</i> under Captain Carl A. Larsen, members of the Swedish South Polar Expedition led by Otto Nordenskjöld, together with a grave of a member of the expedition and the rock cairn built by the survivors of the wreck at the highest point of the island to draw the attention of rescue expeditions.</p> <p>Original proposing Parties: Argentina/UK Parties undertaking management: Argentina/Sweden/ Norway</p>	63°34'S, 55°45'W	Rec. VII-9 Measure 5 (1997)
42.	<p>Area of Scotia Bay, Laurie Island, South Orkney Island, in which are found: stone hut built in 1903 by the Scottish Antarctic Expedition led by William S. Bruce; the Argentine meteorological hut and magnetic observatory, built in 1905 and known as Moneta House; and a graveyard with twelve graves, the earliest of which dates from 1903.</p> <p>Original proposing Party: Argentina Parties undertaking management: Argentina/UK</p>	60°46'S, 44°40'W	Rec. VII-9
43.	<p>Cross erected in 1955, at a distance of 1,300 metres north-east of the Argentine General Belgrano I Station (Argentina) and subsequently moved to Belgrano II Station (Argentina), Nunatak Bertrab, Confin Coast, Coats Land in 1979.</p> <p>Original proposing Party: Argentina Party undertaking management: Argentina</p>	77°52'S, 34°37'W	Rec. VII-9
44.	<p>Plaque erected at the temporary Indian station 'Dakshin Gangotri', Princess Astrid Kyst, Dronning Maud Land, listing the names of the First Indian Antarctic Expedition which landed nearby on 9 January 1982.</p> <p>Original proposing Party: India Party undertaking management: India</p>	70°45'S, 11°38'E	Rec. XII-7

No.	Description	Location	Designation/ Amendment
45.	<p>Plaque on Brabant Island, on Metchnikoff Point, mounted at a height of 70 m on the crest of the moraine separating this point from the glacier and bearing the following inscription:</p> <p>This monument was built by François de Gerlache and other members of the Joint Services Expedition 1983-85 to commemorate the first landing on Brabant Island by the Belgian Antarctic Expedition, 1897-99: Adrien de Gerlache (Belgium) leader, Roald Amundsen (Norway), Henryk Arctowski (Poland), Frederick Cook (USA) and Emile Danco (Belgium) camped nearby from 30 January to 6 February 1898.</p> <p>Original proposing Party: Belgium Party undertaking management: Belgium</p>	64°02'S, 62°34'W	Rec. XIII-16
46.	<p>All the buildings and installations of Port-Martin base, Terre Adélie constructed in 1950 by the 3rd French expedition in Terre Adélie and partly destroyed by fire during the night of 23 to 24 January 1952.</p> <p>Original proposing Party: France Party undertaking management: France</p>	66°49'S, 141°24'E	Rec. XIII-16
47.	<p>Wooden building called 'Base Marret' on the Ile des Pétrels, Terre Adélie, where seven men under the command of Mario Marret overwintered in 1952 following the fire at Port Martin Base.</p> <p>Original proposing Party: France Party undertaking management: France</p>	66°40'S, 140°01'E	Rec. XIII-16
48.	<p>Iron cross on the North-East headland of the Ile des Pétrels, Terre Adélie, dedicated as a memorial to André Prudhomme, head meteorologist in the 3rd International Geophysical Year expedition who disappeared during a blizzard on 7 January 1959.</p> <p>Original proposing Party: France Party undertaking management: France</p>	66°40'S, 140°01'E	Rec. XIII-16

*Revised List of Historic Sites and Monuments*

No.	Description	Location	Designation/ Amendment
49.	<p>The concrete pillar erected by the First Polish Antarctic Expedition at Dobrolowski Station on the Bunger Hill to measure acceleration due to gravity <math>g = 982,439.4</math> mgal <math>\pm 0.4</math> mgal in relation to Warsaw, according to the Potsdam system, in January 1959.</p> <p>Original proposing Party: Poland Party undertaking management: Poland</p>	66°16'S, 100°45'E	Rec. XIII-16
50.	<p>A brass plaque bearing the Polish Eagle, the national emblem of Poland, the dates 1975 and 1976, and the following text in Polish, English and Russian:</p> <p>In memory of the landing of members of the first Polish Antarctic marine research expedition on the vessels 'Profesor Siedlecki' and 'Tazar' in February 1976.</p> <p>This plaque, south-west of the Chilean and Soviet stations, is mounted on a cliff facing Maxwell Bay, Fildes Peninsula, King George Island.</p> <p>Original proposing Party: Poland Party undertaking management: Poland</p>	62°12'S, 59°01'W	Rec. XIII-16
51.	<p>The grave of Włodzimirz Puchalski, surmounted by an iron cross, on a hill to the south of Arctowski station on King George Island. W. Puchalski was an artist and a producer of documentary nature films, who died on 19 January 1979 whilst working at the station.</p> <p>Original proposing Party: Poland Party undertaking management: Poland</p>	62°13'S, 58°28'W	Rec. XIII-16
52.	<p>Monolith erected to commemorate the establishment on 20 February 1985 by the Peoples Republic of China of the 'Great Wall Station' on Fildes Peninsula, King George Island, in the South Shetland Islands. Engraved on the monolith is the following inscription in Chinese: 'Great Wall Station, First Chinese Antarctic Research Expedition, 20 February 1985'.</p> <p>Original proposing Party: China Party undertaking management: China</p>	62°13'S, 58°58'W	Rec. XIII-16

No.	Description	Location	Designation/ Amendment
53.	<p>Bust of Captain Luis Alberto Pardo, monolith and plaques on Point Wild, Elephant Island, south Shetland Islands, celebrating the rescue of the survivors of the British ship <i>Endurance</i> by the Chilean Navy cutter <i>Yelcho</i> displaying the following words:</p> <p>“ Here on August 30<sup>th</sup>, 1916, the Chilean Navy cutter <i>Yelcho</i> commanded by Pilot Luis Pardo Villalón rescued the 22 men from the Shackleton Expedition who survived the wreck of the ‘Endurance’ living for four and one half months in this Island”.</p> <p>The Monolith and the plaques have been placed on Elephant Island and their replicas on the Chilean bases Capitan Arturo Prat (62°30’S, 59°49’W) and President Eduardo Frei (62°12’S, 62°12’W). Bronze busts of the pilot Luis Pardo Villalón were placed on the three above-mentioned monoliths during the XXIVth Chilean Antarctic Scientific Expedition in 1987-88.</p> <p>Original proposing Party: Chile Party undertaking management: Chile</p>	61°03’S, 54°50’W	Rec. XIV-8 Rec. XV-13
54.	<p>Richard E. Byrd Historic Monument, McMurdo Station, Antarctica. Bronze bust on black marble, 5ft high x 2ft square, on wood platform, bearing inscriptions describing the polar achievements of Richard Evelyn Byrd. Erected at McMurdo Station in 1965.</p> <p>Original proposing Party: USA</p>	77°51’S, 166°40’E	Rec. XV-12
55.	<p>East Base, Antarctica, Stonington Island. Buildings and artefacts at East Base, Stonington Island and their immediate environs. These structures were erected and used during two U.S. wintering expeditions: the Antarctic Service Expedition (1939-1941) and the Ronne Antarctic Research Expedition (1947-1948). The size of the historic area is approximately 1,000 metres in the north-south direction (from the beach to Northeast Glacier adjacent to Back Bay) and approximately 500 metres in the east-west direction.</p> <p>Original proposing Party: USA</p>	68°11’S, 67°00’W	Rec. XIV-8

*Revised List of Historic Sites and Monuments*

No.	Description	Location	Designation/ Amendment
56.	<p>Waterboat Point, Danco Coast, Antarctic Peninsula. The remains and immediate environs of the Waterboat Point hut. It was occupied by the UK two-man expedition of Thomas W. Bagshawe and Maxime C. Lester in 1921-22. Only the base of the boat, foundations of doorposts and an outline of the hut and extension still exist. It is situated close to the Chilean station 'President Gabriel Gonzáles Videla'.</p> <p>Original proposing Party: Chile/UK Parties undertaking management: Chile/UK</p>	64°49'S, 62°51'W	Rec. XVI-11
57.	<p>Commemorative plaque at 'Yankee Bay' (Yankee Harbour), MacFarlane Strait, Greenwich Island, South Shetland Islands. Near a Chilean refuge. Erected to the memory of Captain Andrew MacFarlane, who in 1820 explored the Antarctic Peninsula area in the brigantine <i>Dragon</i>.</p> <p>Original proposing Parties: Chile/UK Parties undertaking management: Chile/UK</p>	62°32'S, 59°45'W	Rec. XVI-11
58.	<i>De-listed</i>		
59.	<p>A cairn on Half Moon Beach, Cape Shirreff, Livingston Island, South Shetland Islands and a plaque on 'Cerro Gaviota' opposite San Telmo Islets commemorating the officers, soldiers and seamen aboard the Spanish vessel <i>San Telmo</i>, which sank in September 1819; possibly the first people to live and die in Antarctica.</p> <p>Site incorporated within ASPA 149.</p> <p>Original proposing Parties: Chile/Spain/Peru Parties undertaking management: Chile/Spain/Peru</p>	62°28'S, 60°46'W	Rec. XVI-11

No.	Description	Location	Designation/ Amendment
60.	<p>Wooden plaque and cairn located at Penguins Bay, southern coast of Seymour Island (Marambio), James Ross Archipelago. This plaque was placed on 10 November 1903 by the crew of a rescue mission of the Argentinian Corvette <i>Uruguay</i> in the site where they met the members of the Swedish expedition led by Dr Otto Nordenskjöld. The text of the wooden plaque reads as follows:</p> <p>“10.XI.1903 Uruguay (Argentine Navy) in its journey to give assistance to the Swedish Antarctic expedition.”</p> <p>In January 1990, a rock cairn was erected by Argentina in memory of this event in the place where the plaque is located.</p> <p>Original proposing Party: Argentina Parties undertaking management: Argentina/Sweden</p>	64°16'S, 56°39'W	Rec. XVII-3
61.	<p>‘Base A’ at Port Lockroy, Goudier Island, off Wiencke Island, Antarctic Peninsula. Of historic importance as an Operation Tabarin base from 1944 and for scientific research, including the first measurements of the ionosphere, and the first recording of an atmospheric whistler, from Antarctica. Port Lockroy was a key monitoring site during the International Geophysical Year of 1957/58.</p> <p>Original Proposing Party: UK Party undertaking management: UK</p>	64°49'S, 63°29'W	Measure 4 (1995)
62.	<p>‘Base F (Wordie House)’ on Winter Island, Argentine Islands. Of historic importance as an example of an early British scientific base.</p> <p>Original proposing Party: UK Parties undertaking management: UK/Ukraine</p>	65°15'S, 64°16'W	Measure 4 (1995)
63.	<p>‘Base Y’ on Horseshoe Island, Marguerite Bay, western Graham Land. Noteworthy as a relatively unaltered and completely equipped British scientific base of the late 1950s. ‘Blaiklock’, the refuge hut nearby, is considered an integral part of the base.</p> <p>Original proposing Party: UK Party undertaking management: UK</p>	67°48'S, 67°18'W	Measure 4 (1995)

*Revised List of Historic Sites and Monuments*

No.	Description	Location	Designation/ Amendment
64.	<p>'Base E' on Stonington Island, Marguerite Bay, western Graham Land. Of historical importance in the early period of exploration and later British Antarctic Survey (BAS) history of the 1960s and 1970s.</p> <p>Original proposing Party: UK Party undertaking management: UK</p>	68°11'S, 67°00'W	Measure 4 (1995)
65.	<p>Message post, Svend Foyn Island, Possession Islands. A pole with a box attached was placed on the island on 16 January 1895 during the whaling expedition of Henryk Bull and Captain Leonard Kristensen of the ship <i>Antarctic</i>. It was examined and found intact by the British Antarctic Expedition of 1898-1900 and then sighted from the beach by the USS <i>Edisto</i> in 1956 and USCGS <i>Glacier</i> in 1965.</p> <p>Original proposing Parties: New Zealand/Norway/UK Parties undertaking management: New Zealand/Norway</p>	71°56'S, 171°05'W	Measure 4 (1995)
66.	<p>Prestrud's Cairn, Scott Nunataks, Alexandra Mountains, Edward VII Peninsula. The small rock cairn was erected at the foot of the main bluff on the north side of the nunataks by Lieutenant K. Prestrud on 3 December 1911 during the Norwegian Antarctic Expedition of 1910-1912.</p> <p>Original proposing Parties: New Zealand/ Norway/ UK Parties undertaking management: New Zealand/Norway</p>	77°11'S, 154°32'W	Measure 4 (1995)
67.	<p>Rock shelter, 'Granite House', Cape Geology, Granite Harbour. This shelter was constructed in 1911 for use as a field kitchen by Griffith Taylor's second geological excursion during the British Antarctic Expedition of 1910-1913. It was enclosed on three sides with granite boulder walls and used a sledge to support a seal-skin roof. The stone walls of the shelter have partially collapsed. The shelter contains corroded remnants of tins, a seal skin and some cord. The sledge is now located 50 m seaward of the shelter and consists of a few scattered pieces of wood, straps and buckles.</p> <p>Site incorporated within ASPA 154.</p> <p>Original proposing Parties: New Zealand/Norway/UK Parties undertaking management: New Zealand/UK</p>	77°00'S, 162°32'E	Measure 4 (1995)

No.	Description	Location	Designation/ Amendment
68.	<p>Site of depot at Hells Gate Moraine, Inexpressible Island, Terra Nova Bay. This emergency depot consisted of a sledge loaded with supplies and equipment which was placed on 25 January 1913 by the British Antarctic Expedition, 1910-1913. The sledge and supplies were removed in 1994 in order to stabilize their deteriorating condition.</p> <p>Original proposing Parties: New Zealand/Norway/UK Parties undertaking management: New Zealand/UK</p>	74°52'S, 163°50'E	Measure 4 (1995)
69.	<p>Message post at Cape Crozier, Ross Island, erected on 22 January 1902 by Captain Robert F. Scott's <i>Discovery</i> Expedition of 1901-04. It was to provide information for the expedition's relief ships, and held a metal message cylinder, which has since been removed.</p> <p>Site incorporated within ASPA 124</p> <p>Original proposing Parties: New Zealand/Norway/UK Parties undertaking management: New Zealand/UK</p>	77°27'S, 169°16'E	Measure 4 (1995)
70.	<p>Message post at Cape Wadworth, Coulman Island. A metal cylinder nailed to a red pole 8 m above sea level placed by Captain Robert F. Scott on 15 January 1902. He painted the rocks behind the post red and white to make it more conspicuous.</p> <p>Original proposing Parties: New Zealand/Norway/UK Parties undertaking management: New Zealand/UK</p>	73°19'S, 169°47'E	Measure 4 (1995)
71.	<p>Whalers Bay, Deception Island, South Shetland Islands. The site comprises all pre-1970 remains on the shore of Whalers Bay, including those from the early whaling period (1906-12) initiated by Captain Adolfus Andresen of the Sociedad Ballenera de Magallanes, Chile; the remains of the Norwegian Hektor Whaling Station established in 1912 and all artefacts associated with its operation until 1931; the site of a cemetery with 35 burials and a memorial to ten men lost at sea; and the remains from the period of British scientific and mapping activity (1944-1969). The site also acknowledges and commemorates the historic value of other events that occurred there, from which nothing remains.</p> <p>Original proposing Parties: Chile/ Norway Parties undertaking management: Chile/Norway/UK</p>	62°59'S, 60°34'W	Measure 4 (1995)

*Revised List of Historic Sites and Monuments*

No.	Description	Location	Designation/ Amendment
72.	<p>Mikkelsen Cairn, Tryne Islands, Vestfold Hills. A rock cairn and a wooden mast erected by the landing party led by Captain Klarius Mikkelsen of the Norwegian whaling ship <i>Thorshavn</i> and including Caroline Mikkelsen, Captain Mikkelsen's wife, the first woman to set foot on East Antarctica. The cairn was discovered by Australian National Antarctic Research Expedition field parties in 1957 and again in 1995.</p> <p>Original proposing Parties: Australia/Norway Parties undertaking management: Australia/Norway</p>	<p>68°22'S 78°24'E</p>	<p>Measure 2 (1996)</p>
73.	<p>Memorial Cross for the 1979 Mount Erebus crash victims, Lewis Bay, Ross Island. A cross of stainless steel which was erected in January 1987 on a rocky promontory three kilometers from the Mount Erebus crash site in memory of the 257 people of different nationalities who lost their lives when the aircraft in which they were travelling crashed into the lower slopes of Mount Erebus, Ross Island. The cross was erected as a mark of respect and in remembrance of those who died in the tragedy.</p> <p>Original proposing Party: New Zealand Party undertaking management: New Zealand</p>	<p>77°25'S, 167°27'E</p>	<p>Measure 4 (1997)</p>
74.	<p>The un-named cove on the south-west coast of Elephant Island, including the foreshore and the intertidal area, in which the wreckage of a large wooden sailing vessel is located.</p> <p>Original proposing Party: UK Party undertaking management: UK</p>	<p>61°14'S, 55°22'W</p>	<p>Measure 2 (1998)</p>
75.	<p>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.</p> <p>Original proposing Party: New Zealand Party undertaking management: New Zealand</p>	<p>77°51'S, 166°46'E</p>	<p>Measure 1 (2001)</p>
76.	<p>The ruins of the Base Pedro Aguirre Cerda Station, being a Chilean meteorological and volcanological center situated at Pendulum Cove, Deception Island, Antarctica, that was destroyed by volcanic eruptions in 1967 and 1969.</p> <p>Original proposing Party: Chile Party undertaking management: Chile</p>	<p>62°59'S, 60°40'W</p>	<p>Measure 2 (2001)</p>

No.	Description	Location	Designation/ Amendment
77.	<p>Cape Denison, Commonwealth Bay, George V Land, including Boat Harbour and the historic artefacts contained within its waters. This Site is contained within ASMA No. 3, designated by Measure 1 (2004). Part of this site is also contained within ASPA No. 162, designated by Measure 2 (2004).</p> <p>Original proposing Party: Australia Party undertaking management: Australia</p>	67°00'30"S, 142°39'40"	Measure 3 (2004)
78.	<p>Memorial plaque at India Point, Humboldt Mountains, Wohlthat Massif, central Dronning Maud Land erected in memory of three scientists of the Geological Survey of India (GSI) and a communication technician from the Indian Navy - all members of the ninth Indian Expedition to Antarctica, who sacrificed their lives in this mountain camp in an accident on 8th January 1990.</p> <p>Original proposing Party: India Party undertaking management: India.</p>	71°45'08"S, 11°12'30"E	Measure 3 (2004)
79.	<p>Lillie Marleen Hut, Mt. Dockery, Everett Range, Northern Victoria Land.</p> <p>The hut was erected to support the work of the German Antarctic Northern Victoria Land Expedition (GANOVEX I) of 1979/1980. The hut, a bivouac container made of prefabricated fiberglass units insulated with polyurethane foam, was named after the Lillie Glacier and the song "Lillie Marleen". The hut is closely associated with the dramatic sinking of the expedition ship "Gotland II" during GANOVEX II in December 1981.</p> <p>Original proposing Party: Germany Party undertaking management: Germany</p>	71°12'S, 164°31'E	Measure 5 (2005)
80.	<p>Amundsen's Tent. The tent was erected at 90° by the Norwegian group of explorers led by Roald Amundsen on their arrival at the South Pole on 14 December 1911. The tent is currently buried underneath the snow and ice in the vicinity of the South Pole.</p> <p>Original proposing Party: Norway Party undertaking management: Norway</p>	90°S	Measure 5 (2005)

*Revised List of Historic Sites and Monuments*

No.	Description	Location	Designation/ Amendment
81.	<p>Rocher du Débarquement (Landing Rock), being a small island where Admiral Dumont D'Urville and his crew landed on 21 January 1840 when he discovered Terre Adélie.</p> <p>Original proposing Party: France Party undertaking management: France</p>	66° 36.30'S, 140° 03.85'E	Measure 3 (2006)
82.	<p>Monument to the Antarctic Treaty and Plaque. This Monument is located near the Frei, Bellingshausen and Escudero bases, Fildes Peninsula, King George Island. The plaque at the foot of the monument commemorates the signatories of the Antarctic Treaty. This Monument has 4 plaques in the official languages of the Antarctic Treaty. The plaques were installed in February 2011 and read as follows: "This historic monument, dedicated to the memory of the signatories of the Antarctic Treaty, Washington D.C., 1959, is also a reminder of the legacy of the First and Second International Polar Years (1882-1883 and 1932-1933) and of the International Geophysical Year (1957-1958) that preceded the Antarctic Treaty, and recalls the heritage of International Cooperation that led to the International Polar Year 2007-2008." This monument was designed and built by the American Joseph W. Pearson, who offered it to Chile. It was unveiled in 1999, on the occasion of the 40th anniversary of the signature of the Antarctic Treaty."<sup>22</sup></p> <p>Original proposing Party: Chile Party undertaking management: Chile</p>	62° 12' 01" S; 58° 57' 41" W	Measure 3 (2007) Measure 11 (2011)
83.	<p>Base "W", Detaille Island, Lallemande Fjord, Loubert Coast. Base "W" is situated on a narrow isthmus at the northern end of Detaille Island, Lallemand Fjord, Loubert Coast. The site consists of a hut and a range of associated structures and outbuildings including a small emergency storage building, bitch and pup pens, anemometer tower and two standard tubular steel radio masts (one to the south west of the main hut and the other to the east). Base "W" was established in 1956 as a British science base primarily for survey, geology and meteorology and to contribute to the IGY in 1957. As a relatively unaltered base from the late 1950s, Base "W" provides an important reminder of the science and living conditions that existed when the Antarctic Treaty was signed 50 years ago.</p> <p>Original proposing Party: United Kingdom Party undertaking management: United Kingdom</p>	66°52'S; 66°48'W	Measure 14 (2009)

No.	Description	Location	Designation/ Amendment
84.	<p>Hut at Damoy Point, Dorian Bay, Wiencke Island, Palmer Archipelago. The site consists of a well-preserved hut and the scientific equipment and other artefacts inside it. It is located at Damoy Point on Dorian Bay, Wiencke Island, Palmer Archipelago. The hut was erected in 1973 and used for a number of years as a British summer air facility and transit station for scientific personnel. It was last occupied in 1993.</p> <p>Original proposing Party: United Kingdom Party undertaking management: United Kingdom</p>	64° 49'S; 63°31'W	Measure 14 (2009)
85.	<p>Plaque Commemorating the PM-3A Nuclear Power Plant at McMurdo Station. The plaque is approximately 18 x 24 inches, made of bronze and secured to a large vertical rock at McMurdo Station, the former site of the PM-3A nuclear power reactor. It is approximately half way up the west side of Observation Hill. The plaque text details achievements of PM-3A, Antarctica's first nuclear power plant.</p> <p>Original proposing Party: United States Party Undertaking Management: United States</p>	77° 51' S, 166° 41' E	Measure 15 (2010)
86.	<p>No.1 Building at Great Wall Station. The No.1 Building, built in 1985 with a total floor space of 175 square meters, is located at the centre of the Chinese Antarctic Great Wall Station which is situated in Fildes Peninsula, King George Island, South Shetlands, West Antarctica. The Building marked the commencement of China devoting to Antarctic research in the 1980s, and thus it is of great significance in commemorating China's Antarctic expedition.</p> <p>Original proposing Party: China Party undertaking management: China</p>	62°13'4" S, 58°57'44" W	Measure 12 (2011)

*Revised List of Historic Sites and Monuments*

No.	Description	Location	Designation/ Amendment
87.	<p>Location of the first permanently occupied German Antarctic research station “Georg Forster” at the Schirmacher Oasis, Dronning Maud Land. The original site is situated by the Schirmacher Oasis and marked by a commemorative bronze plaque with the label in German language:</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Antarktisstation Georg Forster 70° 46’ 39” S 11° 51’ 03” E von 1976 bis 1996</p> <p>The plaque is well preserved and affixed to a rock wall at the southern edge of the location. This Antarctic research station was opened on 21 April 1976 and closed down in 1993. The entire site has been completely cleaned up after the dismantling of the station was successfully terminated on 12 February 1996. The site is located about 1.5 km east of the current Russian Antarctic research station Novolazarevskaya.</p> <p>Original proposing Party: Germany Party undertaking management: Germany</p>	<p>70°46’39” S, 11°51’03” E</p> <p>Elevation: 141 meters above sea level</p>	Measure 18 (2013)
88.	<p>Professor Kudryashov’s Drilling Complex Building. The drilling complex building was constructed in the summer season of 1983-84. Under the leadership of Professor Boris Kudryashov, ancient mainland ice samples were obtained.</p> <p>Original proposing Party: Russian Federation Party undertaking management: Russian Federation</p>	<p>78°28’ S, 106° 48’ E</p> <p>Height above sea level 3488 m.</p>	Measure 19 (2013)
89.	<p>Terra Nova Expedition 1910-12, Upper “Summit Camp” used during survey of Mount Erebus in December 1912. Camp Site location includes part of a circle of rocks, which were likely used to weight the tent valences. The camp site was used by a science party on Captain Scott’s Terra Nova Expedition, who undertook mapping and collected geological specimens on Mount Erebus in December 1912.</p> <p>Original proposing Parties: United Kingdom, New Zealand and United States Parties undertaking management: United Kingdom, New Zealand and United States</p>	<p>77°30.348’ S, 167°10.223’ E</p> <p>Circa 3,410m above sea level</p>	Measure 20 (2013)

No.	Description	Location	Designation/ Amendment
90.	<p>Terra Nova Expedition 1910-12, Lower “Camp E” Site used during survey of Mount Erebus in December 1912. Camp Site location consists of a slightly elevated area of gravel and includes some aligned rocks, which may have been used to weight the tent valences. The camp site was used by a science party on Captain Scott’s Terra Nova Expedition, who undertook mapping and collected geological specimens on Mount Erebus in December 1912.</p> <p>Original proposing Parties: United Kingdom, New Zealand and United States Parties undertaking management: United Kingdom, New Zealand and United States</p>	<p>77° 30.348’ S, 167° 9.246’ E</p> <p>Circa 3,410 m above sea level</p>	Measure 21 (2013)
91.	<p>Lame Dog Hut at the Bulgarian base St. Kliment Ohridski, Livingston Island</p> <p>The Lame Dog Hut was erected in April 1988, and had been the main building of St. Kliment Ohridski base until 1998. It is presently the oldest preserved building on Livingston Island, used as radio shack and post office, and hosting a museum exhibition of associated artefacts from the early Bulgarian science and logistic operations in Antarctica</p> <p>Original proposing Party: Bulgaria Party undertaking management: Bulgaria</p>	<p>62° 38’ 29” S, 60° 21’ 53” W</p>	Measure 19 (2015)
92.	<p>Oversnow heavy tractor “Kharkovchanka” that was used in Antarctica from 1959 to 2010.</p> <p>The oversnow heavy tractor “Kharkovchanka” was designed and produced at the Malyshev Transport Machine-Building Plant in Kharkov specially for organizing inland sledge-tractor traverses in Antarctica. This was the first non-serial transport vehicle of the Soviet machine-building produced exclusively for operations in Antarctica. This tractor was not used outside Antarctica. Thus, the STT “Kharkovchanka” is a unique historical sample of engineering-technical developments made for exploration of Antarctica.</p> <p>Original proposing Party: the Russian Federation Party undertaking management: the Russian Federation</p>	<p>69°22’41,0” S, 76°22’59,1” E.</p>	Measure 19 (2015)

## 2. Decisions



## **Revised Rules of Procedure for the Antarctic Treaty Consultative Meeting (2015): Committees and Working Groups**

### **The Representatives,**

*Recalling* Decision 2 (2011) *Revised Rules of Procedure for the Antarctic Treaty Consultative Meeting (2011)*, *Revised Rules of Procedure for the Committee for Environmental Protection (2011)* and *Guidelines for the Submission, Translation and Distribution of Documents for the ATCM and the CEP*;

*Considering* that the functioning of the Antarctic Treaty Consultative Meeting (“ATCM”) could be enhanced by the introduction of provisional arrangements for Working Groups at the end of each ATCM;

*Noting* the need to update the Revised Rules of Procedure for the Antarctic Treaty Consultative Meeting (2011);

**Decide** that the Revised Rules of Procedure of the Antarctic Treaty Consultative Meeting (2015) annexed to this Decision shall replace the Revised Rules of Procedure for the Antarctic Treaty Consultative Meeting (2011) annexed to Decision 2 (2011).



## **Revised Rules of Procedure for the Antarctic Treaty Consultative Meeting (2015)**

1. Meetings held pursuant to Article IX of the Antarctic Treaty shall be known as Antarctic Treaty Consultative Meetings. Contracting Parties entitled to participate in those Meetings shall be referred to as “Consultative Parties”; other Contracting Parties which may have been invited to attend those Meetings shall be referred to as “non-Consultative Parties”. The Executive Secretary of the Secretariat of the Antarctic Treaty shall be referred to as the “Executive Secretary”.

2. The Representatives of the Commission for the Conservation of Antarctic Marine Living Resources, the Scientific Committee on Antarctic Research and the Council of Managers of National Antarctic Programs, invited to attend those Meetings in accordance with Rule 31, shall be referred to as “Observers”.

### **Representation**

3. Each Consultative Party shall be represented by a delegation composed of a Representative and such Alternate Representatives, Advisers and other persons as each State may deem necessary. Each non-Consultative Party which has been invited to attend a Consultative Meeting shall be represented by a delegation composed of a Representative and such other persons as it may deem necessary within such numerical limit as may from time to time be determined by the Host Government in consultation with the Consultative Parties. The Commission for the Conservation of Antarctic Marine Living Resources, the Scientific Committee on Antarctic Research and the Council of Managers of National Antarctic Programs shall be represented by their respective Chairman or President, or other persons appointed to this end. The names of members of delegations and of the observers shall be communicated to the Host Government prior to the opening of the Meeting.

4. The order of precedence of the delegations shall be in accordance with the alphabet in the language of the Host Government, all delegations of non-Consultative Parties following after those of Consultative Parties, and all delegations of observers following after non-Consultative Parties.

### **Officers**

5. A Representative of the Host Government shall be the Temporary Chairman of the Meeting and shall preside until the Meeting elects a Chairman.

6. At its inaugural session, a Chairman from one of the Consultative Parties shall be elected. The other Representatives of Consultative Parties shall serve as Vice-Chairmen of the Meeting in order of precedence. The Chairman normally shall preside at all plenary sessions. If he is absent from any session or part thereof, the Vice-Chairmen, rotating on the basis of the order of precedence as established by Rule 4, shall preside during each such session.

### **Secretariat**

7. The Executive Secretary shall act as Secretary to the Meeting. He or she shall be responsible, with the assistance of the Host Government, for providing secretariat services for the meeting, as provided in Article 2 of Measure 1 (2003), as provisionally applied by Decision 2 (2003) until Measure 1 becomes effective.

### **Sessions**

8. The opening plenary session shall be held in public, other sessions shall be held in private, unless the Meeting shall determine otherwise.

### **Committees and Working Groups**

9. The Meeting, to facilitate its work, may establish such committees as it may deem necessary for the performance of its functions, defining their terms of reference.

10. The committees shall operate under the Rules of Procedure of the Meeting, except where they are inapplicable.

11. Working Groups may be established by the Meeting, or its committees to deal with various agenda items. The Meeting will determine the provisional arrangements for Working Groups at the end of each Consultative Meeting, when it approves the preliminary agenda for the subsequent Meeting (under Rule 36). These arrangements will include

- a. the establishment of Working Group(s) for the subsequent Meeting;
- b. the appointment of Working Group Chair(s); and
- c. the allocation of agenda items to each Working Group.

Where the Meeting decides that a Working Group should be continued for more than one year, the Chair(s) of those Working Group(s) may be appointed for a period of one or two consecutive Meetings in the first instance. Working Group Chairs may subsequently be appointed for further terms of one or two years, but will not serve for more than four consecutive years in the same Working Group.

Should the Meeting be unable to appoint a Working Group Chair(s) for the subsequent Meeting, a Chair(s) shall be appointed at the beginning of the subsequent Meeting.

### **Conduct of Business**

12. A quorum shall be constituted by two-thirds of the Representatives of Consultative Parties participating in the Meeting.

13. The Chairman shall exercise the powers of his office in accordance with customary practice. He shall see to the observance of the Rules of Procedure and the maintenance of proper order. The Chairman, in the exercise of his functions, remains under the authority of the Meeting.

14. Subject to Rule 28, no Representative may address the Meeting without having previously obtained the permission of the Chairman and the Chairman shall call upon speakers in the order in which they signify their desire to speak. The Chairman may call a speaker to order if his remarks are not relevant to the subject under discussion.

15. During the discussion of any matter, a Representative of a Consultative Party may rise to a point of order and the point of order shall be decided immediately by the Chairman in accordance with the Rules of Procedure. A Representative of a Consultative Party may appeal against the ruling of the Chairman. The appeal shall be put to a vote immediately, and the Chairman's ruling shall stand unless over-ruled by a majority of the Representatives of Consultative Parties present and voting. A Representative of a Consultative Party rising to a point of order shall not speak on the substance of the matter under discussion.

16. The Meeting may limit the time to be allotted to each speaker, and the number of times he may speak on any subject. When the debate is thus limited and a Representative has spoken his allotted time, the Chairman shall call him to order without delay.

17. During the discussion of any matter, a Representative of a Consultative Party may move the adjournment of the debate on the item under discussion. In addition to the proposer of the motion, Representatives of two Consultative Parties may speak in favour of, and two against, the motion, after which the motion shall be put to the vote immediately. The Chairman may limit the time to be allowed to speakers under this Rule.

18. A Representative of a Consultative Party may at any time move the closure of the debate in the item under discussion, whether or not any other Representative has signified his wish to speak. Permission to speak on the closure of the debate shall be accorded only to Representatives of two Consultative Parties opposing the closure, after which the motion shall be put to the vote immediately. If the Meeting is in favour of the closure, the Chairman shall declare the closure of the debate. The Chairman may limit the time to be allowed to speakers under this Rule. (This Rule shall not apply to debate in committees.)

19. During the discussion of any matter, a Representative of a Consultative Party may move the suspension or adjournment of the Meeting. Such motions shall not be debated, but shall be put to the vote immediately. The Chairman may limit the time to be allowed to the speaker moving the suspension or adjournment of the Meeting.

20. Subject to Rule 15, the following motions shall have precedence in the following order over all other proposals or motions before the Meeting:

- a) to suspend the Meeting;
- b) to adjourn the Meeting;
- c) to adjourn the debate on the item under discussion;
- d) for the closure of the debate on the item under discussion.

21. Decisions of the Meeting on all matters of procedure shall be taken by a majority of the Representatives of Consultative Parties participating in the Meeting, each of whom shall have one vote.

### **Languages**

22. English, French, Russian and Spanish shall be the official languages of the Meeting.
23. Any Representative may speak in a language other than the official languages. However, in such cases he shall provide for interpretation into one of the official languages.

### **Measures, Decisions, and Resolutions and Final Report**

24. Without prejudice to Rule 21, Measures, Decisions and Resolutions, as referred to in Decision 1 (1995), shall be adopted by the Representatives of all Consultative Parties present and will thereafter be subject to the provisions of Decision 1 (1995).
25. The final report shall also contain a brief account of the proceedings of the Meeting. It will be approved by a majority of the Representatives of Consultative Parties present and shall be transmitted by the Executive Secretary to Governments of all Consultative and non-Consultative Parties which have been invited to take part in the Meeting for their consideration.
26. Notwithstanding Rule 25, the Executive Secretary, immediately following the closure of the Consultative Meeting, shall notify all Consultative Parties of all Measures, Decisions and Resolutions taken and send them authenticated copies of the definitive texts in an appropriate language of the Meeting. In respect to a Measure adopted under the procedures of Article 6 or 8 of Annex V of the Protocol, the respective notification shall also include the time period for approval of that Measure.

### **Non-Consultative Parties**

27. Representatives of non-Consultative Parties, if invited to attend a Consultative Meeting, may be present at:
- a) all plenary sessions of the Meeting; and
  - b) all formal Committees or Working Groups, comprising all Consultative Parties, unless a Representative of a Consultative Party requests otherwise in any particular case.
28. The relevant Chairman may invite a Representative of a non-Consultative Party to address the Meeting, Committee or Working group which he is attending, unless a Representative of a Consultative Party requests otherwise. The Chairman shall at any time give priority to Representatives of Consultative Parties who signify their desire to speak and may, in inviting Representatives of non-Consultative Parties to address the Meeting, limit the time to be allotted to each speaker and the number of times he may speak on any subject.
29. Non-Consultative Parties are not entitled to participate in the taking of decisions.
- 30.
- a) Non-Consultative Parties may submit documents to the Secretariat for distribution to the Meeting as information documents. Such documents shall be relevant to matters under Committee consideration at the Meeting.

- b) Unless a Representative of a Consultative Party requests otherwise such documents shall be available only in the language or languages in which they were submitted.

### **Antarctic Treaty System Observers**

31. The observers referred to in Rule 2 shall attend the Meetings for the specific purpose of reporting on:

- a) in the case of the Commission for the Conservation of Antarctic Marine Living Resources, developments in its area of competence.
- b) in the case of the Scientific Committee on Antarctic Research:
  - i) the general proceedings of SCAR;
  - ii) matters within the competence of SCAR under the Convention for the Conservation of Antarctic Seals;
  - iii) such publications and reports as may have been published or prepared in accordance with Recommendations IX-19 and VI-9 respectively.
- c) in the case of the Council of Managers of National Antarctic Programs, the activities within its area of competence.

32. Observers may be present at:

- a) the plenary sessions of the Meeting at which the respective Report is considered;
- b) formal committees or working groups, comprising all Contracting Parties at which the respective Report is considered, unless a Representative of a Consultative Party requests otherwise in any particular case.

33. Following the presentation of the pertinent Report, the relevant Chairman may invite the observer to address the Meeting at which it is being considered once again, unless a Representative of a Consultative Party requests otherwise. The Chairman may allot a time limit for such interventions.

34. Observers are not entitled to participate in the taking of decisions.

35. Observers may submit their Report and/or documents relevant to matters contained therein to the Secretariat, for distribution to the Meeting as working papers.

### **Agenda for Consultative Meetings**

36. At the end of each Consultative Meeting, the Host Government of that Meeting shall prepare a preliminary agenda for the next Consultative Meeting. If approved by the Meeting, the preliminary agenda for the next Meeting shall be annexed to the Final Report of the Meeting.

37. Any Contracting Party may propose supplementary items for the preliminary agenda by informing the Host Government for the forthcoming Consultative Meeting no later than

180 days before the beginning of the Meeting; each proposal shall be accompanied by an explanatory memorandum. The Host Government shall draw the attention of all Contracting Parties to this Rule no later than 210 days before the Meeting.

38. The Host Government shall prepare a provisional agenda for the Consultative Meeting. The provisional agenda shall contain:

- a) all items on the preliminary agenda decided in accordance with Rule 36; and
- b) all items the inclusion of which has been requested by a Contracting Party pursuant to Rule 37.

Not later than 120 days before the Meeting, the Host Government shall transmit to all the Contracting Parties the provisional agenda, together with explanatory memoranda and any other papers related thereto.

### **Experts from International Organisations**

39. At the end of each Consultative Meeting, the Meeting shall decide which international organisations having a scientific or technical interest in Antarctica shall be invited to designate an expert to attend the forthcoming Meeting in order to assist it in its substantive work.

40. Any Contracting Party may thereafter propose that an invitation be extended to other international organisations having a scientific or technical interest in Antarctica to assist the Meeting in its substantive work; each such proposal shall be submitted to the Host Government for that Meeting not later than 180 days before the beginning of the Meeting and shall be accompanied by a memorandum setting out the basis for the proposal.

41. The Host Government shall transmit these proposals to all Contracting Parties in accordance with the procedure in Rule 38. Any Consultative Party which wishes to object to a proposal shall do so not less than 90 days before the Meeting.

42. Unless such an objection has been received, the Host Government shall extend invitations to international organisations identified in accordance with Rules 39 and 40 and shall request each international organisation to communicate the name of the designated expert to the Host Government prior to the opening of the Meeting. All such experts may attend the Meeting during consideration of all items, except for those items relating to the operation of the Antarctic Treaty System which are identified by the previous Meeting or upon adoption of the agenda.

43. The relevant Chairman, with the agreement of all the Consultative Parties, may invite an expert to address the meeting he is attending. The Chairman shall at any time give priority to Representatives of Consultative Parties or non-Consultative Parties or Observers referred to in Rule 31 who signify their desire to speak, and may in inviting an expert to address the Meeting limit the time to be allotted to him and the number of times he may speak on any subject.

44. Experts are not entitled to participate in the taking of decisions.

45.

- a) Experts may, in respect of the relevant agenda item, submit documents to the Secretariat for distribution to the Meeting as information documents.
  - b) Unless a Representative of a Consultative Party requests otherwise, such documents shall be available only in the language or languages in which they were submitted.
- Intersessional Consultations

46. Intersessionally, the Executive Secretary shall, within his/her competence as established under Measure 1 (2003) and associated instruments that govern the operation of the Secretariat, consult the Consultative Parties, when legally required to do so under relevant instruments of the ATCM and when the exigencies of the circumstances require action to be taken before the opening of the next ATCM, using the following procedure:

- a) The Executive Secretary shall transmit the relevant information and any proposed action to all Consultative Parties through contact persons designated by them, indicating an appropriate date by which responses are requested;
- b) The Executive Secretary shall ensure that all Consultative Parties acknowledge the receipt of such transmission, and shall also ensure the list of contact persons is current;
- c) Each Consultative Party shall consider the matter and communicate their reply, if any, to the Executive Secretary through their respective contact person by the specified date;
- d) The Executive Secretary after informing the Consultative Parties of the result of the consultations, may proceed to take the proposed action if no Consultative Party has objected; and
- e) The Executive Secretary shall keep a record of the intersessional consultations, including their results and the actions taken by him/her and shall reflect these results and actions in his/her report to the ATCM for its review.

47. Intersessionally, when a request for information about the activities of the ATCM is received from an international organisation having a scientific or technical interest in Antarctica, the Executive Secretary shall coordinate a response, using the following procedure:

- a) The Executive Secretary shall transmit the request and a first draft response to all Consultative Parties through contact persons designated by them, proposing to answer the request, and including an appropriate date by which Consultative Parties should either (1) indicate that it would not be appropriate to answer, or (2) provide comments to the first draft response.

The date shall give a reasonable amount of time to provide comments, taking into account any deadlines set by the initial requests for information.

If a Consultative Party indicates that a response would not be appropriate, the Executive Secretary shall send only a formal response, acknowledging the request without going into the substance of the matter.

- b) If there is no objection to proceeding and if comments are provided before the date specified in the transmission referred to in paragraph (a) above, the Executive Secretary shall revise the response in light of the comments and transmit the revised response to all Consultative Parties, including an appropriate date by which reactions are requested;
- c) If any further comments are provided before the date specified in the transmission referred to in paragraph (b) above, the Executive Secretary shall repeat the procedure referred to in paragraph (b) above until no further comments are provided;
- d) If no comments are provided before the date specified in a transmission referred to in paragraph (a), (b) or (c) above, the Executive Secretary shall circulate a final version and shall request both an active digital “read”-confirmation and an active digital “accept”-confirmation from each Consultative Party, suggesting a date by which the “accept”-confirmation should be received. The Executive Secretary shall keep the Consultative Parties informed about the progress of received confirmations.

After receipt of “accept”-confirmations from all Consultative Parties the Executive Secretary shall sign and send the response to the international organisation concerned, on behalf of all Consultative Parties, and shall provide a copy of the signed response to all Consultative Parties.

- e) Any Consultative Party may, at any stage of this process, ask for more time for consideration.
- f) Any Consultative Party may, at any stage of this process, indicate that it would not be appropriate to respond to the request. In this case the Executive Secretary shall send only a formal response, acknowledging the request without going into the substance of the matter.

### **Meeting Documents**

48. Working Papers shall refer to papers submitted by Consultative Parties that require discussion and action at a Meeting and papers submitted by Observers referred to in Rule 2.

49. Secretariat Papers shall refer to papers prepared by the Secretariat pursuant to a mandate established at a Meeting, or which would, in the view of the Executive Secretary, help inform the Meeting or assist in its operation.

50. Information Papers shall refer to:

- Papers submitted by Consultative Parties or Observers that provide information in support of a Working Paper or that are relevant to discussions at a Meeting;
- Papers submitted by Non-Consultative Parties that are relevant to discussions at a Meeting; and
- Papers submitted by Experts that are relevant to discussions at a Meeting.

51. Background Papers shall refer to papers submitted by any participant that will not be introduced in a Meeting, but that are submitted for the purpose of formally providing information.

52. Procedures for the submission, translation and distribution of documents are annexed to these Rules of Procedure.

### **Amendments**

53. These Rules of Procedure may be amended by a two-thirds majority of the Representatives of Consultative Parties participating in the Meeting. This Rule shall not apply to Rules 24, 27, 29, 34, 39-42, 44, and 46, amendments of which shall require the approval of the Representatives of all Consultative Parties present at the Meeting.

## **Procedures for the Submission, Translation and Distribution of Documents for the ATCM and the CEP**

1. These procedures apply to the distribution and translation of official papers for the Antarctic Treaty Consultative Meeting (ATCM) and for the Committee on Environmental Protection (CEP) as defined in their respective Rules of Procedure. These papers consist of Working Papers, Secretariat Papers, Information Papers and Background Papers.
2. Documents to be translated are Working Papers, Secretariat Papers, reports submitted to the ATCM by ATCM Observers and invited Experts according to the provisions of Recommendation XIII-2, reports submitted to the ATCM in relation to Article III-2 of the Antarctic Treaty, and Information Papers that a Consultative Party requests be translated. Background Papers will not be translated.
3. Papers that are to be translated, with the exception of the reports of Intersessional Contact Groups (ICG) convened by the ATCM or CEP, Chair Reports from Antarctic Treaty Meetings of Experts, and the Secretariat's Report and Programme, should not exceed 1500 words. When calculating the length of a paper, proposed Measures, Decisions and Resolutions and their attachments are not included.
4. Papers that are to be translated should be received by the Secretariat no later than 45 days before the Consultative Meeting. If any such paper is submitted later than 45 days before the Consultative Meeting, it may only be considered if no Consultative Party objects.
5. The Secretariat should receive Information Papers for which no translation has been requested and Background Papers that participants wish to be listed in the Final Report no later than 30 days before the Meeting.
6. The Secretariat will indicate on each document submitted by a Contracting Party, an Observer, or an Expert the date it was submitted.
7. When a revised version of a Paper made after its initial submission is resubmitted to the Secretariat for translation, the revised text should indicate clearly the amendments that have been incorporated.
8. The Papers should be transmitted to the Secretariat by electronic means and will be uploaded to the ATCM Home Page established by the Secretariat. Working Papers received before the 45 day limit should be uploaded as soon as possible and in any case not later than 30 days before the Meeting. Papers will be uploaded initially to the password protected portion of the website, and moved to the non-password protected part once the Meeting has concluded.

9. Parties may agree to present any paper for which a translation has not been requested to the Secretariat during the Meeting for translation.
10. No paper submitted to the ATCM should be used as the basis for discussion at the ATCM or at the CEP unless it has been translated into the four official languages.
11. Within six months of the end of the Consultative Meeting the Secretariat will circulate through diplomatic channels and also post on the ATCM Home Page the Final Report of that Meeting in the four official languages.



## Measures on operational matters designated as no longer current

### The Representatives,

*Recalling* Decision 3 (2002), Decision 1 (2007), Decision 1 (2011), Decision 1 (2012), and Decision 1 (2014), which established lists of measures\* that were designated as spent or no longer current;

*Noting* Resolutions F (2015) and G (2015);

*Having* reviewed a number of measures on the subject of Operational Matters;

*Recognising* that the measures listed in the Annex to this Decision are no longer current;

### Decide:

1. that the measures listed in the Annex to this Decision require no further action by the Parties; and
2. to request the Secretariat of the Antarctic Treaty to post the text of the measures that appear in the Annex to this Decision on its website in a way that makes clear that these measures are no longer current and that the Parties do not need to take any further action with respect to them.

\* Measures previously adopted under Article IX of the Antarctic Treaty were described as Recommendations up to ATCM XIX (1995) and were divided into Measures, Decisions and Resolutions by Decision 1 (1995).



**Measures on operational matters designated  
as no longer current**

Recommendation VII-7 (1972)

Recommendation X-3 (1979)

Recommendation XII-2 (1983)

Recommendation VIII-7 (1975)

Resolution 1 (1997)



## Secretariat Report, Programme and Budget

### The Representatives,

*Recalling* Measure 1 (2003) on the establishment of the Secretariat of the Antarctic Treaty (“the Secretariat”);

*Recalling* Decision 2 (2012) on the establishment of the open-ended Intersessional Contact Group (“the ICG”) on Financial Issues to be convened by the host country of the next Antarctic Treaty Consultative Meeting;

*Bearing in mind* the Financial Regulations for the Secretariat annexed to Decision 4 (2003);

### Decide:

1. to approve the audited Financial Report for 2013/14, annexed to this Decision (Annex 1);
2. to take note of the Secretariat Report 2014/15 (SP 2), which includes the Provisional Financial Report for 2014/15 annexed to this Decision (Annex 2);
3. to take note of the five year forward budget profile for 2015 to 2019 and to approve the Secretariat Programme, including the Budget for 2015/16, annexed to this Decision (Annex 3); and
4. to invite the host country for the next Antarctic Treaty Consultative Meeting (“ATCM”) to request the Executive Secretary to open the ATCM for the ICG on Financial Issues and to provide assistance to it.



## **Audited Financial Report for 2013/2014**

### **AUDITOR'S REPORT**

To the Secretary of the Antarctic Treaty Secretariat

Maipú 757, 4<sup>th</sup> floor

Entity's Tax ID CUIT 30-70892567-1

Subject: Antarctic Treaty Consultative Meeting XXXVIII, 2015 - Sofia, Bulgaria

#### **1. Report on Financial Statements**

We have audited all accompanying Financial Statements for the Secretariat of the Antarctic Treaty, including the Statement of Income and Expenditure, the Statement of Financial Position, the Statement of Net Capital Assets, the Statement of Cash Flows and the Explanatory Notes for the period commencing 1 April 2013 and ended 31 March 2014.

#### **2. Management Responsibility for Financial Statements**

The Secretariat of the Antarctic Treaty, created under Argentine Law 25 888 (14th May 2004), is responsible for the preparation and reasonable presentation of these Financial Statements in compliance with International Accounting Standards and specific standards for the Antarctic Treaty Consultative Meetings. This responsibility includes developing, implementing and maintaining internal controls over the preparation and presentation of Financial Statements, so that they are free of misstatements due to error or fraud; selecting and implementing appropriate accounting policies, and developing reasonable accounting estimates adequate to current circumstances.

#### **3. Auditor's Responsibility**

Our responsibility as auditors is to express our opinion regarding these Financial Statements based on the performed audit.

The audit was carried out in accordance with International Auditing Standards and with the Annex to Decision 3 (2008) of Antarctic Treaty Consultative Meeting XXXI, which describes the tasks to be performed by external auditors.

These standards require complying with ethical requirements, as well as planning and executing such an audit to provide reasonable assurance that the Financial Statements are free of significant misstatements.

An audit includes executing a set of procedures with a view to obtain evidence on the figures and exposure reflected in the Financial Statements. The selected procedures vary based on the auditor's best judgement and include an assessment of risks of significant misstatements in financial statements.

On conducting such assessment of risks, the auditor considers the internal control over the preparation and reasonable presentation of the financial statements by the organisation, in order to develop procedures adequate to current circumstances.

An audit also includes an assessment of the overall integrity and the accounting principles used, an opinion about whether the accounting estimates performed by Management are reasonable, as well as an assessment of the general presentation of the Financial Statements.

We believe that the audited evidence obtained is sufficient and adequate to support our opinion in our capacity as external auditors.

#### **4. Opinion**

In our opinion, the audited Financial Statements reasonably reflect, in all material aspects, the financial position of the Secretariat of the Antarctic Treaty as at 31 March 2014 and its financial performance for the period ended thereof in accordance with International Accounting Standards and specific standards for the Antarctic Treaty Consultative Meetings.

#### **5. Other Matters**

The Financial Statements for the period ended 31 March 2013 were audited by a different professional, who has produced an unqualified favourable report dated 22 March 2014. The figures corresponding to this period are included in the attached Financial Statements for merely comparative purposes, and I have not performed any procedure on those totals.

#### **6. Supplementary Information Required by Law**

Pursuant to the analysis described under item 3, I hereby inform that the cited Financial Statements are based on accounting records entered in books that fail to comply with applicable Argentine standards.

We also inform that, according to the accounting records as at 31 March 2014, liabilities paid to Argentina's Social Security System in accordance with settlement practices by the Secretariat total \$105,559.13 ARS (\$13,191.59 USD), remaining no pending liabilities as of such date.

It is important to note that all working relations are regulated by the Staff Regulations of the Secretariat of the Antarctic Treaty.

Dr Gisela Algaze  
Chartered Accountant  
Book no. 300 Page no. 169 by CPCECABA

Buenos Aires, 9 April 2015  
Argentina's National Auditing Office (SIGEN)  
Av. Corrientes 389, Buenos Aires, Argentina

**1. Statement of Income and Expenditure for all Funds for the Period 1<sup>st</sup> April 2013 to 31<sup>st</sup> March 2014 and compared with the previous year.**

<b>INCOME</b>	<b>31/03/2013</b>	<b>Budget</b>	
		<b>31/03/2014</b>	<b>31/03/2014</b>
Contributions (Note 9)	1,339,600	1,339,600	1,339,600
Other Income (Note 2)	1,845	1,000	3,811
<b>Total Income</b>	<b>1,341,445</b>	<b>1,340,600</b>	<b>1,343,411</b>
<b>EXPENDITURE</b>			
Salaries and Wages	628,811	650,580	650,000
Translation and Interpreting Services	290,502	272,101	249,671
Travel and Accommodation	92,573	96,000	81,093
Information Technology	42,773	44,500	41,919
Printing, Editing and Copying	13,944	21,850	12,823
General Services	50,409	60,118	32,943
Communications	16,660	17,699	17,623
Office Supplies	13,912	19,264	11,589
Administration	10,595	16,725	11,780
Representation Expenses	4,523	3,000	2,211
Relocation, Improvements	0	0	0
Financing	13,964	5,000	16,290
<b>Total Expenditure</b>	<b>1,178,666</b>	<b>1,206,837</b>	<b>1,127,942</b>
<b>FUND APPROPRIATION</b>			
Staff Termination Fund	28,424	29,368	29,369
Staff Replacement Fund	0	0	0
Working Capital Fund	0	0	0
Contingency Fund	0	0	0
<b>Total Fund Appropriation</b>	<b>28,424</b>	<b>29,368</b>	<b>29,369</b>
<b>Total Expenses &amp; Appropriation</b>	<b>1,207,090</b>	<b>1,236,205</b>	<b>1,157,311</b>
<b>(Deficit) / Surplus for the period</b>	<b>134,355</b>	<b>104,395</b>	<b>186,100</b>

**This statement should be read together with attached NOTES 1 to 9**

**2. Statement of Financial Position as of 31<sup>st</sup> March 2014, compared to the previous fiscal year**

<b>ASSETS</b>	<b><u>31/03/2013</u></b>	<b><u>31/03/2014</u></b>
<b>Current Assets</b>		
Cash and Cash Equivalents (Note 3)	889,087	1,231,803
Contributions Due (Note 9)	205,624	108,057
Other Receivables (Note 4)	51,104	37,687
Other Current Assets (Note 5)	49,458	99,947
<b>Total Current Assets</b>	1,195,273	1,477,494
<b>Non-Current Assets</b>		
Fixed Assets (Notes 1.3 and 6)	84,132	79,614
<b>Total Non-Current Assets</b>	84,132	79,614
<b>Total Assets</b>	1,279,405	1,557,108
 <b>LIABILITIES</b>		
<b>Current Liabilities</b>		
Payables (Note 7)	27,755	25,229
Advance Contributions (Note 9)	592,476	626,595
Voluntary Special Fund for Specific Purposes (Note 1.9)	2,500	0
Payable Wages and Contributions (Note 8)	26,849	64,507
<b>Total Current Liabilities</b>	649,580	716,331
<b>Non-Current Liabilities</b>		
Executive Staff Termination Fund (Note 1.4)	147,510	176,880
Staff Replacement Fund (Note 1.5)	50,000	50,000
Contingency Fund (Note 1.7)	30,000	30,000
Fixed Asset Replacement Fund (Note 1.8)	17,836	13,318
<b>Total Non-Current Liabilities</b>	245,346	270,198
<b>Total Liabilities</b>	894,926	986,529
<b>NET ASSETS</b>	384,479	570,579

**This statement should be read together with attached NOTES 1 to 9**

**3. Statement of changes in Net Assets as at 31<sup>st</sup> March 2013 and 2014**

<b>Represented by</b>	<b>Net Assets 31/03/2013</b>	<b>Income</b>	<b>Expenditure &amp; Appro- priation (*)</b>	<b>Interests accrued</b>	<b>Net Assets 31/03/2014</b>
General Fund	161,212	1,339,600	(1,157,240)	3,740	347,312
Working Capital Fund (Note 1.6)	<u>223,267</u>		0		<u>223,267</u>
Net Assets	384,479				570,579

(\*) Net of obtained discounts

**This statement should be read together with attached NOTES 1 to 9**

**4. Cash flow statement for the period 1<sup>st</sup> April 2013 to 31<sup>st</sup> March 2014, compared to the previous fiscal year.**

<b>Changes in Cash &amp; Cash Equivalents</b>	<b>31/03/2014</b>	<b>31/03/2013</b>
Cash & Cash Equivalent at beginning of year		889,087
Cash & Cash Equivalent at closing of year	1,231,803	
Net Increase in Cash and Cash Equivalents	342,716	90,141

**Causes for changes in Cash & Cash Equivalents**

**Operating Activities**

Contributions Received	844,697	
Salaries and Social Contributions	(611,720)	
Translation Services	(313,855)	
Travel and Accommodation	(70,569)	
Printing, Editing and Copying	(12,823)	
General Services	(32,943)	
Other Payments to Providers	(65,120)	
<b>Net Cash &amp; Cash Equivalents from Operating Activities</b>	<b>(262,333)</b>	<b>(439,720)</b>

<b>Investment Activities</b>		
Purchase of Fixed Assets	(15,082)	
Voluntary Special Fund	11,689	
<b>Net Cash &amp; Cash Equivalents from Investment Activities</b>	(3,393)	(18,947)
<b>Financing Activities</b>		
Advance Contributions	626,595	
Collection under Staff Regulation 5.6	170,888	
Payment under Staff Regulation 5.6	(157,571)	
Net tax refund (AFIP)	(991)	
Translation services for CEP - ATCM XXXV	(14,189)	
<b>Net Cash &amp; Cash Equivalents from Financing Activities</b>	624,732	562,772
<b>Transactions in Foreign Currency</b>		
Net loss	(16,290)	
<b>Net Cash &amp; Cash Equivalents from Transactions in Foreign Currency</b>	(16,290)	(13,964)
<b>Net increase in Cash and Cash Equivalents</b>		342,716
		90,141

**This statement should be read together with attached NOTES 1 to 9**

## **Notes to the Financial Statements as at 31 March 2013 and 2014**

### **1 BASIS FOR PREPARATION OF FINANCIAL STATEMENTS**

These financial statements are expressed in US dollars, pursuant to the guidelines established in the Financial Regulations, Annex to Decision 4 (2003). These statements were prepared in accordance with the International Financial Reporting Standards (IFRS) of the International Accounting Standards Board (IASB).

#### **1.1. Historical Cost**

These financial statements have been prepared on a historical-cost basis, except where otherwise stated.

#### **1.2. Premises**

The Secretariat Headquarters are provided by the Ministry of Foreign Affairs, International Trade and Worship of the Argentine Republic. Premises are free of rent along with other general expenses.

#### **1.3. Fixed Assets**

All items are valued at historical cost, less accumulated depreciation. Depreciation is calculated on a straight-line basis at annual rates appropriate to their estimated useful life. The aggregate residual value of fixed assets does not exceed their use value.

#### **1.4. Executive Staff Termination Fund**

Pursuant to Staff Regulation 10.4, this fund shall be sufficiently funded to compensate executive staff members at a rate of one month base pay for each year of service.

#### **1.5. Staff Replacement Fund**

This fund is used to cover Secretariat executive staff's travel expenses to and from the Secretariat's Headquarters.

#### **1.6. Working Capital Fund**

Pursuant to Financial Regulations 6.2 (a), the fund shall not exceed one-sixth (1/6) of the budget for the current financial year.

**1.7. Contingency fund**

Pursuant to Decision 4 (2009), this Fund was created to cover all Interpreting and Translation expenses that may arise from an unexpected increase in the number of documents submitted to the ATCM for translation.

**1.8. Fixed Assets Replacement Fund**

Assets with a useful life beyond the current financial year shall be reflected as an asset in the Statement of Financial Position. Until March 2010, the balancing entry was reflected as an adjustment to the General Fund. Since April 2010.

**1.9. Voluntary Special Fund for Specific Purposes**

Under paragraph (82) of ATCM XXXV Final Report about the Special Fund to receive voluntary contributions from Parties. The voluntary Fund of \$14,189 has been recategorised against the translation and interpreting services item.

## Notes to the Financial Statements as of 31<sup>st</sup> March 2013 and 2014

	<u>31/03/2013</u>	<u>31/03/2014</u>
<b>2 Other Income</b>		
Accrued Interests	1,802	3,740
Obtained Discounts	43	71
Total	1,845	3,811
<b>3 Cash and Cash Equivalents</b>		
Cash USD	68	1,185
Cash ARS	128	382
Bank (BNA) special account USD	853,240	411,565
Bank (BNA) account ARS	35,651	15,557
Investments	0	803,114
Total	889,087	1,231,803
<b>4 Other Receivables</b>		
Staff Regulation 5.6.	51,104	37,687
<b>5 Other Current Assets</b>		
Advance Payments	25,194	80,561
VAT Receivable	23,368	14,771
Other Recoverable Expenses	896	4,615
Total	49,458	99,947
<b>6 Fixed Assets</b>		
Books & Subscriptions	7,008	8,104
Office Equipment	9,165	11,252
Furniture	45,466	45,466
IT Equipment and Software	83,126	95,025
Total Original Cost	144,765	159,847
Accumulated Depreciation	(60,633)	(80,233)
Total	84,132	79,614

**Notes to the Financial Statements  
as of 31<sup>st</sup> March 2013 and 2014**

**7 Payables**

Business	2,595	3,764		
Accrued Expenses	22,164	20,854		
Others	2,996	611		
Total	<table border="1"><tr><td>27,755</td></tr></table>	27,755	<table border="1"><tr><td>25,229</td></tr></table>	25,229
27,755				
25,229				

**8 Payable Wages and Contributions**

Wages	8,000	45,479		
Contributions	18,849	19,028		
Total	<table border="1"><tr><td>26,849</td></tr></table>	26,849	<table border="1"><tr><td>64,507</td></tr></table>	64,507
26,849				
64,507				

## Notes to the Financial Statements as of 31<sup>st</sup> March 2013 and 2014

### 9 Contributions due, committed, cancelled and received in advance.

Contributions Parties	Due 31/03/2013	Commi- tted	Cancelled \$	Due 31/03/2014	Advance 31/03/2014
Argentina		60,346	60,346	0	0
Australia		60,346	60,321	25	60,346
Belgium	18	40,110	40,060	68	0
Brazil	40,142	40,110	79,386	866	0
Bulgaria	11	34,038	34,049	0	34,039
Chile		46,181	46,181	0	46,181
China		46,181	46,156	25	0
Ecuador	34,039	34,038	34,038	34,039	0
Finland		40,110	40,110	0	40,110
France	60,346	60,346	120,692	0	0
Germany	23	52,250	52,250	23	0
India	6,062	46,181	52,169	74	46,143
Italy		52,250	52,250	0	0
Japan		60,346	60,346	0	0
Korea	2,891	40,110	43,001	0	40,110
Netherlands		46,181	46,181	0	46,181
New Zealand	26	60,346	60,372	0	60,321
Norway		60,346	60,311	35	0
Peru	21,919	34,038	23,265	32,692	0
Poland		40,110	40,110	0	40,110
Russia		46,181	46,181	0	46,181
South Africa		46,181	46,181	0	46,181
Spain		46,181	46,156	25	0
Sweden		46,181	46,181	0	0
Ukraine	40,122	40,110	40,122	40,110	0
United Kingdom		60,346	60,346	0	60,346
United States		60,346	60,321	25	60,346
Uruguay	25	40,110	40,085	50	0
<b>Total</b>	<b>205,624</b>	<b>1,339,600</b>	<b>1,437,167</b>	<b>108,057</b>	<b>626,595</b>

[signature]  
Dr. Manfred Reinke  
*Executive Secretary*

[signature]  
Roberto A. Fennell  
*Financial Officer*

## Provisional Financial Report for 2014/15

Estimate of Income and Expenditure for all Funds  
for the Period 1 April 2014 to 31 March 2015

APPROPRIATION LINES	Audited Statement 2013/14	Budget 2014/15	Prov. Statement 2014/15
<b>INCOME</b>			
<b>CONTRIBUTIONS pledged</b>	<b>\$ -1,339,600</b>	<b>\$ -1,379,710</b>	<b>\$ -1,379,710</b>
Other Income	\$ -3,811	\$ -1,000	\$ -6,277
<b>Total Income</b>	<b>\$ -1,343,411</b>	<b>\$ -1,380,710</b>	<b>\$ -1,385,987</b>
<b>EXPENDITURE</b>			
<b>SALARIES</b>			
Executive	\$ 316,991	\$ 322,658	\$ 322,658
General Staff	\$ 303,228	\$ 316,646	\$ 318,423
ATCM Support Staff	\$ 10,488	\$ 15,696	\$ 16,530
Trainee	\$ 11,242	\$ 9,600	\$ 7,638
Overtime	\$ 8,051	\$ 14,000	\$ 13,351
	<b>\$ 650,000</b>	<b>\$ 678,600</b>	<b>\$ 678,600</b>
<b>TRANSLATION AND INTERPRETATION</b>			
Translation and Interpretation	<b>\$ 249,671</b>	<b>\$ 325,780</b>	<b>\$ 294,743</b>
<b>TRAVEL</b>			
Travel	<b>\$ 81,093</b>	<b>\$ 110,266</b>	<b>\$ 110,266</b>
<b>INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY</b>			
Hardware	\$ 11,767	\$ 10,000	\$ 9,883
Software	\$ 263	\$ 3,500	\$ 4,407
Development	\$ 22,843	\$ 21,000	\$ 13,157
Support	\$ 7,046	\$ 9,500	\$ 7,594
	<b>\$ 41,919</b>	<b>\$ 44,000</b>	<b>\$ 35,041</b>
<b>PRINTING, EDITING &amp; COPYING</b>			
Final report	\$ 10,758	\$ 17,000	\$ 12,925
Compilation	\$ 2,064	\$ 3,500	\$ 2,046
Site guidelines	\$ 0	\$ 3,140	\$ 0
	<b>\$ 12,823</b>	<b>\$ 23,640</b>	<b>\$ 15,915</b>

APPROPRIATION LINES	Audited Statement 2013/14	Budget 2014/15	Prov. Statement 2014/15
---------------------	---------------------------------	----------------	----------------------------

**GENERAL SERVICES**

Legal advice	\$ 1,000	\$ 4,000	\$ 1,947
External audit	\$ 8,622	\$ 10,000	\$ 8,622
Cleaning, maintenance & security	\$ 10,732	\$ 42,500	\$ 50,837
Training	\$ 4,478	\$ 6,552	\$ 4,351
Banking	\$ 5,391	\$ 6,000	\$ 3,851
Rental of equipment	\$ 2,720	\$ 3,000	\$ 2,504
	<b>\$ 32,943</b>	<b>\$ 72,052</b>	<b>\$ 72,112</b>

**COMMUNICATION**

Telephone	\$ 4,674	\$ 5,200	\$ 4,823
Internet	\$ 2,670	\$ 3,000	\$ 2,630
Web hosting	\$ 8,087	\$ 9,000	\$ 6,709
Postage	\$ 2,193	\$ 2,500	\$ 538
	<b>\$ 17,623</b>	<b>\$ 19,700</b>	<b>\$ 14,700</b>

**OFFICE**

Stationery & supplies	\$ 3,182	\$ 4,300	\$ 3,673
Books & subscriptions	\$ 1,458	\$ 3,000	\$ 1,992
Insurance	\$ 3,005	\$ 3,500	\$ 3,421
Furniture	\$ 174	\$ 900	\$ 0
Office equipment	\$ 2,087	\$ 4,000	\$ 2,558
Maintenance	\$ 1,683	\$ 2,500	\$ 0
	<b>\$ 11,589</b>	<b>\$ 18,200</b>	<b>\$ 11,644</b>

**ADMINISTRATIVE**

Supplies	\$ 6,046	\$ 4,500	\$ 2,883
Local transport	\$ 246	\$ 800	\$ 410
Miscellaneous	\$ 3,944	\$ 4,000	\$ 3,250
Utilities (Energy)	\$ 1,544	\$ 11,000	\$ 1,055
	<b>\$ 11,780</b>	<b>\$ 20,300</b>	<b>\$ 7,598</b>

**REPRESENTATION**

Representation	<b>\$ 2,211</b>	<b>\$ 3,500</b>	<b>\$ 3,997</b>
----------------	-----------------	-----------------	-----------------

Provisional Financial Report for 2014/15

<b>APPROPRIATION LINES</b>	<b>Audited Statement 2013/14</b>	<b>Budget 2014/15</b>	<b>Prov. Statement 2014/15</b>
----------------------------	--	-----------------------	------------------------------------

**FINANCING**

Exchange loss	\$ 16,290	\$ 11,000	\$ 11,161
---------------	-----------	-----------	-----------

**SUBTOTAL**

<b>APPROPRIATIONS</b>	<b>\$ 1,127,942</b>	<b>\$ 1,327,038</b>	<b>\$ 1,255,777</b>
-----------------------	---------------------	---------------------	---------------------

**ALLOCATION TO FUNDS**

Translation Contingency Fund	\$ 0	\$ 0	\$ 0
Staff Replacement Fund	\$ 0	\$ 0	\$ 0
Staff Termination Fund	\$ 29,369	\$ 29,820	\$ 29,820
Working Capital Fund	\$ 0	\$ 6,685	\$ 6,685
	<b>\$ 29,369</b>	<b>\$ 36,505</b>	<b>\$ 36,505</b>

<b>TOTAL APPROPRIATIONS</b>	<b>\$ 1,157,311</b>	<b>\$ 1,363,543</b>	<b>\$ 1,292,282</b>
-----------------------------	---------------------	---------------------	---------------------

<b>Missing Contributions</b>	<b>\$ 40,367</b>	<b>\$ 0</b>	<b>\$ 196,148</b>
------------------------------	------------------	-------------	-------------------

<b>BALANCE</b>	<b>\$ 145,733</b>	<b>\$ 17,167</b>	<b>\$ -102,443</b>
----------------	-------------------	------------------	--------------------

**Summary of Funds**

Translation Contingency Fund	\$ 30,000	\$ 30,000	\$ 30,000
Staff Replacement Fund	\$ 50,000	\$ 50,000	\$ 50,000
Staff Termination Fund	\$ 176,879	\$ 207,189	\$ 207,189
** Working Capital Fund	\$ 223,267	\$ 229,952	\$ 229,952
General Fund	\$ 347,312	\$ 345,659	\$ 244,869

\* Transfer from appropriation line "Translation and Interpretation" to "Salaries" and "Travel" in Budget 14/15 (see SP 2)

Maximum Required Amount

** Working Capital Fund (Fin. Reg. 6.2)	\$ 223,267	\$ 229,952	\$ 229,952
---	------------	------------	------------



# **Secretariat Programme for 2015/16**

## **Introduction**

This work programme outlines the activities proposed for the Secretariat in the Financial Year 2015/16 (1 April 2015 to 31 March 2016). The main areas of activity of the Secretariat are treated in the first four parts, followed by a section on management and a forecast of the programme for the Financial Year 2016/17.

The Budget for the Financial Year 2015/16, the Forecast Budget for the Financial Year 2016/17, and the accompanying contribution and salary scales are included in the appendices.

The programme and the accompanying budget figures for 2015/16 are based on the Forecast Budget for the Financial Year 2015/16 (Decision 2 (2014), Annex 3, Appendix 1).

The programme focuses on the regular activities, such as the preparation of the ATCM XXXVIII and ATCM XXXIX, the publication of Final Reports, and the various specific tasks assigned to the Secretariat under Measure 1 (2003).

Contents:

1. ATCM/CEP support
2. Information Technology
3. Documentation
4. Public Information
5. Management
6. Forecast Programme for the Financial Year 2015/16
  - Appendix 1: Provisional Report for the Financial Year 2014/15, Budget for the Financial Year 2015/16, Forecast Budget for the Financial Year 2016/17
  - Appendix 2: Contribution Scale for the Financial Year 2016/17
  - Appendix 3: Salary Scale

## **1. ATCM/CEP Support**

### **ATCM XXXVIII**

The Secretariat will support the ATCM XXXVIII by gathering and collating the documents for the meeting and publishing them in a restricted section of the Secretariat website. The Secretariat will also provide, in a USB flash drive distributed to all delegates, an application that allows offline browsing of all documents and automatic synchronization with the online

database for the latest updates. The Delegates section will provide online registration for delegates and a downloadable, up-to-date list of delegates.

The Secretariat will support the functioning of the ATCM through the production of Secretariat Papers, a Manual for Delegates, and summaries of papers for the ATCM, the CEP, and the ATCM Working Groups.

The Secretariat will organise the services for translation and interpretation. It is responsible for pre- and post-sessional translation and for the translation services during the ATCM. It maintains contact with the provider of interpretation services, ONCALL.

The Secretariat will organise the note-taking services in cooperation with the secretariat of the host country and is responsible for the compilation and editing of the Reports of the CEP and ATCM for adoption during the final plenary meetings.

### **Coordination and contact**

Aside from maintaining constant contact via email, telephone and other means with the Parties and international institutions of the Antarctic Treaty System, attendance at meetings is an important tool to maintain coordination and communication.

The travelling to be undertaken is as follows:

- COMNAP Annual General Meeting (AGM) XXVII, Tromsø, Norway, 26 - 28 August 2015. Attendance to the meeting will provide an opportunity to further strengthen the connections and interaction with COMNAP.
- CCAMLR, Hobart, Australia, 19 - 30 October 2015. The CCAMLR meeting, which takes place roughly halfway between succeeding ATCMs, provides an opportunity for the Secretariat to brief the ATCM Representatives, many of whom attend the CCAMLR meeting, on developments in the Secretariat's work. Liaison with the CCAMLR Secretariat is also important for the Antarctic Treaty Secretariat, as many of its regulations are modelled after those of the CCAMLR Secretariat.

### **Support of intersessional activities**

During recent years both the CEP and the ATCM have produced an important amount of intersessional work, mainly through Intersessional Contact Groups (ICGs). The Secretariat will provide technical support for the online establishment of the ICGs agreed at the ATCM XXXVIII and CEP XVIII, and will produce specific documents if required by the ATCM or the CEP.

The Secretariat will update the website with the measures adopted by the ATCM and with the information produced by the CEP and the ATCM.

### **Printing**

The Secretariat will translate, publish and distribute the Final Report and its Annexes of the ATCM XXXVIII in the four Treaty languages. The text of the Final Report will be published on the website of the Secretariat and will be printed in book form with the annexes published

as a CD attached to the printed report. The full text of the Final Report will be available in book form (two volumes) through online retailers and also in electronic book form.

## **2. Information Technology**

### **Information Exchange**

The Secretariat will continue to assist Parties in posting their information exchange materials, as well as processing information uploaded using the File Upload functionality.

The Secretariat will continue to provide advice, if requested, to the ongoing ICG on reviewing information exchange requirements.

### **Electronic Information Exchange System**

During the next operational season and depending on the decisions of the ATCM XXXVIII, the Secretariat will continue to make the adjustments necessary to facilitate the use of the electronic system for the Parties, as well as develop tools to compile and present summarised reports.

### **Development of the Secretariat website**

The website will continue to be improved to make it more concise and easier to use, and to increase the visibility of the most relevant sections and information. The interface of some of the website databases, especially the Contacts database, will be updated to improve usability on multiple devices.

### **Development of Databases and Information Systems**

The Secretariat will finalize the redesign of the Site Guidelines for Visitors section in the Secretariat's website, including the development of a new database. Additionally, improved internal procedures for content management, including development of required software, will be implemented.

## **3. Records and documents**

### **Documents of the ATCM**

The Secretariat will continue its efforts to complete its archive of the Final Reports and other records of the ATCM and other meetings of the Antarctic Treaty System in the four Treaty languages. Assistance from Parties in searching for their files will be essential in order to achieve a complete archive at the Secretariat. It is in contact with the Ministerio de Relaciones Exteriores de Chile, the Australian Antarctic Division and other national institutions of Parties to identify and integrate missing documents. The project will continue in the Financial Year 2015/16. A complete and detailed list of missing papers in our database is available to all delegations interested in collaborating.

## **Glossary**

The Secretariat will continue to further develop the Secretariat's glossary of terms and expressions of the ATCM to generate a nomenclature in the four Treaty languages. It will further improve the implementation of the electronically controlled vocabulary server to manage, publish and share these ATCM ontologies, thesauri, and lists.

## **Antarctic Treaty database**

The database of the Recommendations, Measures, Decisions and Resolutions of the ATCM is at present complete in English and almost complete in Spanish and French, although the Secretariat still lacks various Final Report copies in those languages. In Russian, further Final Reports are lacking.

## **4. Public Information**

The Secretariat and its website will continue to function as a clearinghouse for information on the Parties' activities and relevant developments in Antarctica.

## **5. Management**

### **Personnel**

On 1 April 2015 the Secretariat staff consisted of the following personnel:

#### *Executive staff*

<i>Name</i>	<i>Position</i>	<i>Since</i>	<i>Rank</i>	<i>Term</i>
Manfred Reinke	Executive Secretary (ES)	1-09-2009	E1	31-08-2017
José María Acero	Assistant Executive Secretary (AES)	1-01-2005	E3	31-12-2018

#### *General staff*

<i>Name</i>	<i>Position</i>	<i>Since</i>	<i>Rank</i>	
José Luis Agraz	Information Officer	1-11-2004	G1	6
Diego Wydler	Information Technology Officer	1-02-2006	G1	6
Roberto Alan Fennell	Finance Officer (part time)	1-12-2008	G2	6
Pablo Wainschenker	Editor	1-02-2006	G3	6
Ms. Violeta Antinarelli	Librarian (part time)	1-04-2007	G3	6
Ms. Anna Balok	Communication specialist (part time)	1-10-2010	G5	5
Ms. Viviana Collado	Office Manager	15-11-2012	G5	4

The ATCM XXXVI decided to reappoint the Executive Secretary for a term of four years starting on 1 September 2013 (see Decision 2 (2013)). To arrange for the timely appointment of a successor upon completion of this term, the ATCM may wish to commence consideration of this matter no later than ATCM XXXIX.

A self-employed person cleans the premises of the Secretariat on the basis of a 20 hour per week contract. After consultations with the Argentine Foreign Office, the external auditor SIGEN and the Secretariat's lawyer, and a careful examination of the legal conditions, the preferred and most cost-efficient solution would be to create a part time employment of a cleaner. As the salary scale of the Secretariat does not foresee this kind of employment, a new salary line, G7, is added to the salary scale which reflects the salary for such an employment. The salary scale is shown in Appendix 3.

Pablo Wainschenker is advanced to salary level G2 (1) pursuant to Regulation 5.5 of the Staff Regulations. The complexity of the editing process of the Final Report has increased considerably during the last years. The Editor, Pablo Wainschenker, has implemented modern processes including a system of proof-reading and electronic publishing to efficiently manage the editing. He has also been actively engaged in the implementation of the system of note-taking during the ATCM.

The Secretariat will invite international trainees from Parties for internships with the Secretariat. It has extended an invitation to Chile as host of the ATCM XXXIX to send one member of its organisational team for an internship in Buenos Aires.

### **Financial Matters**

The Budget for the Financial Year 2015/16 and the Forecast Budget for the Financial Year 2016/17 are shown in Appendix 1.

### **Translation and Interpretation**

According to its Financial Regulation 9.4, the Secretariat will issue an invitation for the submission of proposals for translation and interpretation services for the ATCM XXXIX (2016), ATCM XL (2017) and ATCM XLI (2018), and for a tentative proposal for the ATCM XLII (2019). Based on the submitted proposals, the Secretariat will decide which company to place in the first position.

The costs of translation and interpretation are budgeted for the ATCM XXXVIII at 339,835 US\$.

### **Salaries**

Costs of living continued to rise considerably in Argentina in the year 2014 but were compensated by the devaluation of the Argentine Peso against the US\$. To compare the development with previous years, the Secretariat calculated the increase of the IVS (Salary Variation Index provided by the Argentine National Office of Statistics and Census) adjusted for the devaluation of the Argentine Peso against the US\$ during the same period.

This method was explained by the Executive Secretary in 2009 at ATCM XXXII (Final Report p. 238).

In 2014 the IVS rose by 34.1%. The devaluation of the Argentine Peso against the US\$ resulted in a calculated rise in cost of living of 2.1% in US\$.

The Executive Secretary will compensate 1.1% for the rise in the cost of living to the General Staff and the Executive Staff.

Regulation 5.10 of the Staff Regulations requires the compensation of General Staff members when they are required to work more than 40 hours during one week. Overtime is requested during the ATCM Meetings.

## **Funds**

### *Working Capital Fund*

According to Financial Regulation 6.2 (a), the Working Capital Fund must be maintained at 1/6 of the Secretariat's budget of 229,952 US\$ in the upcoming years. The contributions of the Parties form the basis of the calculation of the level of the Working Capital Fund.

### **Further Details of the Draft Budget for the Financial Year 2015/16**

The allocation to the appropriation lines follows the proposal from last year. Some smaller adjustments have been implemented according to the foreseen expenses of the Financial Year 2015/2016.

- Translation and Interpretation: Extra funds for the maintenance of the glossary are included.
- Office: Some further maintenance tasks are foreseen concerning the repair of the climate control system of the office.

Appendix 1 shows the Budget for the Financial Year 2015/2016 and the Forecast Budget for the Financial Year 2016/2017. The salary scale is given in Appendix 3.

### **Contributions for the Financial Year 2016/17**

The contributions for the Financial Year 2016/17 will not rise.

Appendix 2 shows the contributions of the Parties for the Financial Year 2016/17.

## **6. Forecast Programme for the Financial Year 2016/17 and the Financial Year 2017/18**

It is expected that most of the ongoing activities of the Secretariat will be continued in the Financial Year 2016/17 and the Financial Year 2017/2018, and therefore, unless the programme undergoes major changes, no change in staff positions is foreseen for the following years.

**Appendix 1**

**Provisional Statement for 2014/15, Forecast 2015/16,  
Budget 2015/16 and Forecast 2016/17**

<b>APPROPRIATION LINES</b>	<b>Prov. Statement 2014/15*</b>	<b>Forecast 2015/16</b>	<b>Budget 2015/16</b>	<b>Forecast 2016/17</b>
<b>INCOME</b>				
<b>CONTRIBUTIONS pledged</b>	<b>\$ -1,379,710</b>	<b>\$ -1,378,100</b>	<b>\$ -1,378,097</b>	<b>\$ -1,378,097</b>
Interest Investments	\$ -6,277	\$ -1,000	\$ -1,000	\$ -3,000
<b>Total Income</b>	<b>\$ -1,385,987</b>	<b>\$ -1,379,100</b>	<b>\$ -1,379,097</b>	<b>\$ -1,381,097</b>

**EXPENDITURE**

**SALARIES**

Executive Staff	\$ 322,658	\$ 328,071	\$ 331,680	\$ 336,377
General Staff	\$ 318,423	\$ 321,165	\$ 330,098	\$ 341,392
ATCM Support Staff	\$ 16,530	\$ 15,796	\$ 18,192	\$ 18,092
Trainee	\$ 7,638	\$ 9,600	\$ 10,600	\$ 9,600
Overtime	\$ 13,351	\$ 14,000	\$ 16,000	\$ 16,000
	<b>\$ 678,600</b>	<b>\$ 688,632</b>	<b>\$ 706,570</b>	<b>\$ 721,461</b>

**TRANSLATION AND INTERPRETATION**

Translation and Interpretation	<b>\$ 294,743</b>	<b>\$ 332,785</b>	<b>\$ 340,000</b>	<b>\$ 338,505</b>
--------------------------------	-------------------	-------------------	-------------------	-------------------

**TRAVEL**

Travel	<b>\$ 110,266</b>	<b>\$ 98,000</b>	<b>\$ 99,000</b>	<b>\$ 90,000</b>
--------	-------------------	------------------	------------------	------------------

**INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY**

Hardware	\$ 9,883	\$ 11,025	\$ 10,815	\$ 11,356
Software	\$ 4,407	\$ 3,500	\$ 3,500	\$ 3,605
Development	\$ 13,157	\$ 21,000	\$ 24,000	\$ 21,630
Support	\$ 7,594	\$ 9,500	\$ 9,500	\$ 9,785
	<b>\$ 35,041</b>	<b>\$ 45,025</b>	<b>\$ 47,815</b>	<b>\$ 46,376</b>

**PRINTING, EDITING & COPYING**

Final report	\$ 12,925	\$ 17,850	\$ 17,850	\$ 18,386
Compilation	\$ 2,046	\$ 3,558	\$ 3,500	\$ 3,412
Site guidelines	\$ 0	\$ 3,297	\$ 3,500	\$ 3,396
	<b>\$ 15,915</b>	<b>\$ 24,705</b>	<b>\$ 24,850</b>	<b>\$ 25,193</b>

ATCM XXXVIII Final Report

<b>APPROPRIATION LINES</b>	<b>Prov. Statement 2014/15*</b>	<b>Forecast 2015/16</b>	<b>Budget 2015/16</b>	<b>Forecast 2016/17</b>
<b>GENERAL SERVICES</b>				
Legal advice	\$ 1,947	\$ 4,200	\$ 4,200	\$ 4,326
External audit	\$ 8,622	\$ 10,500	\$ 10,500	\$ 10,815
Cleaning, maintenance & security	\$ 50,837	\$ 17,325	\$ 19,011	\$ 17,845
Training	\$ 4,351	\$ 6,880	\$ 6,880	\$ 7,086
Banking	\$ 3,851	\$ 6,300	\$ 6,300	\$ 6,489
Rental of equipment	\$ 2,504	\$ 3,150	\$ 2,556	\$ 3,245
	<b>\$ 72,112</b>	<b>\$ 48,355</b>	<b>\$ 49,447</b>	<b>\$ 49,806</b>
<b>COMMUNICATION</b>				
Telephone	\$ 4,823	\$ 5,460	\$ 5,460	\$ 5,624
Internet	\$ 2,630	\$ 3,150	\$ 3,150	\$ 3,245
Web hosting	\$ 6,709	\$ 9,450	\$ 9,450	\$ 9,734
Postage	\$ 538	\$ 2,625	\$ 2,625	\$ 2,704
	<b>\$ 14,700</b>	<b>\$ 20,685</b>	<b>\$ 20,685</b>	<b>\$ 21,306</b>
<b>OFFICE</b>				
Stationery & supplies	\$ 3,673	\$ 4,515	\$ 4,515	\$ 4,650
Books & subscriptions	\$ 1,992	\$ 3,150	\$ 3,150	\$ 3,245
Insurance	\$ 3,421	\$ 3,675	\$ 3,675	\$ 3,785
Furniture	\$ 0	\$ 945	\$ 7,945	\$ 973
Office equipment	\$ 2,558	\$ 4,200	\$ 4,200	\$ 4,326
Maintenance	\$ 0	\$ 2,625	\$ 2,625	\$ 2,704
	<b>\$ 11,644</b>	<b>\$ 19,110</b>	<b>\$ 26,110</b>	<b>\$ 19,683</b>
<b>ADMINISTRATIVE</b>				
Supplies	\$ 2,883	\$ 4,725	\$ 4,725	\$ 4,867
Local transport	\$ 410	\$ 840	\$ 840	\$ 865
Miscellaneous	\$ 3,250	\$ 4,200	\$ 4,200	\$ 4,326
Utilities (Energy)	\$ 1,055	\$ 11,550	\$ 6,550	\$ 11,897
	<b>\$ 7,598</b>	<b>\$ 21,315</b>	<b>\$ 16,315</b>	<b>\$ 21,954</b>
<b>REPRESENTATION</b>				
Representation	<b>\$ 3,997</b>	<b>\$ 3,500</b>	<b>\$ 4,000</b>	<b>\$ 3,500</b>
<b>FINANCING</b>				
Exchange loss	<b>\$ 11,161</b>	<b>\$ 11,550</b>	<b>\$ 11,393</b>	<b>\$ 11,897</b>
<b>SUBTOTAL APPROPRIATIONS</b>	<b>\$ 1,255,777</b>	<b>\$ 1,313,662</b>	<b>\$ 1,346,185</b>	<b>\$ 1,349,680</b>

*Secretariat's Work Programme and Budget for 2015/16*

<b>APPROPRIATION LINES ALLOCATION TO FUNDS</b>	<b>Prov. Statement 2014/15*</b>	<b>Forecast 2015/16</b>	<b>Budget 2015/16</b>	<b>Forecast 2016/17</b>
Translation Contingency Fund	\$ 0	\$ 0	\$ 0	\$ 0
Staff Replacement Fund	\$ 0	\$ 0	\$ 0	\$ 0
Staff Termination Fund	\$ 29,820	\$ 30,300	\$ 32,912	\$ 31,417
Working Capital Fund	\$ 6,685	\$ 0	\$ 0	\$ 0
	<b>\$ 36,505</b>	<b>\$ 30,300</b>	<b>\$ 32,912</b>	<b>\$ 31,417</b>
<hr/>				
<b>TOTAL APPROPRIATIONS</b>	<b>\$ 1,292,282</b>	<b>\$ 1,343,962</b>	<b>\$ 1,379,097</b>	<b>\$ 1,381,097</b>
<hr/>				
<b>Missing Contributions</b>	<b>\$ 196,148</b>	<b>\$ 0</b>	<b>\$ 0</b>	<b>\$ 0</b>
<hr/>				
<b>BALANCE</b>	<b>\$ -102,443</b>	<b>\$ 35,139</b>	<b>\$ 0</b>	<b>\$ 0</b>

**Summary of Funds**

Translation Contingency Fund	\$ 30,000	\$ 30,000	\$ 30,000	\$ 30,000
Staff Replacement Fund	\$ 50,000	\$ 50,000	\$ 50,000	\$ 50,000
Staff Termination Fund	\$ 207,189	\$ 237,489	\$ 240,101	\$ 271,518
** Working Capital Fund	\$ 229,952	\$ 229,952	\$ 229,952	\$ 229,952
General Fund	\$ 244,869	\$ 380,798	\$ 244,869	\$ 244,869

Provisional Statement				
* as of 31 Mar 2015				
Maximum Required Amount				
Working Capital Fund				
** (Fin. Reg. 6.2)	\$ 229,952	\$ 229,683	\$ 229,683	\$ 229,683



**Appendix 2**

**Contribution Scale 2016/17**

2016/17	Cat.	Mult.	Variable	Fixed	Total
Argentina	A	3,6	\$ 36,587	\$ 23,760	\$ 60,347
Australia	A	3,6	\$ 36,587	\$ 23,760	\$ 60,347
Belgium	D	1,6	\$ 16,261	\$ 23,760	\$ 40,021
Brazil	D	1,6	\$ 16,261	\$ 23,760	\$ 40,021
Bulgaria	E	1	\$ 10,163	\$ 23,760	\$ 33,923
Chile	C	2,2	\$ 22,359	\$ 23,760	\$ 46,119
China	C	2,2	\$ 22,359	\$ 23,760	\$ 46,119
Czech Republic	D	1,6	\$ 16,261	\$ 23,760	\$ 40,021
Ecuador	E	1	\$ 10,163	\$ 23,760	\$ 33,923
Finland	D	1,6	\$ 16,261	\$ 23,760	\$ 40,021
France	A	3,6	\$ 36,587	\$ 23,760	\$ 60,347
Germany	B	2,8	\$ 28,456	\$ 23,760	\$ 52,216
India	C	2,2	\$ 22,359	\$ 23,760	\$ 46,119
Italy	B	2,8	\$ 28,456	\$ 23,760	\$ 52,216
Japan	A	3,6	\$ 36,587	\$ 23,760	\$ 60,347
Republic of Korea	D	1,6	\$ 16,261	\$ 23,760	\$ 40,021
Netherlands	C	2,2	\$ 22,359	\$ 23,760	\$ 46,119
New Zealand	A	3,6	\$ 36,587	\$ 23,760	\$ 60,347
Norway	A	3,6	\$ 36,587	\$ 23,760	\$ 60,347
Peru	E	1	\$ 10,163	\$ 23,760	\$ 33,923
Poland	D	1,6	\$ 16,261	\$ 23,760	\$ 40,021
Russian Federation	C	2,2	\$ 22,359	\$ 23,760	\$ 46,119
South Africa	C	2,2	\$ 22,359	\$ 23,760	\$ 46,119
Spain	C	2,2	\$ 22,359	\$ 23,760	\$ 46,119
Sweden	C	2,2	\$ 22,359	\$ 23,760	\$ 46,119
Ukraine	D	1,6	\$ 16,261	\$ 23,760	\$ 40,021
United Kingdom	A	3,6	\$ 36,587	\$ 23,760	\$ 60,347
United States	A	3,6	\$ 36,587	\$ 23,760	\$ 60,347
Uruguay	D	1,6	\$ 16,261	\$ 23,760	\$ 40,021

**Budget**

**\$1,378,097**



Salary Scale 2015/16

Schedule A  
SALARY SCALE FOR THE EXECUTIVE STAFF  
(United States Dollar)

2014/15 Level	STEPS														
	I	II	III	IV	V	VI	VII	VIII	IX	X	XI	XII	XIII	XIV	XV
E1 A	\$135,302	\$137,819	\$140,337	\$142,855	\$145,373	\$147,890	\$150,407	\$152,926							
E1 B	\$169,127	\$172,274	\$175,421	\$178,569	\$181,716	\$184,863	\$188,009	\$191,158							
E2 A	\$113,932	\$116,075	\$118,218	\$120,359	\$122,501	\$124,642	\$126,783	\$128,926	\$131,069	\$133,211	\$135,352	\$137,494			
E2 B	\$142,415	\$145,093	\$147,772	\$150,449	\$153,126	\$155,802	\$158,479	\$161,158	\$163,837	\$166,513	\$169,190	\$172,136			
E3 A	\$95,007	\$97,073	\$99,140	\$101,207	\$103,275	\$105,341	\$107,408	\$109,476	\$111,542	\$113,608	\$115,675	\$118,154	\$120,193	\$122,231	
E3 B	\$118,758	\$121,341	\$123,925	\$126,509	\$129,094	\$131,676	\$134,260	\$136,845	\$139,427	\$142,010	\$144,594	\$146,143	\$147,693	\$150,242	\$152,788
E4 A	\$78,779	\$80,693	\$82,609	\$84,518	\$86,435	\$88,347	\$90,257	\$92,174	\$94,089	\$96,000	\$97,915	\$98,448	\$100,336	\$102,223	\$104,110
E4 B	\$98,474	\$100,866	\$103,262	\$105,648	\$108,044	\$110,434	\$112,822	\$115,217	\$117,611	\$119,999	\$122,393	\$123,060	\$125,419	\$127,778	\$130,137
E5 A	\$65,315	\$67,029	\$68,739	\$70,452	\$72,162	\$73,873	\$75,586	\$77,293	\$79,007	\$80,719	\$82,427	\$82,981			
E5 B	\$81,644	\$83,786	\$85,924	\$88,065	\$90,203	\$92,342	\$94,482	\$96,617	\$98,759	\$100,899	\$103,034	\$103,726			
E6 A	\$51,706	\$53,351	\$54,994	\$56,641	\$58,284	\$59,928	\$61,575	\$63,219	\$64,862	\$66,508					
E6 B	\$64,632	\$66,689	\$68,742	\$70,801	\$72,855	\$74,910	\$76,969	\$79,024	\$81,078	\$82,328	\$83,135				

Note: Row B is the base salary (shown in Row A) with an additional 25% for salary on-costs (retirement fund and insurance premiums, installation and repatriation grants, education allowances etc.) and is the total salary entitlement for executive staff in accordance with Regulation 5.

Schedule B  
SALARY SCALE FOR THE GENERAL STAFF  
(United States Dollar)

Level	STEPS														
	I	II	III	IV	V	VI	VII	VIII	IX	X	XI	XII	XIII	XIV	XV
G1	\$61,102	\$63,952	\$66,804	\$69,653	\$72,624	\$75,722									
G2	\$50,918	\$53,293	\$55,670	\$58,044	\$60,520	\$63,102									
G3	\$42,430	\$44,410	\$46,390	\$48,370	\$50,434	\$52,587									
G4	\$35,360	\$37,010	\$38,659	\$40,309	\$42,029	\$43,822									
G5	\$29,210	\$30,574	\$31,936	\$33,301	\$34,723	\$36,207									
G6	\$23,944	\$25,059	\$26,177	\$27,294	\$28,460	\$29,675									
G7	\$10,000	\$10,466	\$10,933	\$11,399	\$11,886	\$12,394									



## Multi-Year Strategic Work Plan for the Antarctic Treaty Consultative Meeting

### The Representatives,

*Reaffirming* the values, objectives and principles contained in the Antarctic Treaty and its Protocol on Environmental Protection;

*Recalling* Decision 3 (2014) on the Multi-Year Strategic Work Plan (“the Plan”);

*Bearing in mind* that the Plan is complementary to the agenda of the Antarctic Treaty Consultative Meeting (“ATCM”) and that the Parties and other ATCM participants are encouraged to contribute as usual to other matters on the ATCM agenda;

### Decide:

1. that the following Principles will guide implementation and further development of the Plan:
  - a. the Plan will reflect the objectives and principles of the Antarctic Treaty and its Protocol on Environmental Protection;
  - b. consistent with the operation of the ATCM, the adoption of the Plan, the inclusion of items on the Plan and decisions regarding the Plan will be made by consensus;
  - c. the purpose of the Plan is to complement the agenda by assisting the ATCM to identify a limited number of priority issues and to operate more effectively and efficiently;
  - d. the Parties and other ATCM participants are encouraged to contribute as usual to other matters on the ATCM agenda;
  - e. the Plan will cover a rolling multi-year period, and should be reviewed at each ATCM and updated as necessary to reflect work still to be completed, new issues and changing priorities;

- f. the Plan will be dynamic and flexible, and will incorporate emerging issues as they arise;
  - g. the Plan will identify issues that require the collective attention of the ATCM, and that require discussion and/or decisions by the ATCM; and
  - h. the Plan should not interfere with the regular development of the ATCM agenda;
2. to adopt the Plan annexed to this Decision; and
  3. to designate the Plan annexed to Decision 3 (2014) as no longer current.

## ATCM Multi-year Strategic Work Plan

Priority	ATCM 38 (2015)	Intersessional	ATCM 39 (2016)	ATCM 40 (2017)	ATCM 41 (2018)
Conduct a comprehensive review of existing requirements for information exchange and of the functioning of the Electronic Information Exchange System, and the identification of any additional requirements	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Legal and Institutional Working Group (L&amp;I WG) considered the report of the Intersessional Contact Group (ICG) on the comprehensive review of the existing requirements for information exchange and the identification of any additional requirements and the advice of the CEP</li> <li>• L&amp;I WG adopted Decision 6 (2015)</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• ICG on the comprehensive review of the existing requirements for information exchange, and the identification of any additional requirements</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• WG1 to discuss the functioning of the EIES.</li> <li>• WG1 to discuss the information to be exchanged</li> <li>• WG1 to consider the report of the ICG on Information Exchange</li> <li>• WG1 to consider updating Decision 6 (2015)</li> </ul>		
Consider coordinated outreach to non-party states whose nationals or assets are active in Antarctica and states that are Antarctic Treaty Parties but not yet to the Protocol	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• L&amp;I WG requested the working group addressing tourism and non-governmental activities for input on non-Party states whose nationals are active in Antarctica</li> </ul>		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• ATCM to consider support for new accessions to the Protocol</li> </ul>		
Contribute to nationally and internationally coordinated education and outreach activities from an Antarctic Treaty perspective	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• ATCM established an ICG on Education and Outreach</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• ICG on Education and Outreach</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• WG1 to consider the report of the ICG on Education and Outreach</li> </ul>		
Share and discuss strategic science priorities in order to identify and pursue opportunities for collaboration as well as capacity building in science, particularly in relation to climate change	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• SCAR presented its Horizon Scan</li> </ul>		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• WG2 to collate and compare strategic science priorities with a view to identify cooperation opportunities</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• WG2 to identify priorities for cooperation and capacity-building</li> </ul>	

*ATCM XXXVIII Final Report*

<b>Priority</b>	<b>ATCM 38 (2015)</b>	<b>Intersessional</b>	<b>ATCM 39 (2016)</b>	<b>ATCM 40 (2017)</b>	<b>ATCM 41 (2018)</b>
Enhance effective cooperation between Parties (e.g. joint inspections, joint scientific projects and logistic support) and effective participation in meetings (e.g. consideration of effective working methods in meetings)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>L&amp;I WG considered the report of the Intersessional Contact Group on Cooperation in Antarctica</li> </ul>				
Strengthening cooperation between the CEP and the ATCM	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>ATCM received advice from the CEP</li> </ul>		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>ATCM to consider issues raised in CEP report at ATCM 38;</li> <li>ATCM to receive advice from CEP that requires follow-up action;</li> </ul>		
To bring Annex VI in to force and to continue to gather information on repair and remediation of environmental damage and other relevant issues to inform future negotiations on liability	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>L&amp;I WG considered whether to resume negotiations on liability in accordance with Decision 4 (2010)</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Parties to work towards the approval of Annex VI and to share with one another information and experience</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>ATCM to evaluate progress made towards Annex VI becoming effective in accordance with Article IX of the Antarctic Treaty, and what action may be necessary and appropriate to encourage Parties to approve Annex VI in a timely manner</li> </ul>		
Assess the progress of the CEP on its ongoing work to reflect best practices and to improve existing tools and develop further tools for environmental protection, including environmental impact assessment procedures (and consider, if appropriate, further development of the tools)			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>WG1 to consider advice of the CEP on its review of the Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA) Guidelines</li> </ul>		
Address the recommendations of the Antarctic Treaty Meeting of Experts on Implications of Climate Change for Antarctic Management and Governance (CEP-ICG)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>ATCM considered recommendations 9-17</li> </ul>		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>WG2 to consider recommendations 7 and 8</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>WG2 to consider recommendations 4-6</li> <li>WG2 to consider outcomes of the SC-CCAMLR and CEP workshop</li> </ul>	

*ATCM Multi-Year Strategic Work Plan*

<b>Priority</b>	<b>ATCM 38 (2015)</b>	<b>Intersessional</b>	<b>ATCM 39 (2016)</b>	<b>ATCM 40 (2017)</b>	<b>ATCM 41 (2018)</b>
Strengthen cooperation among Parties on current Antarctic specific air and marine operations and safety practices, and identify any issues that may be brought forward to the IMO and ICAO, as appropriate		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Secretariat to request ICAO and IMO to present their views on air and maritime safety issues at ATCM 39</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• WG2 to consider any advice from CEP and/or COMNAP and SCAR on UAVs</li> <li>• WG2 to consider any views presented on air and maritime safety issues by ICAO and IMO</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Dedicated discussion on UAVs (in WG2)</li> </ul>	
Review and assess the need for additional actions regarding area management and permanent infrastructure related to tourism, as well as issues related to land based and adventure tourism and address the recommendations of the CEP tourism study	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• A Special Working Group on Competent Authorities was held to discuss issues relating to tourism and non-governmental activities</li> <li>• Tourism Working Group (TWG) considered further report material from the CEP</li> </ul>				
Develop a strategic approach to environmentally managed tourism and non-governmental activities in Antarctica		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• ICG on Working towards Developing a Strategic Approach to Environmentally Managed Tourism and non-governmental Activities in Antarctica</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• WG2 to consider report of ICG on Working towards Developing a Strategic Approach to Environmentally Managed Tourism and non-governmental Activities in Antarctica</li> </ul>		

NOTE: The ATCM Working Groups mentioned above are not permanent but are established by consensus at the end of each Antarctic Treaty Consultative Meeting.



## Liability arising from Environmental Emergencies

### The Representatives,

*Recalling* the undertaking in Article 16 of the Protocol on Environmental Protection to the Antarctic Treaty (“the Protocol”) to elaborate rules and procedures relating to liability for damage arising from activities taking place in the Antarctic Treaty area and covered by the Protocol;

*Recalling* Measure 1 (2005) and the adoption of Annex VI to the Protocol, as a step in the establishment of a liability regime in accordance with Article 16 of the Protocol;

*Noting* that Annex VI has yet to become effective;

*Recalling* Decisions 1 (2005) and 4 (2010) regarding the annual evaluation of progress towards Annex VI becoming effective and the establishment of a time-frame for the resumption of negotiations on liability in accordance with Article 16 of the Protocol;

*Welcoming* the advice provided by the Committee for Environmental Protection in 2013 on environmental issues related to the practicality of specific instances of repair or remediation of environmental damage in the circumstances of Antarctica;

### Decide:

1. to continue to evaluate annually the progress made towards Annex VI becoming effective in accordance with Article IX of the Antarctic Treaty, and what action may be necessary and appropriate to encourage Parties to approve Annex VI in a timely manner;
2. to continue to share with one another information and experience, to support progress towards Annex VI becoming effective;

3. to take a decision in 2020 on the establishment of a time-frame for the resumption of negotiations on liability in accordance with Article 16 of the Protocol, or sooner if Parties so decide in light of progress made in approving Measure 1 (2005); and
4. that Decision 4 (2010) is no longer current.

## Exchange of Information

### The Representatives,

*Recalling* Articles III(1)(a) and VII(5) of the Antarctic Treaty;

*Conscious* of the obligations within the Protocol on Environmental Protection to the Antarctic Treaty (“the Protocol”) and its Annexes to exchange information;

*Conscious* also of decisions of the Antarctic Treaty Consultative Meeting (“ATCM”) in relation to the information to be exchanged between the Parties;

*Desiring* to ensure that the exchange of information between Parties is conducted in the most efficient and timely manner;

*Desiring* also that the information to be exchanged between Parties can be readily identified;

*Recalling* Decision 4 (2012), which made mandatory the use of the Electronic Information Exchange System (“EIES”) as the means for Parties to fulfill their information exchange obligations under the Antarctic Treaty and the Protocol, and specified that Parties shall continue to work with the Secretariat of the Antarctic Treaty (“the Secretariat”) to refine and improve the EIES;

*Noting* that Decision 4 (2012) required Parties to update relevant sections of the EIES regularly throughout the year, and at a minimum in accordance with Resolution 6 (2001), in order that such information be available and accessible to Parties as soon as practicable;

### Decide:

1. that the Annex to this decision represents a consolidated list of the information agreed to be exchanged by the Parties;

2. that the Secretariat shall modify the EIES to reflect the information contained in the Annex attached to this Decision, and make available, as soon as practicable, information submitted by the Parties; and
3. that the Appendix to Decision 6 (2013) and Appendix 4 of the Final Report of ATCM XXIV are no longer current.

# Information Exchange Requirements

## 1. Pre-season Information

*The following information should be submitted as early as possible, preferably by 1 October, and in any event no later than the start of the activities being reported.*

### 1.1 Operational information

#### 1.1.1 National Expeditions

##### *A. Stations*

Names of wintering stations (giving region, latitude and longitude), maximum population and medical support available.

Names of summer stations/bases and field camps (giving region, latitude, longitude), operating period, maximum population and medical support available.

Names of refuges (region, latitude and longitude) medical facilities and accommodation capacity. Other major field activities, e.g. scientific traverse (giving locations).

##### *B. Vessels*

Name of vessels, country of registry of vessels, number of voyages, planned departure dates, areas of operation, ports of departure and arrival to and from Antarctica, and purpose of voyage (e.g. science deployment, resupply, change-over, oceanography, etc).

Maximum Crew, Maximum Passengers.

##### *C. Aircraft*

Category (Intercontinental Flights, Intracontinental Flights, Local Helicopter Flights), Quantity of each aircraft, type, planned number of flights, period of flights or planned departure dates, routes and purpose.

##### *D. Research Rockets*

Coordinates of the place of launching, time and date/period, direction of launching, planned maximum altitude, impact area, type and specifications of rockets, purpose and title of research project.

##### *E. Military*

- Number of military personnel in expeditions, and rank of any officers
- Number and types of armaments possessed by personnel.

- Number and types of armaments of ships and aircraft and information on military equipment, if any, and its location in the Antarctic Treaty Area.

### **1.1.2 Non-governmental Expeditions**

#### *A. Vessel-based Operations*

Name of operator, name of vessel, Maximum crew, Maximum Passengers, country of registry of vessel, number of voyages, expedition leader, planned departure dates, ports of departure and arrival to and from Antarctica, areas of operation including the names of proposed visited sites and the planned dates at which these visits will take place, type of activity, whether these visits include landing and the number of visitors that participate in each of the specific activities.

#### *B. Land-based Operations*

Name of expedition, name of the operator, method of transportation to, from and within Antarctica, type of adventure/activity, location/s, dates of expedition, number of personnel involved, contact address, web-site address.

#### *C. Denial of Authorizations*

Name of Vessel and/or Expedition, Name of Operator, Date, Reason for Denial.

### **1.2 Visits to Protected Areas**

Name and number of protected area, number of people permitted to visit, date/period and purpose.

## **2. Annual Report**

The following information should be submitted as early as possible after the end of the austral summer season, but in all cases before 1 October, with a reporting period of 1 April to 30 March.

### **2.1 Scientific Information**

#### **2.1.1 Forward Plans**

Details of strategic or multi-year science plans or contact point for printed version. List of planned participations in major, international, collaborative science programs/projects.

#### **2.1.2 Science Activities in Previous Year**

List of research projects undertaken in previous year under science discipline (giving location/s, principal investigator, project name or number, discipline and main activity/remarks).

## **2.2 Operational information**

### **2.2.1 National expeditions**

Update of information given under 1.1.1.

### **2.2.2 Non-governmental expeditions**

Update of information given under 1.1.2.

## **2.3 Permit Information**

### **2.3.1 Visits to Protected Areas**

Update of information provided under 1.2.

### **2.3.2 Taking and harmful interference with flora and fauna**

Species, location, amount, sex, age and purpose.

### **2.3.3 Introduction of non-native species**

Species, location, amount and purpose, removal or disposal.

## **2.4 Environmental Information**

### **2.4.1 Compliance with the Protocol**

New measures adopted during past year in accordance with Article 13 of the Protocol on Environmental Protection to the Antarctic Treaty including the adoption of laws and regulations, administrative actions and enforcement measures giving description of measure, date of effect.

### **2.4.2 List of IEEs and CEEs**

List of IEEs/CEEs undertaken during year giving proposed activity, location, level of assessment and decision taken.

### **2.4.3 Monitoring activities report**

Monitoring activities connected with activities subject to initial and comprehensive environmental evaluations (referred to in Protocol Annex I, Art. 6.1 c) including Name of activity, location, procedures put in place, significant information obtained, action taken in consequence thereof.

### **2.4.4 Waste Management Plans**

Waste management plans issued during the year giving title including name of station/vessel/location. Report on implementation of waste management plans during the year.

#### **2.4.5 Measures taken to implement the provisions of Annex V**

Information on measures taken to implement Annex V including site inspections and any steps taken to address instances of activities in contravention of the provisions of ASPA or ASMA management plans giving description of measures.

#### **2.4.6 Procedures relating to EIAs**

Description of appropriate National Procedures.

#### **2.4.7 Prevention of marine pollution**

Description of Measures.

### **3. Permanent Information**

The following information should be submitted in accordance with the requirements of the Antarctic Treaty and Protocol on Environmental Protection to the Antarctic Treaty. The information can be updated at any time.

#### **3.1. Science Facilities**

##### **3.1.1 Automatic Recording Stations/Observatories**

Site name, co-ordinates (latitude and longitude), elevation (m), parameters recorded, observation frequency, reference number (e.g. WMO no.).

#### **3.2 Operational Information**

##### *A. Stations*

Name of wintering stations (giving region, latitude and longitude, and maximum population), date established and accommodation and medical facilities.

Name of summer stations/bases and field camps (giving region, latitude, longitude, operating period and maximum population).

Names of refuges (region, latitude and longitude) medical facilities and accommodation capacity.

Search and Rescue Information.

##### *B. Vessels*

Name of vessels, Flag State, ice strength, length, beam and gross tonnage (a link may be provided to COMNAP data). Maximum crew, Maximum Passengers.

Search and Rescue Information.

*C. Aircraft*

Quantity and type of aircraft operated. Search and Rescue Information.

**3.3 Environmental Information**

**3.3.1 Waste Management Plans**

Title of Plan, copy (PDF) or contact point for printed version and brief report on implementation.

**3.3.2 Contingency Plans**

Title of Contingency Plan(s) for Oil Spills and other emergencies, copies (PDFs) or contact point for printed versions. Brief report on implementation.

**3.3.3 Inventory of Past Activities**

Name of station/base/field camp/traverse/crashed aircraft/etc, co-ordinates (latitude and longitude) period during which activity undertaken; description/purpose of activities undertaken; description of equipment or facilities remaining.

**3.3.4 Compliance with the Protocol**

Same as 2.4.1.

**3.3.5 Procedures relating to EIAs**

Same as 2.4.6.

**3.3.6 Prevention of marine pollution**

Same as 2.4.7.

**3.3.7 Measures taken to implement the provisions of Annex V**

Same as 2.4.5.

**3.4 Other Information**

**3.4.1 Relevant National Legislation**

Description of law, regulation, administrative action or other measure, date of effect/enacted, giving copy (PDF) or contact point for printed version.



## 3. Resolutions



## Cooperative Air Transport System

### The Representatives,

*Recalling* Recommendations VII-8 (1972), which is still current, and Recommendation VIII-7 (1975), which is no longer current but contained general principles that remain valid;

*Recognising* that access to Antarctica by long-range aircraft combined with intracontinental feeder routes by smaller aircraft facilitates new levels of co-operation and flexibility in research;

*Noting* the interest taken by the Scientific Committee on Antarctic Research and by the Council of Managers of National Antarctic Programs (COMNAP) in the potential benefits to be derived from a co-operative air transport system;

**Recommend** that their Governments request their national Antarctic programmes to keep their scientific programmes under review, in order to identify the ways in which a co-operative air transport system might benefit them, and to discuss and develop as necessary, using organisations such as COMNAP to help facilitate this.



## Antarctic Information and Telecommunications Technology Systems

### The Representatives,

*Recalling* Recommendations VI-1 (1970), VII-7 (1972), and X-3 (1979);

*Recognising* that modern Information and Telecommunications Technology Systems (“ICTS”) can serve the Antarctic community to ensure timely and full exchange of information;

*Noting* that advanced technology is available;

*Noting* also that innovative research often makes high demands on ICTS capability and capacity;

### Recommend that their Governments:

1. strive to ensure effective use of the Antarctic ICTS already in existence, and to utilise, as appropriate, developing technology, with a view to achieving improved communications between the Antarctic stations, as well as between those stations and points outside Antarctica; and
2. invite the Council of Managers of National Antarctic Programs to continue to:
  - a. regularly update the Antarctic Telecommunications Operators Manual with information from national Antarctic programmes and others working in Antarctica;
  - b. examine practical and technological issues relating to ICTS requirements and capabilities, including the cost-effectiveness of communications options, and the benefits to operational efficiency and scientific research that may be derived therefrom; and
  - c. discuss the adequacy of the Antarctic ICTS to meet demands and to suggest improvements where these might be desirable.



## The Antarctic Environments Portal

### The Representatives,

*Recalling* Article 3 of the Protocol on Environmental Protection to the Antarctic Treaty (“the Protocol”), in particular its requirement that activities in the Antarctic Treaty area shall be planned and conducted on the basis of information sufficient to allow prior assessments of, and informed judgments about, their possible impacts on the Antarctic environment and dependent and associated ecosystems and on the value of Antarctica for the conduct of scientific research;

*Recognising* that the increasing complexity of protecting the Antarctic environment in the context of increasing human activity and a changing Antarctic climate requires access to policy-ready information to support the effective implementation of the Protocol;

*Acknowledging* with appreciation the longstanding scientific advisory role to the Antarctic Treaty system of the Scientific Committee on Antarctic Research (“SCAR”);

*Welcoming* the development of the Antarctic Environments Portal (“the Portal”) as a mechanism to provide state-of-knowledge reports on priority or emerging issues, which can be drawn on to support effective management and governance of the region, including effective implementation of the Protocol;

*Noting* that the Portal will also provide a mechanism to support SCAR in providing independent, scientifically based information to the Antarctic Treaty system;

### **Recommend** that their Governments:

1. commend the Portal as an important mechanism for making high quality, accurate, non-political and up-to-date scientific advice available to the Committee for Environmental Protection (“CEP”) and the Antarctic Treaty Parties and as a useful tool for its use by Parties on a voluntary basis;

2. request SCAR to use the Portal as appropriate for providing state-of-knowledge reports on issues of policy and management relevance;
3. encourage scientists to participate in the preparation and review of articles for the Portal;
4. consider opportunities to support the management of the Portal; and
5. invite Members of CEP to contribute to the environmental policy relevance of the Portal through active involvement in the Editorial Group, and by providing feedback on the content of the Portal, including the identification of new material.

## Committee for Environmental Protection Climate Change Response Work Programme

### The Representatives,

*Concerned by* Scientific Committee on Antarctic Research's ("SCAR") regular Antarctic Climate Change and the Environment reports on the effects of climate change that are already occurring in the Antarctic region;

*Recalling* the 2009 Washington Ministerial Declaration on the Fiftieth Anniversary of the Antarctic Treaty, in which Ministers from all Antarctic Treaty Consultative Parties noted their concern over the implications of global environmental change, in particular climate change, for the Antarctic environment and dependent and associated ecosystems and confirmed their intention to work together to better understand changes to the Earth's climate and to actively seek ways to address the effects of climate and environmental change on the Antarctic environment and dependent and associated ecosystems;

*Recalling* also the recommendations from the 2010 Antarctic Treaty Meeting of Experts on implications of Climate Change for Antarctic Management and Governance, including the recommendation that the Committee for Environmental Protection ("CEP") consider developing a climate change response work programme;

*Welcoming* the work of the CEP to respond to this recommendation and its development of the Climate Change Response Work Programme ("CCRWP");

*Desiring* that the CEP begin implementing the CCRWP as a matter of priority;

### **Recommend** that their Governments:

1. encourage the CEP to begin implementing the CCRWP as a matter of priority, and provide annual progress reports to the Antarctic Treaty Consultative Meeting on its implementation;

2. request the CEP to keep the CCRWP under regular review, with the input of the SCAR and the Council of Managers of National Antarctic Programs on scientific and practical matters respectively; and
3. give consideration, within their own national scientific funding systems and national Antarctic research programmes, as to how they can address the research needs and actions identified in the CEP's CCRWP.

## Important Bird Areas in Antarctica

### **The Representatives,**

*Recognising* that in some parts of Antarctica, a changing Antarctic climate is having an observable effect on native wildlife, including populations of penguins and seabirds;

*Recalling* Article 3 of the Environmental Protocol to the Antarctic Treaty (“the Protocol”), which requires that activities in the Antarctic Treaty area shall be planned and conducted so as to limit adverse impacts on the Antarctic environment;

*Recalling* also the requirements of Annex II to the Protocol on the Conservation of Antarctic Fauna and Flora;

*Recognising* BirdLife International’s extensive global network of Important Bird Areas;

*Desiring* to ensure that conservation practices in Antarctica are consistent with current global best practice approaches;

*Aware of* the potential for harmful disturbance to concentrations of birds in Antarctica from a range of human activities in the region;

*Aware also* that ongoing research is required to improve the state of knowledge of the status and trends of Antarctic bird populations;

### **Recommend** that their Governments:

1. welcome and acknowledge the report on identified Important Birds Areas in Antarctica, which covers breeding sites;
2. bring the report to the attention of the Secretariat of the Agreement on the Conservation of Albatrosses and Petrels for its consideration;

3. take account of the information in the report in the planning and conduct of their activities in Antarctica including in the preparation of environmental impact assessments;
4. request the Committee for Environmental Protection to provide an update to the Antarctic Treaty Consultative Meeting on the extent to which these Important Bird Areas are, or should be, represented within the series of Antarctic Specially Protected Areas, in particular those areas that might qualify as “major colonies of breeding native birds”; and
5. undertake appropriate monitoring of bird populations to inform future management actions that may be required.

## The role of Antarctica in global climate processes

### The Representatives,

*Noting* that Antarctica plays a crucial role in the global climate system, as a key driver of global circulation in the atmosphere and ocean, and as a significant control on global sea level;

*Recognising* that scientific study of Antarctica is crucial to further inform understanding of global climate processes and their consequential impacts on the entire Earth system;

*Conscious* that climatic changes within Antarctica are resulting in considerable regional changes across the continent and that some of these changes have the potential to impact human activities within Antarctica;

*Welcoming* the ongoing work of the Scientific Committee on Antarctic Research (“SCAR”) on its Antarctic Climate Change and the Environment initiative, and the submission of annual updates to the Antarctic Treaty Consultative Meeting about the effects of climate change on Antarctica itself;

*Desiring* to ensure that the international science community continues to focus its effort and collaborate effectively in the study of climate change processes within Antarctica;

### **Recommend** that their Governments:

1. encourage their national Antarctic programmes to work with SCAR to consider how best to promote international Antarctic climate change research, including to support the objective of the 21<sup>st</sup> Conference of the Parties of the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change, which is due to be held in Paris in December 2015; and

2. support their national Antarctic programmes to lead collaborative and ambitious international scientific programmes to underpin improved understanding of the impact of climatic changes on the Antarctic environment and its dependent and associated ecosystems.







