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Buenos Aires
13 - 18 May, 2018

Summary
The XLI Antarctic Treaty Consultative Meeting (ATCM) was conducted in Buenos Aires, Argentina from 13-18 May, 2018. The meeting was shortened due to a last minute change of venue. ASOC was represented by 6 delegates (5 on the ASOC delegation, 1 as an NGO representative on the UK delegation). ASOC submitted information papers (IPs) on topics including shipping, climate change, protected areas, and tourism, as well as the report of ASOC to the XLI ATCM. ASOC also participated in several intersessional contact groups (ICGs) during the intersessional period.

The selection of themes of the information papers reflected the key priority issues identified by the Coalition. Salient points of the ATCM/CEP from an ASOC perspective include:

- The introduction of CCAMLR-related issues and perspectives into ATCM work, specifically with respect to discussions about harmonising ASPAs and ASMAs under the Protocol with CCAMLR MPAs, and the limits imposed on the CEP to conduct its own discussions on this type of issue.

- The adoption of new guidelines on Historic Sites and Monuments and their potential effect on the relation between Annexes III and V of the Protocol. This may result in fewer sites being designated as HSMs by the ATCM but also more sites developed by individual parties as “heritage” sites rather than being removed as waste.

- The broad agreement to discuss (again) tourism with a view to implement a vision on the management of this activity in the context of an anticipated expansion of this activity.

1 Introduction
The XLI Antarctic Treaty Consultative Meeting (ATCM) was conducted in Buenos Aires, Argentina from 13 - 18 May 2018. Ecuador was scheduled to host the ATCM, but was unable to do so, and Argentina volunteered to host instead. Because of the last-minute change, the meeting had to be shortened to six days with no sessions running in parallel. This resulted in a 3-day meeting for the Committee on Environmental Protection and a 3-day meeting for the ATCM.

This Report on the XLI ATCM focuses on the key issues for ASOC member groups. It does not intend to be an exhaustive report, but rather to complement the official report of the ATCM. The report is structured as follows:

- Section 2 contains an overview of the XLI ATCM.
- Sections 3 – 7 report in more detail on some of the key issues at XLI ATCM.

1 This report was written by Claire Christian and Ricardo Roura.
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- Section 8 contains conclusions and identifies main areas of future action.
- Appendix 1 lists commonly used Antarctic acronyms. Appendix 2 contains a list of ASOC documents submitted to the meeting. Appendix 3 discusses some issues relevant to CCAMLR MPAs.

2 Overview of the XLI ATCM

2.1 ATCM structure

ATCMs give effect to obligations under the 1959 Antarctic Treaty, and the 1991 Protocol on Environmental Protection to the Antarctic Treaty.

ATCMs are hosted by Consultative Parties (the full voting members – currently 29)\(^2\) in English-language alphabetical order, with this year being an exception as described above. There are also 21 Non-Consultative Parties\(^3\) – non-voting members, an increasing number of which are active in Antarctica and the Antarctic Treaty System although the majority are not. The ATCM lasts one and a half weeks, and conducts its business through a number of Working Groups – presently Legal and Institutional and Science, Operations and Tourism. In addition, the Committee for Environmental Protection (CEP) meets during the ATCM.

The Antarctic and Southern Ocean Coalition (ASOC) is invited as an Expert to ATCMs, the only environmental non-governmental group with such access.\(^4\)

The ATCM received 35 Working Papers and 73 Information Papers submitted by Parties, Observers and Experts, as well as a set of Secretariat papers dealing with operations of the Secretariat and summaries of information relevant to the meeting. It produced a Final Report containing 6 Measures\(^5\) (management plans for protected/managed areas); 5 Resolutions\(^6\) (all of which are of interest, in varying degrees); and 3 Decisions\(^7\) (of which 1 is of interest).\(^8\)

Electronic copies of these documents are available on the Antarctic Treaty Secretariat website - http://ats.aq/. Information Papers are available in the original language, and Working Papers are available in the four official languages - English, French, Russian and Spanish.

The Final Report of the Meeting on the AT Secretariat website provides an official record of key discussions and decisions on all matters discussed. ASOC made numerous interventions

---

\(^2\) Argentina, Australia, Belgium, Bulgaria, Bulgaria, Chile, China, the 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, the USA and Uruguay.

\(^3\) Austria, Belarus, Canada, Colombia, Cuba, Denmark, Estonia, Greece, Guatemala, Hungary, Korea (DPRK), Malaysia, Monaco, Pakistan, Papua New Guinea, Portugal, Romania, Slovak Republic, Switzerland, Turkey, and Venezuela.

\(^4\) Formally ASOC is an “Expert” to the ATCM and an “Observer” to the CEP meetings. In practice the role of ASOC is that of observer, as the term is commonly used outside the ATS.

\(^5\) A Measure is legally binding once it has entered into force.

\(^6\) A Resolution is hortatory.

\(^7\) A Decision is an administrative action, usually relating to a short-term event, and like a Resolution, hortatory.

\(^8\) Exact text of these Resolutions and Decisions can be obtained from the ATS website’s official Report of the Meeting.
at the ATCM Working Groups and the CEP, a number of which are reflected in the official reports, and participated in open-ended contact groups on the side of the meetings.\(^9\)

### 2.2 ASOC delegation

ASOC was represented by 6 delegates either on the ASOC delegation or as NGO representatives on national delegations. The ASOC delegation was composed of:

- **Mariano Aguas** (WWF-Argentina), **Claire Christian** (ASOC Interim Executive Director and Head of Delegation, US); **Ryan Dolan** (Pew Charitable Trusts, US); **Estefania González** (Greenpeace-Chile), **Dr. Ricardo Roura** (ASOC Senior Advisor and CEP representative, The Netherlands) and **Dr. Rodolfo Werner** (Antarctic and Southern Ocean Advisor, Pew Charitable Trusts, Argentina)

In addition, one government delegation included an NGO representative from ASOC:

- **Rod Downie** (WWF-UK) on the UK delegation.

### 2.3 Materials submitted

ASOC submitted 6 IPs, 5 on topical information, and a report to the ATCM summarising its activities over the previous year.

The ASOC team decided not to publish any ECOs due to the shortness of the meeting.

The ASOC information papers are available on the ASOC website\(^{10}\) and described in Appendix 2.

### 2.4 ASOC priorities

ASOC’s general priorities for the XLI ATCM were to promote:

- **1. Expansion of the protected areas system.** This includes designation of protected areas for all the values listed in Annex V, with a focus on increasing climate change resilience, preserving biodiversity, and protecting wilderness values and minimizing the human footprint. This should be done according to a comprehensive, systematic process that ensures adequate representation of different values and bioregions/environmental domains in the system.

- **2. Precautionary management of tourism and other activities.** This includes developing rules that would ensure that tourism maintains many of the characteristics it has today (i.e., primarily no land-based infrastructure, limits on landings to ships with fewer than 500 passengers) along with managing growth in tourist numbers and preventing visitor numbers from exceeding the carrying capacity of visited sites. However, it could also include strengthening the EIA process as a whole, expanding the network of specially protected areas as a form of managing tourism developments, and developing other measures to limit environmental impacts, such as minimizing pollution from vessels. ASOC also supports greater oversight and management of activities related to biological prospecting.

- **3. Development of an active ATCM response to Antarctic climate change and an ATCM role in global climate change discussions.** This includes management measures to protect ecosystems from direct and indirect climate change impacts, such as

---

\(^9\) There are 42 entries for ASOC in the CEP Final Report and 19 in the ATCM Final Report, comparable in numbers to that of key ATCPs and exceeding some ATCPs.

monitoring for non-native species introductions and creating protected areas to limit impact in sensitive areas. On a global scale, ATCPs and the ATCM should participate more actively by raising awareness about Antarctic climate change impacts and science, and by providing the Antarctic perspective in global climate change discussions.

2.5 Key outcomes

2.5.1 Positives

- The Czech Republic offered to host a joint SCAR/CEP workshop on further developing the Antarctic protected areas system prior to next year’s ATCM and CEP.
- The Netherlands offered to host an informal workshop on tourism management during the intersessional period.
- Many ATCPs expressed a desire for the ATCM to continue discussing bioprospecting despite U.S. efforts to quash the debate.
- Despite the limitations of the meeting there were some interesting issues on the agenda that may be further developed in future meetings.

2.5.2 Negatives

- The length and format of the meeting meant that few issues were discussed in depth.
- A discussion about establishing an ICG to support harmonisation of marine protection initiatives between the CEP/ATCM and CCAMLR devolved into a debate over the status of the Ross Sea Research and Monitoring Plan. The ICG is therefore now only “informal intersessional work” and not a full ICG.
- There was little discussion on climate change.

2.5.3 Presently Indeterminate

- Several ATCPs indicated a desire to see more substantive outcomes at the 2019 ATCM, but it remains to be seen if they will actually follow through.
- An expansion in the range of activities (new bases, new air links, new cruise ships) and the relatively limited role the ATCM plays in ensuring that these are conducted with limited environmental impacts. For instance, the new Chinese base in the Ross Sea is likely to result in a substantial increase of activities and impacts in that area.
- There seemed to be some willingness to discuss tourism issues with a view of taking concrete future action.

2.5.4 Key instruments approved

The Measures, Resolutions and Decisions approved of particular importance for ASOC are:

- Decision 3, which updates the Multi-Year Strategic Work Plan for the Antarctic Treaty Consultative Meeting.
- Resolution 1, which updates some of the Site Guidelines for Visitors.
- Resolution 2, which provides guidelines for the assessment and management of Heritage in Antarctica.
• Resolution 3, which provides a Revised Guide to the presentation of Working Papers containing proposals for Antarctic Specially Protected Areas, Antarctic Specially Managed Areas or Historic Sites and Monuments.

• Resolution 4, which provides Environmental Guidelines for operation of Remotely Piloted Aircraft Systems (RPAS) in Antarctica.

• Resolution 5, which provides SCAR's Environmental Code of Conduct for Terrestrial Scientific Field Research in Antarctica

2.6 Operation of the Antarctic Treaty System

• Belarus, Canada, Colombia, Turkey, Malaysia, Monaco, and Venezuela sent delegations.

• Venezuela requested to become an ATCP but this request was denied.

• Future ATCM hosts will be the Czech Republic (2019) and Finland (2020). The XLII ATCM will be in Prague on 1-11 July, 2019.

3 Meeting of the Committee for Environmental Protection

The agenda of the CEP was shortened to accommodate the shorter meeting schedule. The main substantive agenda items remaining were:

• Draft Comprehensive Environmental Evaluations (CEEs)

• Management Plans

• Site Guidelines

• Inspection Reports

• Reports from Subsidiary Bodies and Intersessional Contact Groups (ICGs)

• Five-Year Work Plan

• General Matters (this is where several of ASOC’s papers were introduced since their usual agenda items were not available).

3.1 Annex I – Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA)

Comprehensive Environmental Evaluations (CEEs)

Two CEEs were submitted, by China and the UK respectively.

China presented “The Draft Comprehensive Environmental Evaluation for the Proposed Construction and Operation of a New Chinese Research Station, Victoria Land, Antarctica”, a modified and expanded version of an earlier draft submitted in 2014. The CEP determined that the CEE generally conformed to requirements (text directly quoted from CEP report):

• Description, impacts, and mitigation of the full range of activities associated with the building of the station proper, including: aircraft operations; the ice runway and associated facilities; construction of the proposed wharf; wind and solar power installations; scientific field installations and activities; sourcing and processing of local rock; marine noise; waste management; and fuel transport, handling, and storage;
Mitigation measures related to non-native species, fuel management and energy production, and potential disturbance and impact to both terrestrial and near-shore marine fauna and flora and nearby HSMs; and

The potential for cumulative impacts of operational and scientific research activities in proximity to other national programmes.

It was positive that the CEE explicitly referenced international research cooperation and the opportunity to contribute to the Ross Sea research and monitoring program.

The UK presented its “Draft Comprehensive Environmental Evaluation (CEE) for the Proposed Rothera Wharf Reconstruction and Coastal Stabilisation”. The CEP determined that the CEE generally conformed to requirements, but recommended strengthening the CEE in the following areas (text directly quoted from the CEP report):

Possible challenges with the proposed programme and timing of the construction activity due to the ice conditions in the area;

Providing further details of the possible cumulative impacts of the proposed activities in light of the planned broader modernisation of Rothera Station;

Giving further details of possible alternative mechanisms for station resupply, such as the use of smaller boats or helicopters; and

Analysis of noise impacts on land of the proposed activities, taking into account the noise associated with existing activities undertaken at Rothera Station.

This was a strong CEE. It was also encouraging that the UK committed to providing follow up on the CEE, which is recommended in one of ASOC’s papers submitted to this ATCM.

**Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA) Guidelines**

ASOC submitted IP 62, “Follow-Up of Comprehensive Environmental Evaluations”, in which ATCPs were encouraged to plan to follow up when preparing CEEs and to carry out such follow up. Additionally, those conducting inspections in areas where CEEs had been carried out were encouraged to include CEE follow up in their observations. Unfortunately, although several ATCPs such as New Zealand already carry out follow up activities (and we had requested that they comment in support of the paper), the only one to speak in support of the paper was Belarus.

**UAVs/RPAS**

Unmanned aerial vehicles (UAVs) or remotely piloted aircraft systems (RPAS) were the subject of a surprisingly intense discussion. Germany led an intersessional contact group (ICG) to discuss guidelines for RPAS. Nevertheless, Germany clearly wanted the ICG to fulfil its terms of reference, which included presenting draft guidelines to the ATCM with the intention of having those guidelines adopted as a resolution. The discussion started in the CEP but was continued in a supplementary evening session. Some of the reasons for disagreement included (language from the report): “whether to specify wildlife separation distances in the guidelines; whether to retain a reference list in the guidelines; the extent to which guidance on operational matters should be incorporated in the guidelines; and whether the guidelines should apply to all RPAS activities or be restricted only to professional uses.”
Ultimately, the guidelines adopted as part of Resolution 4 (2018) provide general advice, but avoid prescriptive requirements (such as giving a fixed distance from wildlife that RPAS should observe) unless these are related to established provisions in the Protocol.

3.2 Annex V – Protected Areas (including Marine Protected Areas)

*Antarctic Specially Protected Areas (ASPAs) and Antarctic Specially Managed Areas (ASMAs)*

Discussion on issues beyond approval of management plans was not extensive, but on the positive side, there was strong support for the terms of reference for a joint SCAR/CEP workshop on protected areas. These ToR are:

- Review the current status of the Antarctic protected area system.
- Identify information and resources relevant to designating ASPAs within a systematic environmental-geographic framework.
- Identify actions that could be taken to support the further development of the Antarctic protected area system.
- Prepare a report for consideration by the CEP.

ASOC has called for this type of initiative for several years and plans to participate in the workshop.

The UK and the Netherlands submitted a paper on the prior assessment of *proposed Antarctic Specially Protected Area within the Léonie Islands, Ryder Bay, Antarctic Peninsula*. The proposed area contains numerous wilderness, aesthetic, scientific and environmental values, including rich vegetation and significant populations of shags and skuas. There was a direct link between this proposal and the intensification of activities at nearby Rothera Station as well as the general expansion of tourism in the region potentially reaching into these sites. The CEP agreed that the area merited protection and encouraged the UK and the Netherlands to submit a draft management plan. ASOC hopes to see the area designated as an ASPA as soon as possible.

Chile proposed delisting ASPA 144 (Discovery Bay) due to its no longer being a viable control area (an original reason for designation) and the lack of threats to its environmental values. However, the CEP wanted further discussion of the area, noting that there was still research value in the ASPA. ASOC supported the continuation of the ASPA designation noting that maintaining the status of an area that had been protected for decades was in itself a value worth protecting. Spain supported this idea.

China expressed its intention to develop an ASPA on Inexpressible Island, where its new station will be built. Italy will be a co-proponent as it is also active in the area. ASOC is supportive of this.

*Dome A discussion*

China presented the informal code of conduct it drafted for the Dome A area in central Antarctica. Other ATCPs continue to insist that as only China is operating at Dome A, any guidelines or codes of conducts should be specific to the Chinese national program. China however emphasizes that it is interested in applying an approach similar to that used in other areas and that it welcomes international cooperation in the future.
Historic Sites and Monuments (HSM)

Guidelines for the assessment and management of heritage in Antarctica were adopted, meaning that new HSM designations can now proceed. Previously, the CEP advised that new designations pause while the guidelines were being developed. It remains to be seen if the new guidelines will be followed. However, it may be that under the new guidelines “heritage” sites that are not formally HSMs will be established by individual parties to e.g. attract tourism.

Site Guidelines for Visitors

Following a field review during 2017-2018, several site guidelines for visitors were reviewed and new ones were adopted. ASOC-member WWF-UK was invited to participate in this process. In the end, ASOC appeared as a co-author of several of the WPs on this issue, together with various Parties and IAATO.

In parallel, the CEP expressed general support for the recommendations in a paper by ASOC on the anticipated growth of Antarctic tourism, and encouraged Members to consider these matters further and bring forward related proposals for consideration at future meetings.

3.3 CEP Five-year Work Plan

Again time constraints prevented longer discussion on this issue. The main outcome was the incorporation of CEP science needs into the work plan. This is an initiative of the CEP Chair. The science needs identified are fairly extensive and generally solid. It remains to be seen whether adding this to the workplan will result in any improvements in the CEP’s work.

4 Multi-Year Strategic Work Plan

The ATCM considered the multi-year strategic work plan agreed at the previous ATCM and discussed how to bring the various issues forward for the next few years.

The new version of the strategic workplan includes 16 priority items and extends to ATCM XLIII in 2020. Items of note, particularly with respect to ASOC strategic priorities (as outlined in section 2.4), include:

- 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 (ATCM Priority 4);
- 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 (ATCM Priority 7);
- Assess the progress of the CEP on its ongoing work to review best practices and to improve existing tools and develop further tools for environmental protection, including environmental impact assessment procedures (ATCM Priority 8);
- Discuss issues related to the collection and use of biological material in Antarctica (ATCM Priority 8 bis).
- Address the recommendations of the Antarctic Treaty Meeting of Experts on Implications of Climate Change for Antarctic Management and Governance (CEP-ICG); discuss implementation of the Climate Changes Response Work Programme (CCRWP); modernisation of Antarctic stations in context of climate change (ATCM Priorities 9-11).
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; and develop a strategic approach to environmentally managed tourism and non-governmental activities in Antarctica (ATCM priorities 14-15).

5 Climate Change Issues
Climate change was not included as a separate agenda item for the CEP but was discussed under “other issues”. Russia presented a paper to more strictly define which papers should be presented to which body (CEP or ATCM). The paper was not supported by the CEP. ASOC presented its papers relevant to climate change (IPs 49 and 60) and received generally positive comments.

6 Tourism Issues
Although little progress was made on directly regulating Antarctic tourism, there was a reasonably good discussion of the issue at the ATCM given the time constraints. The projected 40% growth in tourist numbers expected to take place over the next few years appears to have given some extra motivation to ATCPs to discuss the issue. Some major issues related to tourism noted by the ATCM included:

- Concern about the increasing pressures on the environment, in particular regarding the pressures on landing sites and on search and rescue resources, presented by the anticipated growth in volume of tourism, in terms of both the number of vessels and number of visitors, and in high-risk adventure tourism activities;
- The need to consider cumulative impacts when assessing tourism activities including those unauthorised or of non-IAATO members;
- The desire to maintain wilderness values;
- The importance of providing national authorities with the correct legal instruments and tools to respond to unregulated or unauthorised activities in the Antarctic;
- The need to find additional mechanisms to improve the monitoring of tourism;
- The need to consider the implications of potential SAR burdens on national programmes and personnel associated with increased activities in Antarctica;
- A further consideration of the understanding of the terms non-permanent, semi-permanent and permanent infrastructure, in light of the EIA provisions of the Environment Protocol;
- The desirability of improving communications, in particular the speed of communication, between Parties regarding tourism issues, noting that the Competent Authorities Forum was helpful, but potentially not sufficient, in this regard; and
- The desirability of developing an interactive mapping tool on the ATS website (based on the Geographical Information tool demonstrated for the inspections database) that could help illustrate visitation over time for sites covered by Site Guidelines.

Most of these issues have been highlighted by ASOC over the past few years as well.
The Netherlands announced plans to hold an informal workshop on tourism management over the intersessional period (April 2019).

SCAR and IAATO reported that as yet there were no outcomes from the joint conservation planning process they have proposed. This process is now starting.

### 7 Other Issues

**7.1. Inspections**

Norway conducted inspections of four scientific research stations in Queen Maud Land (Halley VI, Neumayer III, SANAE IV and Princess Elisabeth Antarctica), one field station/logistical support base/e-base (SANAP summer station) and two installations that provide support functions to national Antarctic programmes (Novo Airbase and Airfield, and Perseus Runway). The observers were not able to land at Perseus Runway operated by a South Africa based Russian company, which raised some questions as to what is actually happening there. One important conclusion of the report was the increase in air traffic. On a more positive note, the report also highlighted that they found that the Protocol had a positive impact on the conduct of station operations.

**7.2. Bioprospecting**

Following last year’s surprisingly lively bioprospecting discussion, the ATCM resumed its conversation this year with a working paper by Argentina, Chile, France and Norway and an IP by the Netherlands detailing trends in bioprospecting in the Antarctic Treaty Area. There was also a paper by Brazil on the need to define the term bioprospecting. The WP cosponsors argued for the creation of an ICG to reflect that the ATCM needed to have further discussions on the matter. The US argued that the ATCM should wait for BBNJ to discuss bioprospecting further before the ATCM tackles the issue. Most other ATCPs disagreed, given the longstanding tendency of the ATS to resist input from other international organizations. ASOC and most other Parties supported the ICG and highlighted the potential for bioprospecting and related activities to impact the environment and other Antarctic values.

### 8 Miscellaneous issues

**8.1. ASOC event**

ASOC hosted a reception at the Círculo Militar on the evening of 16 May. Footage from an expedition to the Antarctic Peninsula led by Paul Nicklen and Cristina Mittermeier of National Geographic was presented by Andy Mann and Rodolfo Werner, who were also present on the expedition.

**8.2. New CEP Chair**

Birgit Njåstad from Norway was elected as the new CEP Chair beginning after the end of the CEP. She is the first female CEP chair although over the years several women (from AR, BR, CL, NO) have been CEP Vice-Chairs. She brings significant experience and commitment to this role.

---

11 The inspection is significant in the context of a growing presence of Norway in this region, including with respect of discussions concerning the Weddell Sea MPA.
8.3. ASMA management group meetings

There were brief side meetings about some of the active ASMA management groups. ASOC attended discussions for ASMA 4 (Deception Island) and ASMA 6 (Dry Valleys).

The main issues discussed by the Deception Island ASMA management group concerned the periodic review of various management and conservation plans, and issues caused by increased shipping and tourism landings. ASPA 145, which is entirely marine, will be reviewed and potentially de-designated. Points raised concerning the growth of activities included the impact of increasing shipping on benthic biodiversity. In addition, it was suggested to conduct a camera based study of tourism behavior, which would be funded by IAATO.

The main issues discussed for the Dry Valleys ASMA management group concerned the review of various zones within the ASMA, and the consequences of raising lake levels, with potential for lake contamination and impact on some permanent field camps.

9 Conclusions

ATCM XLI covered a broad range of issues and was reasonably productive considering its short duration.

It is apparent that human activities in the Antarctic will expand quite significantly in the short to medium term.

This includes a predicted 40% increase on shipborne tourism, expansion of land-based tourism, the building of new bases and other infrastructure by established ATCPs, the growing number of countries willing to become ATCPs and establish their own presence in Antarctica, and the ongoing intermixing of biological prospecting activities in the traditional conduct of science.

These developments, coupled with stress in the system resulting from climate change and the international political context, will present further challenges to the ATCM/CEP and require tangible, dedicated action to safeguard the vision of the Protocol. ASOC will need to redouble its efforts to ensure that this is the case.
## Appendix 1 – Acronyms

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Acronym</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ASMA</td>
<td>Antarctic Specially Managed Area</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ASOC</td>
<td>Antarctic and Southern Ocean Coalition <a href="http://www.asoc.org/">http://www.asoc.org/</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ASMA</td>
<td>Antarctic Specially Managed Area</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ASPA</td>
<td>Antarctic Specially Protected Area</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ATCM</td>
<td>Antarctic Treaty Consultative Meeting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ATCP</td>
<td>Antarctic Treaty Consultative Party</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ATS</td>
<td>Antarctic Treaty System</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COMMISSION</td>
<td>Commission for CCAMLR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CEE</td>
<td>Comprehensive Environmental Evaluation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CEP</td>
<td>Committee for Environmental Protection (of the ATCM) <a href="http://www.cep.aq/">http://www.cep.aq/</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EIA</td>
<td>Environmental Impact Assessment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IAATO</td>
<td>International Association of Antarctica Tour Operators <a href="http://www.iaato.org">http://www.iaato.org</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ICG</td>
<td>Intersessional Contact Group</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IEE</td>
<td>Initial Environmental Evaluation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IMO</td>
<td>International Maritime Organization</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IP</td>
<td>Information Paper presented to either the ATCM or CCAMLR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IPY</td>
<td>International Polar Year</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IUCN</td>
<td>World Conservation Union (formerly International Union for Conservation of Nature) <a href="http://www.iucn.org">http://www.iucn.org</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IWC</td>
<td>International Whaling Commission</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MARPOL</td>
<td>International Convention for the Prevention of Pollution from Ships</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MEPC</td>
<td>Marine Environment Protection Committee (of IMO)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MSC</td>
<td>Maritime Safety Committee (of IMO)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NAP</td>
<td>(National Antarctic Programs)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SGMP</td>
<td>Subsidiary Group on Management Plans (of CEP)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UAV</td>
<td>Unmanned Aerial Vehicle</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WG</td>
<td>Working Group (currently Legal and Institutional, Operations, and Tourism)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WP</td>
<td>Working Paper</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Appendix 2 – List of documents submitted by ASOC to ATCM XLI\(^{12}\)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Abstract</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>IP 49</td>
<td>Emperor penguin population variability in a region subject to climate warming</td>
<td>In this paper the United Kingdom and ASOC present data showing levels of inter-annual variability in emperor penguin population numbers across the Antarctic Peninsula and Weddell Sea. Precautionary spatial protection would best be located in those places where refugia from climate change are most likely to exist, that is, in the high latitude Weddell Sea.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IP 58</td>
<td>ASOC update on Marine Protected Areas in the Southern Ocean 2017-2018</td>
<td>In this document, ASOC provides an update on MPAs discussions that took place at the CCAMLR XXXVI meeting in October 2017. These discussions are directly and indirectly relevant to the work of the ATCM/CEP, which has an overlapping but not identical membership to CCAMLR. ASOC recommends that the CEP and the ATCM note the progress made by CCAMLR on the adoption of MPAs in the Southern Ocean and encourage further progress; consider developing a process of systematic conservation planning with a view to expanding the network of ASPAs in Antarctica; and contribute to the harmonisation of ASPAs, ASMAs and MPAs, starting with the Ross Sea region.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IP 59</td>
<td>The Polar Code and Marine Mammal Avoidance Planning in the International Maritime Organization</td>
<td>This paper provides information on the marine mammal(^{13}) avoidance provision of the International Maritime Organization’s Polar Code, including sources of available information on marine mammal densities, and methods of conveying information to ship masters. ASOC advocates enhanced cooperation with the IMO and the Antarctic Treaty System (ATS), as well as further discussion by the CEP and ATCM on implementing the marine mammal avoidance provision in Antarctic waters.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IP 60</td>
<td>Enacting the Climate Change Response Work Programme under a Changing Antarctic Environment</td>
<td>ASOC has made annual recommendations to the ATCM regarding how to address Antarctic climate change since 2013. These recommendations have been based on recent Antarctic climate events and research findings. This year, we link these recommendations directly to items on the Climate Change Response Work Programme (CCRWP). In general, we find the CCRWP has focused mostly on information gathering and could significantly enhance its plans for developing a management response. In this paper, ASOC’s recommendations focus on five core areas: investing in robust monitoring of the Antarctic region, investing in ecological monitoring, developing precautionary or rapid-response management plans, establishing protected areas as climate reference areas, and implementing SMART monitoring and evaluation into the response plan.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IP 61</td>
<td>Anticipated growth of Antarctic tourism: Effects on existing regulation</td>
<td>Polar tourism is expected to grow quite significantly in coming years, partly driven by demand (including from newer Asian markets) and partly by an increase of capacity, as several new cruise vessels are currently under construction for operation in polar waters. Apart from shipborne tourism, other modalities of tourism may expand, too. How will the current Antarctic tourism regulatory system respond to this growth? This document provides a first attempt to answer this question and makes some recommendations. ASOC suggests Parties to pursue timely, proactive and precautionary approaches to addressing tourism growth, which includes the following steps: 1) review the current Antarctic tourism regulation system to ensure adequate resilience and effectiveness in the future including with respect to the adoption and/or review of Site Guidelines; 2) address issues of impact assessment and monitoring, particularly with respect to cumulative impacts; and 3) expand the network of specially protected and managed areas adopted under Annex V of the Protocol.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IP 62</td>
<td>Follow-Up of Comprehensive Environmental Evaluations</td>
<td>Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA) follow-up is the continuation of the EIA process after the submission of the EIA document and once the activity is implemented. This document examines EIA follow-up as it applies to Comprehensive Environmental Evaluations (CEEs). Resolution 2 (1997) encourages Parties to anticipate and carry out follow-up CEEs. ASOC recommends that Parties that submitted final CEEs in the recent past submit reports in accordance with Resolution 2 (1997); that Parties preparing CEEs include follow-up plans in CEE documents and act upon those plans; and that observations on CEE follow-up are included in official inspections reports where applicable.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

\(^{12}\) ASOC also submitted IP 146, *The Report of the Antarctic and Southern Ocean Coalition*, but this IP is largely a summary of the other papers. ASOC was also a co-author on a number of Site Guidelines review Working Papers submitted jointly with the UK, IAATO and others, but these are also not summarized here.

\(^{13}\) For the purposes of the Polar Code “marine mammals” refers to both cetaceans and pinnipeds.