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BACKGROUND

1. Antarctic Treaty Consultative Meetings (ATCMs) give effect to obligations under the 1959 Antarctic Treaty, and the 1991 Protocol on Environmental Protection to the Antarctic Treaty. The XXX ATCM was held in New Delhi from 30 April to 11 May 2007.

2. ATCMs are hosted by Consultative Parties (essentially voting members – currently 29)\(^1\) in English-language alphabetical order. All Consultative Parties attended the New Delhi meeting. There are also 18 Non-Consultative Parties - non-voting members, although the majority do not regularly attend ATCMs (10 attended in New Delhi).\(^2\) The ATCM lasts two weeks, and conducts its business through a number of Working Groups - presently on Legal and Institutional Affairs, Tourism and Non-Governmental Activities, Operational Matters and the Committee for Environmental Protection (CEP).

3. The Antarctic and Southern Ocean Coalition (ASOC) has participating ‘Expert’ status at ATCMs. It is the only environmental non-governmental group with such access. The intergovernmental UNEP and hybrid governmental/non-governmental IUCN are also invited ‘Experts’.

4. The ATCM received 45 Working Papers and 143 Information Papers tabled by Parties, Observers and Experts, and 13 Secretariat papers. It produced a Final Report containing three Measures\(^3\) (management plans for protected/managed areas and historic sites and monuments); five Resolutions\(^4\) (on Site Guidelines for visitors, southern giant petrel, long-term scientific monitoring, discouraging passengers from being landed from ships carrying more than 500 passengers, and discouraging land-based tourism infrastructure being constructed in the Antarctic Treaty Area); and four Decisions\(^5\) (status of measures relating to area protection and management, re-appointment of the Executive Secretary, appointment of an external auditor, approval of the Secretariat 2007/08 programme and budget). Electronic copies of these documents (in the original language for Information Papers, and in English, French, Spanish and Russian for Working Papers) are available on the Antarctic Treaty Secretariat site (http://30atcm.ats.ag/30atcm/).

5. The ASOC Report on the New Delhi meeting focuses on the key issues for ASOC member groups and the interested public, including summary reporting on outcomes, papers and press associated with ASOC participation. The official Final Report of the Meeting on the ATS website provides an official record of key discussion of and decisions on all matters discussed.\(^6\)

6. The ASOC delegation comprised:
   - Mariano Aguas (ASOC Adviser – Argentina)
   - Jim Barnes (ASOC Executive Director – France)
   - Yeyong Choi (ASOC Adviser – Korea)
   - Clifton Curtis (Antarctic Krill Conservation Project Director, Pew Charitable Trusts, US)
   - Dr Alan Hemmings (Senior ASOC Adviser – Australia)
   - Jessica Leigh O’Reilly (ASOC Adviser – US)
   - Lic. Ricardo Roura (Madrid Protocol and Tourism Campaign Coordinator – The Netherlands)
   - Dr Tina Tin (ASOC Adviser – France)
   - Estelle van der Merwe (ASOC Southern African Coordinator – South Africa)

---

\(^1\) Argentina, Australia, Belgium, Brazil, Bulgaria, Chile, China, 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.

\(^2\) Austria, Belarus, Canada, Colombia, the Czech Republic, Denmark, Greece, Romania, Switzerland and Venezuela.

\(^3\) A Measure is legally binding once it has entered into force.

\(^4\) A Resolution is hortatory.

\(^5\) A Decision is an administrative action, usually relating to a short-term event, and like a Resolution, hortatory.

\(^6\) Note that in the official report language the detail of some sensitive discussions is omitted and reported as e.g. “after lengthy discussion, the Meeting agreed...”. In addition, in the reporting of some discussions individual Parties are not identified e.g. “A Party was of the opinion that...”.
7. In addition, three delegations included NGO representatives from ASOC:
   - Melanie Hutton (WWF Antarctic and Climate Change Focal Point) on the New Zealand delegation.
   - Constance Johnston (WWF Antarctic and Southern Ocean Initiative) on the Australian delegation
   - Michele Perrault (ASOC Board Member-Sierra Club) on the US delegation

MATERIALS

8. ASOC presented 11 Information Papers, including our annual report, which, like other requested reports
   is reproduced verbatim in the ATCM Final Report. These papers, which were submitted in English and
   were not translated, are available both on the ASOC website (www.asoc.org) and the ATS website
   (www.ats.aq).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Ag. Items</th>
<th>Title</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>IP079</td>
<td>ATCM CEP 6(b)</td>
<td>11 The Case Against Tourism Landings From Ships Carrying More Than 500 Passengers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IP080</td>
<td>CEP 6(b)</td>
<td>Taking Action on Marine Noise in the Southern Ocean</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IP081</td>
<td>ATCM 5</td>
<td>Amendment or Modification of Annex II and the Implications for Further Annex Review</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IP082</td>
<td>ATCM CEP 9</td>
<td>13 The Antarctic and Climate Change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IP083</td>
<td>ATCM CEP 7(c)</td>
<td>11 A Commentary on Policy Issues Arising from On-Site Review of Guidelines for Visitor Sites in the Antarctic Peninsula</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IP084</td>
<td>ATCM CEP 6(b)</td>
<td>5 Strengthening the CEE Process</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IP085</td>
<td>ATCM 11</td>
<td>Tourism and the Duty for ATCP Action</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IP086</td>
<td>ATCM CEP 5</td>
<td>10 The Human Footprint of the IPY 2007-2008 in Antarctica</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IP087</td>
<td>ATCM CEP 7(e)</td>
<td>10 Marine Protected Areas – Steps Forward for the ATCM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IP128</td>
<td>ATCM 4</td>
<td>Report of the Antarctic and Southern Ocean Coalition (ASOC)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IP136</td>
<td>CEP 7(e)</td>
<td>Implementing the Madrid Protocol: A case study of Fildes Peninsula, King George Island</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

9. Five editions of the international newspaper ECO were produced. These are available on the ASOC
   website and included the following stories:

ECO No 1
   - Welcome to India, Delegates!
   - Evidence for Sudden Decline in SCAR Papers
   - A Focus on Substance at the CEP

ECO No 2
   - An ASMA at Fildes Peninsula?
   - The Heat is On
   - Weather Forecasting
   - IPY’s Future Legacy
ECO No 3
- Vexed Review of Annex II
- Time for Marine Protected Areas
- The Biology of an Antarctic Creature
- Successful Cooperation on ASMA!

ECO No 4
- Tourism – Time to Take the First Step
- Antarctic Krill and Global Warming

ECO No 5
- Pulling Teeth to Get Resolutions
- Sharing Stations and Logistics
- The *Nisshin Maru* Accident
- Climate Change Debate

PRESS

10. In the lead-up to the ATCM, substantial media coverage on tourism was secured in Australia, New Zealand, United Kingdom and the United States (resulting in secondary coverage at websites globally). Media access at the conference centre was tightly restricted by the hosts, but there was some coverage in the Indian media. A UK TV documentary crew operating in New Delhi through the ATCM promises some more substantive coverage in the future. Post-ATCM there have been a few more stories in the Indian press and elsewhere.

KEY ISSUES

11. ASOC's priorities were:

- Promoting real steps towards an ecologically and politically secure Antarctic future - including progress on regulation of commercial tourism; prompt entry into force of Protocol Annex VI on Liability; station sharing or creation of international stations; and arguing for a positive “green” legacy from the International Polar Year 2007-2008 (IPY).

- Greater attention by the ATCM and CEP to protection of the Antarctic marine environment - including greater cooperation between the ATCM and CCAMLR; creation of marine protected areas; addressing acoustic impacts; taking the political steps needed to stop IUU fishing in the Antarctic Treaty and CCAMLR Areas; and steps to ensure protection of krill, the base of the Southern Ocean food web.

- Better scrutiny by the CEP of the significant infrastructure developments in the Antarctic planned for the next few years, and the associated need for review of application and scope of Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA), particularly in the light of IPY, the growth of infrastructure proposals and the need to incorporate emerging scientific data.

- Continuing to raise awareness about deficiencies in Protocol compliance, the entrenchment of chronic sub-standard Protocol implementation by many operators, and the increasing tendency to 'roll back' or only minimally interpret the more innovative and progressive environmental management initiatives under the Protocol.

- Arguing that the review and updating of Protocol Annex II - Conservation of Antarctic Fauna and Flora, the removal of fur seals from its list of Specially Protected Species and consideration of proposals for new Specially Protected Species (southern giant petrel and macaroni penguin) were viewed as a package.
KEY OUTCOMES

12. Strong positives:

- Adoption of two Resolutions discouraging landings from tourist passenger ships carrying more than 500 passengers and discouraging land-based tourism infrastructure. These Resolutions, which built on significant discussions conducted in previous ATCMs, are not legally binding, but send a signal to industry that certain constraints to tourism activity may be imposed.

- A letter was written by the ATCM to the Government of Cyprus, where a company is based that is reported to intend to conduct landings in Antarctica from a vessel carrying more than 1000 passengers during 2007-2008, intended to discourage this from happening. This was the first time such a group letter has been sent by an ATCM since 1991, when Pakistan was discouraged from launching an expedition without joining the Treaty.

13. Weak positives:

- Progress on the adoption of a five-year strategic plan for the CEP. The initiative is very worthwhile, but the slowness of progress puts into question if this plan will ever be agreed and acted upon.

- Two additional site-specific guidelines for regulating tourism impacts were agreed. Currently 14 sites Antarctic wide are the subjects of such guidelines, which is a small fraction of the more than 150-200 sites of tourism interest. Site guidelines result from a growing concern about the local effects of tourism, but they are without legal obligation and do not a substitute for a global tourism policy and legally binding regulatory structure.

- Climate change was featured in a number of different ways during the two weeks, including the annual SCAR Science Lecture, and in the debate surrounding the SCAR and ASOC climate change papers. Despite the now wide-spread acceptance of climate change, the only concrete steps taken were the adoption of a new sub-agenda item to the CEP agenda item dealing with Environmental Monitoring and Reporting, and revision to the ATCM Agenda Item 13 to read “Science Issues, Including Climate-Related Research, Scientific Co-operation and Facilitation”. ASOC’s proposal for all Antarctic activities to be ‘carbon-neutral’ by a date in the future was not discussed formally, but several Parties privately supported it.

- The long-awaited Antarctic Specially Managed Area for the Larsemann Hills was eventually approved, but only after the original proponents bent backwards to accept India's controversial selection of location for its proposed new station in the middle of the proposed protected zone.

- A comprehensive US inspection report of a number of stations laid out problems reasonably honestly, along with documentary evidence.

- Some debate occurred on the saga of the fire on the Japanese whaling vessel Nisshin Maru in the Northern Ross Sea, and the implications of that incident for emergency response and liability, which was triggered by a New Zealand information paper. It remains unclear if Japan will agree to circulate the results of its maritime inquiry into the accident and lessons learned.

- A number of expressions of support for the CCAMLR Bioregionalisation Workshop (Brussels, 13-17 August 2007) hopefully mean that the issue of MPAs will continue to be advanced.

14. Negatives:

- The unwillingness or inability of the CEP to address many urgent environmental issues in a timely manner. This is partly a result of its reluctance to adopt processes that would improve its performance, and the obsessive science focus promoted by many of its Members, which requires that it can only be “precautionary” on the basis of detailed scientific data – a complete inversion of the
usual interpretation of precautionary action as action taken when one lacks conclusive scientific data but has other reasons for concern.

- The complete stalling of the review of Protocol Annex II. The process has already been protracted and arduous. The matter was referred to the Legal and Institutional Working by the CEP two meetings back after the CEP itself had spent several years (including intersessional work) on the matter. Aside the problems this indicates for this particular annex, the inability to conclude a review of what was selected as the simplest annex has undermined interest in reviewing any further annex, and that in turn undercuts a prime rationale for constructing the Protocol as a framework convention in the first place.

- The fiasco of SCAR ’s handling of the consideration of southern giant petrel and macaroni penguin as Specially Protected Species under Protocol Annex II.

- The emerging issue of state-sponsored tourism, and the reluctance of the most involved Parties to allow discussion of it.

- The restriction of Measures to Protected Area designations and Management Plans, with all other substantive decisions (to the extent that they are seen as warranting more than Final Report language) enacted as Resolutions, which are not legally binding.

- Failure to make any progress on creating mitigation guidelines on acoustic impacts in the marine environment.

- The unwillingness of any state to engage with Russia over its intention to drill into Lake Vostok in 2008, even after an accident last year that required emergency action to retrieve the broken off drill bit, which apparently has led Russia to develop a different technology for penetration than articulated in their CEE.
SUMMARY REPORT ON ISSUES

The following section reports in more detail on some of the key issues at XXX ATCM. Appendix 1 provides a glossary of commonly used Antarctic acronyms; Appendix 2 provides the Provisional agenda for CEP XI; and Appendix 3 provides the Preliminary agenda for ATCM XXXI.

OPERATION OF THE ANTARCTIC TREATY SYSTEM

Update on Non Consultative Parties

15. Belarus - Belarus acceded to the Antarctic Treaty between XXIX and XXX ATCM and participated in New Delhi as a Non Consultative Party. It announced its intentions for an extensive research program, including the construction of a new station.

16. Malaysia - This was the 6th meeting that Malaysia had been invited to attend as an Observer. Malaysia has been seeking representation at the annual ATCMs (and making vague noises about becoming a Party) for some years now, without actually showing any real signs of so doing. This may not be a bad geopolitical hand from their own perspective, but it is certainly not building friends among the ATCPs, nor does it suggest any immediate urgency to joining the ATS. The perception that Malaysia "enjoys an observer's status" reported in Malaysian media⁷, while not strictly correct in a legal sense, is pretty close to the practical truth. It reflects the central dilemma for the ATCPs: Why, given that Malaysia has had an ad hoc invitation to each ATCM since 2002, would it feel under any pressure to accede to the Treaty? As a result, Malaysia has been on the doorstep of the ATS for longer than any other state.

Review of Recommendations

17. An ICG, chaired by the US, prepared a list of all Recommendations and Measures relating to area protection and management that have been superseded and another list of Recommendations and Measures that are still current and therefore require implementation. This ICG did not include observers or experts.

Future ATCM Hosts

18. Ukraine announced that it would host the XXXI ATCM in Kiev from 2-13 June 2008. USA, Uruguay and Argentina will host the ATCM in 2009, 2010 and 2011 respectively.

Relationship of the ATCM and CCAMLR

19. Australia proposed to follow up on the CCAMLR secretary’s information about continued IUU fishing for Antarctic Toothfish with a Resolution modelled on those agreed in the past. It proved to be impossible to convince China to accept this, even after numerous contact group meetings and alternative drafting. China insisted that a resolution of this sort needed to be circulated 45 days in advance of the ATCM, although there is no such rule of procedure but merely a translation guideline for working papers. This is probably related to the fact that a Chinese vessel was named at last year’s CCAMLR meeting as engaging in IUU activities. The outcome of the exercise was the inclusion of some resolution-like general report text.

COMPLIANCE WITH THE PROTOCOL

20. At the Stockholm ATCM, the CEP endorsed the establishment of an online Discussion Forum of Competent Authorities (DFCA) to share experiences on administration of domestic Antarctic legislation. This forum, a joint Dutch-German initiative, could become a useful mechanism to advance national

---

procedures for assessing and/or authorising activities in Antarctica; implementation of ATCM Measures, Resolutions and Decisions at a national level, and coordination of the assessment and/or authorisation process for multilateral activities.

21. Germany hosted a workshop of Competent Authorities in Berlin in November 2006, at which Ricardo Roura represented ASOC. The meeting was quite well attended albeit mostly by European states and the outcome was discussed at XXX ATCM. This Forum could have a potentially useful role in the implementation of the Madrid Protocol. However, there are lingering concerns among many Parties about the creation of further Antarctic bodies - even informal bodies - that may in any way threaten the ability of individual Parties to conduct their activities as they wish. In particular, some Parties are wary of any action that may lead to mandatory environmental standards. Meetings of this Forum may take place on the margins of the ATCM.

**Electronic Information Exchange System**

22. The Secretariat set up an electronic information exchange system that encourages Parties to make Exchange of Information submissions on line in order to meet requirements under the Protocol's Art. 17.\(^8\) Currently only about a dozen ATCPs inform of the steps taken to implement the Protocol (as required under the Protocol's Art. 17) in a paper format.\(^9\) Only a few of these have done so consistently since 1998. Reportedly some ATCPs display this information on their websites - but it is never clear where this information is available and in which format it is displayed. Other ATCPs simply ignore this requirement of the Protocol. At any event, there is no consistent method of reporting and no standard reporting format, so that the initiative of the Secretariat is welcome.

23. This requirement is a proxy indicator of implementation standards. Information exchange should show not only what Parties are doing implement the Protocol, but also - by omission - what they are not doing. This may be of course a source of embarrassment for some Parties, and it is perhaps one of the reasons why some Parties are not coming forward with the information.

24. After receiving a report by the Secretariat on the environmental sections of the Electronic Information Exchange System, the Committee agreed to continue with the trials of the system during the intersessional period and agreed that all Members should enter the required data in the system.

**OPERATION OF THE CEP**

*Standing group on Protected Areas*

25. Protected areas are increasingly used to manage or protect Antarctic sites (including in the future marine protected areas) so this is a key area of work for CEP Members. A contact group on the margins of CEP X was convened to discuss the establishment of a Standing Group that would deal with Protected Area plans in between the annual CEP meetings. This proposal resulted partly due to the growing number of management plans that need to be approved or reviewed, and partly because the participation in ICGs discussing specific management plans has usually been limited to a handful of Members. However, Members expressed great reluctance to give such a body any sort of formal standing (hence the labels of temporary, ad hoc, informal, etc. were attached to it).

26. Nevertheless, a group was formed on a trial basis. It would make little difference with the intersessional contact groups that have been discussing management plans for some years. The main difference is that in this case some individuals would commit themselves to serve in this group; that the group would process several Protected Area plans rather than a single one, as it has usually been the case in the past; and that some documents produced during the group’s discussion would be translated.

---

\(^8\) ASOC identified years ago the need for a standard reporting under Art. 17, and had developed a standard report format for internal use, which was made available to the Antarctic Treaty Secretariat and subsequently used by the Secretariat as the basis for its own form.

\(^9\) In 2007 these were: China, Ecuador, France, Italy, Korea, New Zealand, Peru, United Kingdom, Romania, Spain, Ukraine, and Uruguay.
27. At CEP VII, Sweden initiated discussion on the strategic direction and future work of the CEP. The discussion was continued at CEP VIII, and focused both on the work arising from the environmental impacts from human activity within the continent, and on work associated with external environmental pressures such as anthropogenic climatic change. A pre-meeting Workshop by the CEP on "Antarctica's Future Environmental Challenges" was held in Edinburgh prior to CEP IX. An ICG was set up to review the outcomes of the Workshop, drawing from the work undertaken by CCAMLR in developing a work plan for its WG-EMM as a model example, and taking into account the IPY planning work, and develop a 5 year forward prioritised action plan for consideration at CEP X.

28. The outcome of this intersessional work, in which ASOC participated, was taken to CEP X for further discussion.

29. In the setting of priorities there was some confusion as to what constitutes a priority for individual Members or for the CEP as a whole. ASOC noted that the Protocol relies on the individual and collective effort of the Members for its implementation. Consequently, individual Members are better positioned to address some matters, while others are best dealt with by the CEP as a whole. In ASOC's view the CEP should set its own priorities and leave it to individual Members to address routine matters such as waste management that might not always be of high priority for the CEP but that are fundamental for the implementation of the Protocol.

30. The CEP five-year work plan will be discussed again in the period leading to CEP XI in 2008 so as to allow for further comments (this work will be convened by Tania Britos, CEP Vice-Chair). Chances are that it will take two years to agree on a five-year plan, and that by the time the plan is agreed the priorities will need to be reassessed.

ANNEX I - ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT ASSESSMENT (EIA)

Draft CEEs

31. The CEP considered a draft CEE for a new Indian Research Station at Larsenmann Hills and had concluded in its advice that the draft CEE meets the requirements of Annex I. This discussion was tied up with the ASMA plan for the Larsenmann Hills. Curiously, the ASMA did not mention the proposed station, and the CEE did not mention the ASMA - a point ASOC raised at the CEP, although WP8 (the draft management plan for the ASMA) mentions the Indian base. The location of India's proposed station is outside the facility zone agreed upon in the ASMA - i.e. the zone where all infrastructures should concentrate. India's position was controversial since it had chosen not to be involved in the ASMA process until the location of its proposed station had been set, and consideration of alternative locations for the station was perfunctory.

32. ASOC noted that the Indian CEE anticipated a lifetime for the station of 25 years, and asked India how it had assessed the contribution of cumulative impacts of its proposed station and those of existing activities.

33. Russia presented an update on the drilling above Lake Vostok. The drilling project ran into trouble in the 2006-2007 summer when a drill bit got stuck in the ice and broke. 200 litres of antifreeze were poured into the hole to melt the ice and free the drilling bit. The incident underscored the difficulties of drilling and minimizing contamination under such challenging conditions as those of Lake Vostok. As at past ATCMs, Russia noted that a Final CEE for water sampling of the lake would be presented (but not discussed) at ATCM XXXI.

34. The situation of Lake Vostok remains extremely worrying - yet all possibilities of action by the ATCM or CEP appear to have been exhausted. While we may hope that Russia could still decide not to penetrate the lake, plainly it intends to do precisely this. As we had already noted at XXIX ATCM, this is a depressing state of affairs given the widespread and reasonable concerns about the risks entailed in
penetrating the lake using the old, contaminated borehole and last-generation technology. It is, in our estimation, a serious indictment of the wider ATS that post-Protocol a globally significant feature - the seventh largest freshwater body on the planet - should be put at risk in this way.

35. The discussion of these CEEs at the CEP was muted, even though both projects had been controversial at prior ATCMs. There was some discussion as to whether final CEEs should be discussed at the CEP or simply presented for information purposes only (i.e. whether final CEEs should be submitted as Working Papers or as Information Papers.) The latter is the approach that prevailed, and CEP X accepted Information Papers containing the final CEEs for the construction/reconstruction of Belgian and British stations.

The replacement of Ukrainian fuel tanks

36. When Ukraine took over Faraday Station from the UK in 1996 it formally committed itself to replace the old British fuel tanks (which were in fact water tanks, of a sort used throughout former British colonies). Yet serious work on the tanks did not take place until the 2006-07 season, with preliminary work beginning a year earlier. A CEE for this activity - which had already started - was informally announced at the Meeting of Competent Authorities in Berlin in November 2006, but subsequently there was never a formal notification. The inverted sequence of the activity and the EIA raised some eyebrows both in Berlin and just before the CEP. In addition, no draft CEE was distributed among ATCPs, although some of the Ukrainian officials thought that they had distributed this document for comments.

37. At the end it was accepted that while due process had not been followed, it was all a bureaucratic mistake; that Ukraine had done the right thing in building the new tank; and that at any event probably only an IEE was needed (as indeed Brazil had done to replace its tanks in the same season).

38. However, in its presentation Ukraine noted that it has not replaced the old tanks but simply built a new tank in a new location. The old tanks remain standing, and they still contain some fuel and a huge amount of sludge. While the new tank will help prevent many problems of fuel handling and storage in the years to come, the issue of removing a large amount of toxic waste remains. So, on reflection, a CEE was the right level of assessment. The opportunity to comment on a draft CEE would have resulted not only on an EIA process in accordance to the Protocol but, arguably, in much needed advice.

Landings from ships carrying more than 500 passengers

39. The XXIX ATCM posed to the CEP the question "whether the proposal to prevent ships carrying more than 500 passengers from landing in Antarctica was an environmentally responsible and precautionary approach or whether they would recommend an alternative". It was agreed that this issue would be discussed under the agenda item dealing with "other EIA matters". Papers by the US (WP 6) and by ASOC (IP 79) introduced the issue to CEP X. Several Parties and IAATO thanked ASOC for its paper.

40. Eventually the vast majority of the members of the Committee endorsed the proposal to prevent ships carrying more than five hundred passengers from landing. However, few Members supported the proposal wholeheartedly. Some were quite opposed, albeit for different reasons.

41. Many Members were concerned that the CEP should make decisions only on the bases of sufficient scientific information. Since such information may be lacking - and this is by no means unusual in the Antarctic - this reflects poorly on the ability of the CEP to do its work as a technical body able to provide timely advice to the ATCM on urgent environmental matters. The CEP recommended that more consistent and dedicated monitoring of tourism be undertaken to ensure that data and information are available to support such decision-making. The ATCM addressed landings from large passenger vessels further under agenda item 11 in the Tourism Working Group, discussed below.

Strengthening the CEE process

42. This issue, raised in ASOC IP 84, was discussed in both the CEP and the Legal and Institutional WG. In the former it received a sympathetic hearing, and was kindly commended in the CEP Report. In the
latter, the implicit criticism of state practice and the policy implications of the suggested strengthening of the role of the CEP in examining CEEs triggered some predictable defensiveness. But overall, the ideas we put forward seem to have been, in general, positively received. The prospects for our specific proposals will not become clear unless and until a review of Annex I commences, and whether this happens depends on how the review of Annex II concludes.

Other EIA issues

43. Italian IEE - Italy submitted an IEE for the construction and operation of an ice runway. Some Parties commented that this type of activity should be the subject of a CEE. As usual, other Parties noted that the level of EIA depends on the impact of the activity and not necessarily on its scale. Italy has a model Antarctic program, and is regrettable that it has opted for the easy way out in this case.

44. EIA database - ASOC thanked the Secretariat for developing the EIA database and noted that in the database there is a vast disparity in the production of EIAs by different Parties. To a large extent this EIA list reflects primarily circulation of information requirements rather than EIA practice per se. Yet, only a handful of Parties have produced the vast majority of the 500+ EIAs listed in the Antarctic Treaty Secretariat database, and some Parties with large Antarctic programs have made no EIAs available to the Secretariat. It is not entirely clear whether this is because some Parties are not producing EIAs, or because they are not willing to make information on EIAs available to the Secretariat. ASOC asked the Secretariat about this matter, and the response was that it does not have the mandate to search for "missing" EIAs, nor could it use other EIA databases even if they existed.

45. Estonia's proposed station - There was no discussion of Estonia's proposed station on Robertson Point, which was discussed at recent CEP meetings and was supposed to be the subject of an EIA. This also was the subject of a confrontation with Italy with regard to an ASPA proposed for this area - a conflict comparable with that of India's proposed station in the Larsemann Hills. However, there were no Estonian representatives at the ATCM.

ANNEX II - CONSERVATION OF ANTARCTIC FLORA AND FAUNA

Review of Annex II

46. As ASOC’s IP 81 noted, there are three components to this issue – (i) resolving what (if any) modification to the main body of the Annex is politically acceptable; (ii) the delisting of fur seals from the list of Specially Protected Species (SPS) in Appendix A to the Annex (agreed at XXIX ATCM); and (iii) the question of adding any new species to the SPS list (the candidates being southern giant petrel and macaroni penguin). ASOC has argued that for ease of domestic action and to ensure consistency, all three of these components need to be resolved before Parties seek to amend their domestic legal and administrative arrangements.

47. The situation was not advanced at XXX ATCM. SCAR ran out of time for tabling a WP with a proposal and draft Action Plan for listing macaroni penguins, and although it did table WP 1 with a proposal and Action Plan for the southern giant petrel, it then withdrew this paper two days before the meeting commenced because of apparent new unpublished data on the population at the South Orkney Islands. As a result, the CEP was unable to progress any proposal for adding species to the SPS list. ASOC drew attention to the concept of a "critical issue" used in the intersessional discussion on a five-year work plan for the CEP. According to the CEP Chair "a critical issue is something that may make us fail if we don't adequately address it." ASOC reminded the CEP of this concept, expressing its view that protection of southern giant petrel was a critical issue, and encouraged members to reflect on the possibility of the CEP failing to protect this species if it is not listed as a Specially Protected Species under Annex II of the Protocol.

48. SCAR initially proposed to discuss the southern giant petrel data within SCAR at a meeting that would occur after XXXI ATCM. When it was pointed out by ASOC on the floor of the meeting that such a timeline would preclude any SCAR advice to the CEP before the 2009 meeting, SCAR revised its
position and said that it would attempt to hold its meeting earlier so that it could provide advice to the next CEP. Our latest information is that SCAR is looking at a discussion of southern giant petrel in May 2008 – which would be very tight for a subsequent drafting and tabling of a new proposal and Action Plan for consideration by the CEP.

49. The ATCM agreed Resolution 2, which exhorts SCAR and others to complete a review of southern giant petrel status.

50. The situation in relation to any amendment of the main text of Annex II was also not resolved in New Delhi. Although the Legal and Institutional WG examined the text as it had come from the CEP several years back, there was no agreement on any part of this. The UK and Australia in particular led efforts to agree to some amendments. But some other Parties, most obviously the US, are clearly not persuaded that the sorts of minimal amendments upon which agreement might be reached are worth it. The issue will be examined further at XXXI ATCM.

Acoustic issues

51. As it has done the past few ATCMs, ASOC prepared a detailed information paper updating delegates on recent scientific and legal developments involving various aspects of acoustic impacts, asking the meeting to establish an ad hoc expert group to share ideas intersessionally and perhaps develop a draft of mitigation measures appropriate for Antarctica. SCAR also has a modestly active program going on, with an expert group. The ASOC and SCAR inputs on this set of issues were useful, but in the end nothing concrete was agreed, nor was an informal expert group established – SCAR rejected that idea as well.

Invasive species

52. ASOC was not active on this issue, given IUCN’s deep involvement with it – they introduced an information paper on invasive species. This is a subject of interest to the chair of the CEP, and one of the agreed high priority issues for the CEP. There were fairly decent discussions about various threats and what might be done about them. It was generally agreed that climate change would provoke more intensive invasions from various sources.

INSPECTIONS

53. Two inspections were reported at CEP X. Sweden, France, and New Zealand inspected the South Pole Station and Concordia - both modern stations dedicated to science. The US inspected a range of facilities in the Antarctic Peninsula, including some tourist vessels. In both instances the findings were just as expected: some stations are clearly devoted primarily to science and/or are implementing the Protocol adequately, while many others simply are not.

54. The findings of these inspections were compatible with those of earlier inspections and showed that there is a range of standards of Protocol implementation among Antarctic Treaty Parties. ASOC noted that inspections are fundamental to evaluate the implementation of the Protocol on the ground and to ensure the transparency of the Antarctic Treaty System, and that while there have been progress in many aspects of the Protocol since 1998 other aspects are taking a long time to be implemented. ASOC commended the sharing of stations - such as the case of Concordia Station, which is operated jointly by France and Italy - and expressed concern about reports on fuel and waste storage standards, awareness of EIA and tourism policy at some of the stations, the existence of dilapidated huts in some locations, and reports of two tourism incidents, further discussed below.

EMERGENCY RESPONSE AND CONTINGENCY PLANNING

55. Two tourism vessels were grounded at Deception Island in the 2006-07 season: the Orlova (Russian flag) and Nordkapp (Norwegian flag and operators). Both incidents required assistance from National
Program Operators, and the latter resulted in hull damage, spillage of fuel, and the evacuation of the passage and part of the crew.

56. In an intervention ASOC asked Norway for an estimate of the amount of fuel spilled during the grounding of the Nordkapp. Norway noted that, while they had initially made an estimate of 500-750 litres, subsequent assessment by the classification society Det Norske Veritas suggested that it was not possible to estimate the quantity of spilled fuel with any certainty. The reporting appeared to suggest that there was no impact from the spillage - but the impacts were only assessed visually and using what appeared to be basic equipment at one of the research stations on Deception Island. ASOC expressed concern about the evaluation of environmental impacts resulting from this incident as reported in WP37, particularly since the amount of fuel that had been spilled was currently unknown. ASOC asked Norway whether environmental monitoring at Deception Island is anticipated, to which Norway responded that they are considering if and how to this.

57. The Deception Island Management Group met on the margins of the CEP.

ANNEX V - AREA PROTECTION AND MANAGEMENT

58. The CEP is mandated by Article 12 of the Madrid Protocol to advise the ATCM on the operation and further elaboration of the Antarctic Protected Area system, including proposals to create marine protected and managed areas.

59. CEP X considered new or revised draft management plans for three Antarctic Specially Managed Areas and seven Antarctic Specially Protected Areas. The Committee also considered a proposal for a new Historic Site or Monument (interesting only in that it is a structure on Fildes Peninsula that is only a few years old) and two Site Guidelines. The CEP referred five management plans for intersessional review prior to CEP XI. Some of these management plans are discussed below.

Ardley Island ASPA

60. At CEP IX (2006) Chile had put up a revised Management Plan for Antarctic Specially Protected Area No. 150, Ardley Island, which included a tourist zone around a southern giant petrel colony. Following objections to the inclusion of a tourist zone in an ASPA designed to protect flora and fauna, the plan was referred to an ICG to be redrawn so as to permit continued tourist visits to the colony.

61. This issue was discussed intersessionally, however it did not take place at the CEP Forum but at a different Forum held by the Antarctic Treaty Secretariat. Experts were not invited to participate in the debate. In itself this reveals that sensitive discussions, even if nominally addressing environmental matters, take place off to the side in a non-transparent manner.

62. An IP by Chile reviewed an ASPA on Ardley Island, which as noted above, is controversial in that it is has areas set aside for tourism use. ASOC asked Chile what criteria had been used to exclude parts of Ardley Island from the ASPA and to allow visitation by tourists in those parts of the island. Chile responded that those areas had been left as buffer to allow visitation, and that scientists already used those areas that had been set aside - i.e. that's where some of the huts are located. (Many ASPAs contain such zones where scientists work, yet those zones are kept within the ASPA). As a result, there is now (potentially) an ASPA that is bisected by a road and that contains a de facto tourism zone. However, Ardley Island is also the subject of separate discussions on the establishment of an ASMA at Fildes Peninsula, so the review of the ASPA took place in parallel with those discussions.

Fildes Peninsula ASMA

63. The Fildes Peninsula ASMA, proposed by Germany, was not discussed at the CEP itself but was the subject of debate on the margins of the meeting. A workshop on this issue took place in Punta Arenas, Chile, in April 2007 shortly before the CEP meeting. In essence, Germany and other Parties are willing to establish an ASMA at Fildes Peninsula, and they have already produced draft ASMA plans. Chile,
which has its main Antarctic facilities in the area, appears unwilling to have an ASMA although it has expressed interest in protecting the sensitive features of the Peninsula. Resolving this issue may take a long time. In the meantime, Germany announced that it will post the draft management plan on the CEP Forum and invited Parties to comment.

*Site Guidelines*

64. The CEP adopted two new site guidelines for Brown Bluff (one of the twenty most visited sites in the Antarctic) and Snow Hill Island (which has one of the few "Heroic Era" huts that are left in the Antarctic, and where tourism has been gradually increasing). These guidelines raise the number of sites for which Site Guidelines have been approved since 2005 to 14, including a majority of the most visited sites in the Antarctic, but still less than 10% of the 150-200 sites used regularly by tour operators.

65. With regard to Brown Bluff, ASOC requested IAATO for clarification regarding what appeared to be contradictory guidelines about the extent of free roaming that is acceptable, and whether the landing should be suspended in the event that the beach is crowded.

*Larsemann Hills*

66. As discussed above, there is a long history to the creation of an ASMA in the Larsemann Hills. For several years a detailed map was developed for the facilities area (shared by three countries) and the remainder, which was to be a protected zone, totally dedicated to science. India did not participate in that working group process, choosing instead to proceed to identify a site in the middle of the proposed protected area and in logistical respects not respecting the facilities zone. There were intensive efforts among a few countries prior to the ATCM to sort out a solution. Eventually the other Parties agreed to India’s decision on the location of the new station and logistics, and incorporated those two areas as facilities zones on the final plan.

*Other Protected Area issues*

67. The Committee considered a draft checklist for inspecting protected areas and decided that the list would be resubmitted to CEP XI for further consideration. This would be the third time that such a list is discussed - some Members oppose using it on the grounds that it duplicates the content of other inspection checklists and of the requirements of the Protocol to establish Protected Areas.

68. In relation to the broader establishment of marine protected areas, this issue unfortunately did not spark any substantial discussion on the floor. This was despite strong interest from the CEP chair and the UK delegation. It would seem that the parties are still grappling with what the CEP and ATCM can do practically about the issue and there seems to be a feeling that this is still a CCAMLR issue.

**KRILL ISSUES**

69. ASOC followed up its information paper on the krill campaign last year with a section on key steps in its Report to the meeting. An article on the krill campaign also appeared in *ECO*. We had very useful discussions with various delegations concerning ASOC’s application to participate as an observer at the July 2007 meeting of the CCAMLR Scientific Committee’s Working Group on Ecosystem Monitoring and Management (WG-EMM) on krill issues. WG-EMM is reviewing and assessing options for selecting an appropriate management regime for allocation, monitoring and management of krill catches within the 15 small-scale management units in Area 48 that were agreed by CCAMLR in 2002. ASOC’s application was unfortunately blocked by Japan.

**INTERNATIONAL POLAR YEAR**

70. Dr Chris Rapley and Dr David Carlson presented updates of the International Polar Year on behalf of the IPY-IPO to the CEP and ATCM respectively. The IPY-IPO described the launch activities that took
place around the world in March 2007. An estimated $1.25 billion of funding will be available for the IPY, and approximately $250 million of additional funds are still needed. The IPY-IPO urged delegates to adopt a resolution on long-term monitoring and sustained environmental observation in Antarctica, similar to the one that has been adopted by the Arctic Council for the Arctic. ASOC's contribution to the IPY website was highlighted in one of the presentations.

71. Ten countries and SCAR presented their activities during the IPY, many of which are very ambitious and extend beyond the IPY, such as China's plan to build a station and obtain a deep ice core at Dome A, with traverse transport from Zhongshan. Participation in the IPY appears to be a matter of national pride and recognition of this may explain the enthusiasm with which such a large number of countries wish to report on their activities.

72. ASOC presented IP 86, *The Human Footprint of the IPY 2007-2008 in Antarctica*. As part of the IPY endorsed project no. 454, ASOC contends that the IPY is likely to expand the human footprint in Antarctica and increase pressure on Antarctica's wilderness values, and highlights the need for strategic-level planning and cumulative impact assessments.

73. IPY-IPO welcomed the ASOC paper and noted that all IPY endorsed projects must conform fully with the requirements of the Environmental Protocol. IPY-IPO also noted that the IPY website included a statement of ethical policy that it expects all IPY projects to conform to.

74. Peru concurred with the environmental concerns of ASOC and requested that they be reflected in the resolution on long-term monitoring systems in the Antarctic.

75. A working group led by the UK met several times to prepare a resolution on the need to initiate and support an Antarctic observing system network, which was adopted by the ATCM.

**CLIMATE CHANGE ISSUES**

76. A special lecture on Climate Change was organised by SCAR, presented by Professor Chris Rapley, President of SCAR and Director of the British Antarctic Survey. The lecture framed climate change within the context of industrial development of fossil fuel usage, the planetary carbon budgets available to return to global climate stability, and the current extent of warming impacts across the Antarctic. Using the latest IPCC reports, future scenarios were discussed and a range of technological solutions to reducing emissions presented. Rarely seen in similar discussions, the issues of population growth and the energy needs of the production of meat for human consumption were also mentioned. The presentation ended with a strong articulation of the unprecedented challenge facing us, and a call for leadership. The importance of Antarctic research in continuous monitoring of climate variations was highlighted. The paper and PowerPoint of the presentation are available on the SCAR website (http://www.scar.org/communications). Despite the enthusiasm generated by this lecture, the CEP was unable to agree on any concrete action, other than listing climate change as a sub-agenda item.

77. On other relevant matters, the CEP endorsed a set of guiding principles on best practice for energy use prepared by COMNAP, and ASOC congratulated Australia for the use of wind turbines at Mawson Station (IP 48) and expressed its hope that this model would be followed by other Parties adopting renewable energy sources during the IPY 2007-2008. ASOC’s proposal that Parties set a goal of making the totality of Antarctic science and logistics operations ‘carbon neutral’ received only private support, but our point is reflected in the Final Report.

**TOURISM**

78. The issues discussed under this agenda item were divided into the following broad categories, not all of which will be discussed here:
   - Overview of Antarctic tourist activity in the 2006/07 season;
   - Ships carrying more than 500 passengers;
79. ASOC tabled three papers on tourism (IPs 79, 83 and 85). The number of tourists was reported to increase by 14% from the previous year to 37,506 tourists entering the Antarctic Treaty Area.\textsuperscript{10}

80. There were lengthy discussions on the issues of landings from large vessels, and land-based tourism. These discussions largely took place in two contact groups on the margins of the WG meeting led by Argentina and Australia, respectively. A third contact group agreed on the Terms of Reference for an IGC on shipping aspects of tourism, based on a US initiative, which is being chaired by the UK. This issue had been discussed at the CEP the previous week (and is discussed in more detail in the CEP section of this report). A Resolution on this issue was approved after much private discussion on the precise wording.

81. The discussions on land-based tourism were convened by Australia but both New Zealand and USA were strong participants. Most other Parties and IAATO were relatively quiet during the discussions in the contact groups - IAATO was not even present for some of the discussions. ASOC was also relatively quiet since the discussion was moving in the right direction.

82. Overall, there was broad common interest in preventing land-based tourism, but no common understanding on the way to define the limits of what is acceptable or on how to enforce this. The options discussed included banning land-based tourism via the EIA process, or via direct banning of infrastructure. The former was opposed by the US on the grounds that it has no traction under US law, the latter was opposed by Argentina and Chile on the ground that it hurt their territorial interests. In particular, Argentina repeated concerns expressed in the past about the ATCM adopting instruments banning the establishment of new land-based tourism infrastructure while accepting land-based tourism facilities operated by states that already exist. Argentina made several incisive references to existing land-based tourism facilities run by Chile and the UK, namely the Chilean hotel at Fildes Peninsula, and Port Lockroy, which has mutated from a Historic Site and Monument into a summer station devoted primarily to serving tourism. These were factual comments that neither Chile nor the UK disputed – or responded to.

83. The process of approving the Final Report of the Tourism Working Group report led to substantive debate on the issue of state-sponsored tourism - an offspring of the debate on land-based tourism. This resulted from an intervention by Argentina stating that it reserved the right to build interpretation centres for tourists with accommodation at any of its stations. The original statement was incorrectly reported as Argentina planning to construct such centres. The statement ruffled the feathers of many Parties, which noted that had they actually heard about actual plans to construct such centres, they would have commented. The issue was resolved by reporting the statement as initially made, yet it left a bitter aftertaste that it is only a matter of time before an escalation of state-sponsored tourism takes place.

84. The plans by a Cyprus-based shipping company to conduct landings from a ship carrying upwards of 1,000 passengers in the 2007-2008 seasons were discussed at the Meeting. After a proposal by Italy, a letter to Cyprus was quickly drafted, and agreed by the Tourism Working Group, which was sent on behalf of all the ATCPs to the company.

85. The issue of site guidelines for visitors received substantially less attention than in the past. In 2006, the UK had announced that it would discuss policy issues resulting from site guidelines - and this prompted ASOC to write IP 83. Eventually, however, this discussion did not take place.

\textsuperscript{10} Para 145 of the Final Report of the XXIX ATCM: “The (IAATO) Paper reported an increase in the estimated number of tourists entering the Antarctic Treaty area to 30,877 passengers (landing and cruise only) in 2005/06 (with an additional 1,165 passengers on over-flights). In 2004/05 28,739 landed and cruise only passengers entered the Antarctic Treaty area, with an additional 2,030 on over-flights. IAATO reported no increase in the diversification of activities.”
86. As has been customary for the past several years there was a strong exchange of words between Argentina and the UK about the Falklands/Malvinas issue, this time in the context of the Tourism Working Group.

87. For the past five years prior to the XXIX ATCM, the UK was the most trenchant supporter of IAATO, seemingly reluctant to see any regulatory inroads into industry "self-regulation". Starting last year there has been a slow change of position by the UK towards trying to prevent some of the worst excesses of tourism such as very large vessels, landings from vessels of a certain size, and land-based tourism. The US also has traditionally been uncritical of tourism industry while at the same time adopting a hard line to manage tourism at its own stations. Between XXIX and XXX ATCM, however, the US changed its position on certain aspects of tourism, in the process becoming an advocate for some of the positions it opposed in the past.

88. The XXIX ATCM in 2006 saw a substantive discussion on Antarctic tourism, and given the movement by the US and UK ASOC anticipated progress on tourism regulation this year. Annual increases of tourism numbers of 10-20% do not surprise anybody any longer (the industry now talks about stable tourism growth, rather than stable numbers of tourists), but the accident of the Nordkapp was a wake up call for many states. There was limited but definite progress towards constraining some aspects of tourism, with ATCM policies stated in Resolutions agreed against use of larger vessels to land passengers and land-based tourism infrastructure.

BIOLOGICAL PROSPECTING

89. Two papers were tabled on this matter, a further useful update from UNEP (IP 67) which proposed, inter alia, a data-base on the activity, and a Working Paper (WP 36) by The Netherlands, Belgium and France, on scoping for a regulatory framework. These stimulated the most substantive ATCM discussion of biological prospecting to date, in terms of both the depth of discussion and the number of participants. Seventeen ATCPs spoke - a large number of states to engage on any ATCM subject.

90. There was widespread concern that the ATCM should not leave the issue for other fora, and substantial support for the establishment of either a dedicated biological prospecting Working Group (WG) or some sort of Intersessional Contact Group (ICG). However, others argued that a dedicated WG was “premature” (the classic label for proposals politically unacceptable to key players), and that it should remain within the Legal and Institutional WG. With that position embedded, it was further argued by the US that setting a day aside within the WG, or encouragement to come with biological prospecting experts was also unnecessary. So, the US, while speaking at length on the issue for the first time in the WG, continued its position of limiting discussion of biological prospecting. The Chair provided cover for divergent positions by noting that of course the length of time made available for discussion of the issue would depend upon the number of papers on the issue which were tabled.

91. An ICG was agreed, convened by The Netherlands and operating via an interactive discussion forum established by the Secretariat. However, its terms of reference were restricted at Japanese insistence, and fully interactive participation was ultimately confined to Parties, while Experts and Observers may only send information to the ICG but not see the comments and proposals of Parties.

LIABILITY

92. Sweden remains the only Party to have completed domestic implementing legislation, and the US confirmed that as Depository it had received advice to this effect from Sweden. Over half the other ATCPs have now asserted that they have commenced domestic processes, and a few suggested their processes were advanced. Others clearly have not seriously commenced. ASOC is unaware of any ATCP likely to complete its domestic implementing legislation in 2007. Positive signs are the evident exchange of ideas between Parties, and the very useful compendium of issues raised by various Parties tabled as IP 54 by the UK.
**APPENDIX 1 - GLOSSARY OF ANTARCTIC TERMS RELEVANT TO ATCMS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Acronym</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ACAP</td>
<td>Agreement on the Conservation of Albatrosses and Petrels</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AEON</td>
<td>Antarctic Environmental Officers Network</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AKCP</td>
<td>Antarctic Krill Conservation Project</td>
</tr>
<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>ASPA</td>
<td>Antarctic Specially Protected Area</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ASTI</td>
<td>Area of Special Tourism Interest (None designated)</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>CCAS</td>
<td>Convention for the Conservation of Seals</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COMMISSION</td>
<td>Commission for CCAMLR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CEE</td>
<td>Comprehensive Environmental Evaluation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CEMP</td>
<td>CCAMLR Ecosystem Monitoring Program</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CEP</td>
<td>Committee for Environmental Protection (of the ATCM) <a href="http://www.cep.ag/">http://www.cep.ag/</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COMNAP</td>
<td>Council of Managers of National Antarctic Programs <a href="http://www.comnap.ag/">http://www.comnap.ag/</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CRAMRA</td>
<td>Convention on the Regulation of Antarctic Mineral Resource Activities (not in force)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DFCA</td>
<td>Discussion Forum of Competent Authorities <a href="http://forum.cep.ag">http://forum.cep.ag</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EIA</td>
<td>Environmental Impact Assessment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GOSEAC</td>
<td>Group of Specialists on Environmental Affairs and Conservation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HCA</td>
<td>Hydrographic Committee on Antarctica</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HSM</td>
<td>Historic Sites and Monuments <a href="http://www.cep.ag/">http://www.cep.ag/</a></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>ICSU</td>
<td>International Council of Science Unions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IEE</td>
<td>Initial Environmental Evaluation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IMO</td>
<td>International Maritime Organisation <a href="http://www.imo.org">http://www.imo.org</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IP</td>
<td>Information Paper presented to either the ATCM or CCAMLR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IPO</td>
<td>IPY Program Office</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IPY</td>
<td>International Polar Year</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IUCN</td>
<td>International Union for the Conservation of Nature and Natural Resources (now World Conservation Union) <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>PA</td>
<td>Preliminary Assessment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SATCM</td>
<td>Special Antarctic Treaty Consultative Meeting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SCALOP</td>
<td>Standing Committee on Antarctic Logistics and Operations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SDR</td>
<td>Special Drawing Right</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SEA</td>
<td>Strategic Environmental Assessment (not yet used in ATS)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SPA</td>
<td>Specially Protected Area (now ASPA) <a href="http://www.cep.ag/">http://www.cep.ag/</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SSSI</td>
<td>Site of Special Scientific Interest (now ASPA) <a href="http://www.cep.ag/">http://www.cep.ag/</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TANGO</td>
<td>Tourism and NGOs Working Group (of COMNAP)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WG</td>
<td>Working Group</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WP</td>
<td>Working Paper</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WTO</td>
<td>World Tourism Organization</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX 2 – PRELIMINARY AGENDA ATCM XXXI

1) Opening of the Meeting
2) Election of Officers and creation of Working Groups
3) Adoption of the Agenda and allocation of items
4) Operational 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) Report of the Committee for Environmental Protection
9) Safety and Operations in Antarctica
10) The International Polar Year 2007- 2008
11) Tourism and Non-Governmental Activities in the Antarctic Treaty Area
12) Inspections under the Antarctic Treaty and the Environment Protocol
13) Science Issues, including climate-related research, scientific co-operation and facilitation
14) Operational issues
15) Education issues
16) Exchange of Information
17) Biological Prospecting in Antarctica
18) Preparation of the XXXII Meeting
19) Any other business
20) Adoption of the Final Report
APPENDIX 3 - PROVISIONAL AGENDA CEP XI

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. International Polar Year
6. Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA)
   a. Draft Comprehensive Environmental Evaluations
   b. Other EIA Matters
7. Area Protection and Management Plans
   a. Management Plans
   b. Historic Sites and Monuments
   c. Site Guidelines
   d. Systematic Environmental Geographic Framework
   e. Other Annex V Matters
8. Conservation of Antarctic Flora and Fauna
   a. Quarantine and Non-native Species
   b. Specially Protected Species
   c. Marine Acoustics
   d. Other Annex II Matters
9. Environmental Monitoring and Reporting
   a. Climate Change
   b. Other Environmental Monitoring and Reporting Matters
10. Inspection Reports
11. Emergency Response and Contingency Planning
12. Waste Management
13. Prevention of Marine Pollution
14. Cooperation with Other Organisations
15. General Matters
16. Election of Officers
17. Preparation for Next Meeting
18. Adoption of the Report
19. Closing of the Meeting