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1. Overview

At ATCM XXXI Japan noted that it “would welcome IAATO and ASOC to come to ATCM XXXII with as much information as possible and an analysis of land-based facilities.” Japan also requested all Parties involved “…to verify such information and to provide supplementary information.”

The concept of “land based facilities” can be defined in several ways. For the purposes of this paper, and based on the context in which Japan’s request was made, ASOC will focus on land-based facilities used to support and/or manage tourism, whether by Antarctic Treaty Parties or private interests, both commercial and non-commercial.

In previous papers, ASOC has identified the rise of land-based and state-supported tourism as an important issue in Antarctic tourism. Similarly, IAATO “has regularly noted the existence of Antarctic land-based tourism expeditions departing from South Africa, and visits to land-based facilities on King George Island, in IAATO’s annual overviews of Antarctic Tourism, presented as Information Papers at ATCM.” The issue has been discussed before in some information papers submitted to the ATCM as well as in the literature. As tourism increases in Antarctica, the likelihood of tourism infrastructure ashore also grows. The increase in tourism has led some Parties to take greater action to manage the tourism near their science stations and other facilities. There is a growing recognition among Parties that a more coordinated approach to regulating tourism use of land-based facilities would be helpful.

At the XXXI ATCM it was decided that the UK would coordinate development of a strategic vision for Antarctic tourism. This vision statement could be part of the basis for future tourism regulations. The UK has stated that none of the comments it has received regarding development of a strategic vision for Antarctic tourism “promoted land-based infrastructure.”

This paper updates information presented by ASOC at XXXI ATCM. It describes the current status of land-based facilities linked to tourism activities and discusses some of the issues associated with the growing number of such facilities. This analysis is based on the information publicly available to ASOC, primarily documents submitted to ATCMs as information papers or working papers; websites of National Antarctic Programs or commercial tour operators; and IAATO statistics.

Descriptions of all governmental and private land-based tourist facilities identified during research for this information paper are included in Appendix 1. ASOC would appreciate the inputs of all Parties to a questionnaire that is being circulated in advance of the meeting, which is attached as Appendix 2. Appendix 3 contains extracts of the discussion on land-based tourism facilities at XXXI ATCM.

---

1 Lead authors C. Christian, R. Roura, and J. Barnes.
2 Final Report XXXI ATCM, paragraph 251.
3 Final Report XXXI ATCM, paragraph 251.
4 Final Report XXXI ATCM, paragraphs 211-215 and 247-250 (see Appendix 3 of this document).
5 Many Historic Sites and Monuments are former facilities that constitute the focus of tourism visits (Roura 2009 in press). These will not be included in this analysis except when they are manned or otherwise developed with the apparent or stated purpose of attracting tourism.
6 ASOC 2008.
7 Personal communication from IAATO February 2009.
9 Bastmeijer et al. 2008.
10 UK 2009, p. 2.
11 ASOC 2008.
2. Types of land-based facilities used to support and/or manage tourism

As commercial tourism in Antarctica has expanded and diversified since the early 1990s, the facilities available to tourists on the continent have apparently also increased in number. There are now several types of land-based facilities with primary or partial tourism purposes.\(^{12}\) This paper lists permanent and semi-permanent facilities that offer any services or support to tourists, whether or not their primary purpose is commercial. However, given the difficulties in finding information about some operations, particularly those that involve commercial transactions for the use of facilities, the list is not yet comprehensive.

Operators have established several permanent or semi-permanent facilities on land to support tourism activities. 2041/Inspire Antarctic Expeditions has constructed a permanent base (called E-base) in the outskirts of Bellinghausen Station. E-base operates partly using renewable energy and is conceived as an educational tool for climate change awareness.\(^ {13}\) E-base is linked to leadership training program for corporate and other customers.\(^ {14}\) Aerovias DAP, a tour operator offering flights to and tours of Antarctica, has also established permanent infrastructure, a container hotel and airstrip.\(^ {15}\) Eco-Nelson is a permanent private base that recruits volunteers to help carry out experiments in sustainable living practices, but apparently on a non-profit basis.\(^ {16}\) Volunteers apparently contribute money to help with transportation and living expenses.\(^ {17}\) White Desert,\(^ {18}\) ALE\(^ {19}\) and ALCI\(^ {20}\) have each set up annual camps that are reportedly fully or partly dismantled during the off-season, but are usually reassembled in the same location the next year. These camps all provide the basis for their adventure tour packages, which include activities such as skiing and hiking.

Tourism accommodation has been provided at least at two government facilities, although they are reportedly no longer used for tourism. A hotel built by Chile in Fildes Peninsula in King George Island in the 1980s was used for some years for tourist accommodation,\(^ {21}\) but it is now patronized exclusively by scientists and logistic support personnel.\(^ {22}\) Artigas Station of the Uruguayan Antarctic program provided lodging for tourists during the early 2000s.\(^ {23, 24}\) At the time Uruguay stated that “[visitors] contribute with their personal assistance to the activities involving logistics and direct support…at the same time they provide their material contribution to the development of scientific projects.”\(^ {25}\)

Historic sites are among the most visited sites in Antarctica. Plainly, the management of historic sites is undertaken by Antarctic Treaty Parties. The Antarctic Heritage Trust – UK\(^ {26}\) manages the Port Lockroy historical site (Historic Site and Monument 61). Port Lockroy is manned through the summer and receives a

12 Discussion of types of tourism follows Bastmeijer et al. 2008.
13 “The E-Base serves as a symbolic model for educational, environmental and energy issues throughout the world. Its purpose is to inspire a global audience to tackle the issue of climate change, by showing that when we achieve the seemingly impossible in Antarctica, we can all take small, achievable steps in our own backyards.” http://ebase.2041.com/2009/about-the-e-base/, accessed March 2009.
14 “The location is Antarctica, the last great wilderness on earth...No place on earth provides a more demanding environment to face the ultimate leadership challenge. Here, the Inspire Antarctic Expedition (IAE) program focuses on leadership, teamwork and personal development.” http://expedition.2041.com/2009/about-iae-expeditions/, accessed March 2009.
16 Greenpeace 1994. UK et al (2005:121) do not mention any commercial activity at this facility. It notes that it is privately owned and that research into remote survival skills is undertaken.
22 See XXXI ATCM Final Report, paragraph 215 (Appendix 3 of this document) “Chile noted that the Air Force Hotel was currently used by staff from national programmes, not tourists. Chile noted that it had determined state-sponsored tourism at their stations would be unconstitutional and illegal.”
23 Uruguay 2005.
24 See XXXI ATCM Final Report, paragraph 215 (Appendix 3 of this document).
26 The United Kingdom Antarctic Heritage Trust was set up as a charity in 1993 to conserve the British cultural heritage in Antarctica. http://www.ukaht.org/aboutus.htm, accessed April 2009.
large number of day visitors.\textsuperscript{27} Along similar lines, the Chilean Air Force operates a station that has been converted into an exclusively historic preservation site (Historic Sites and Monuments 30 and 56), which is frequently visited by day visitors.\textsuperscript{28}

Day visits to research stations are a separate category of tourism use of land-based facilities. In this instance the research stations constitute tourism attractions but are not otherwise linked to tourism. Some Parties have restrictive policies regulating tourism visits at their stations. Tourists visited more than twenty research stations in 2007-08, with visitor numbers ranging from less than one hundred to more than five thousands over the tourism season.\textsuperscript{29} Facilities available to tourists may include gift shops or post offices. Usually these facilities do not cater solely to tourists but also are intended for and patronized by base personnel and official visitors. In addition, some stations have established museums, and Arctowski Station has established a Tourism Information Center. Small boat landings and station visits are the most common activity at Antarctic stations; however, tourism-related activities that take place at or around Antarctic stations include extended walks, kayaking, and camping.\textsuperscript{30} These activities may take place as a result of factors such as logistic convenience and the type of attraction that exists around the stations, rather than necessarily as a result of deliberate policy by National Antarctic Programs. Finally, tour operators are permitted to use some government infrastructure such as jetties or airstrips although that is not the principal use of this type of infrastructure.\textsuperscript{31}

3. Some issues regarding tourism and land-based facilities in Antarctica

The main difficulty in assessing the status of land-based facilities that are used to support and/or manage tourism in Antarctica is that accurate, up-to-date information is difficult to obtain. The information available does not show fully the linkages between tourism and the use of land-based facilities. Though there is nothing inherently wrong with tourism visits at science or other government facilities, one concern is that they do not disrupt too much or too often research and related activities.\textsuperscript{32} Potentially, another concern is that facilities built primarily to carry out scientific research end up primarily as tourism-support facilities.

In some cases it appears that tourist visits to research stations are actively sought. For instance, official inspections of several Antarctic stations and other facilities in 2005 and 2006 concluded that some scientific stations “seemed to be going out of their way to attract tourist vessels.”\textsuperscript{33} Some Parties have reportedly stated that tourism is an integral part of their overall Antarctic program.\textsuperscript{34} Finally, some Parties may consider the future installation of tourism facilities including accommodation. For instance, Argentina has reserved “…its right to install at any time interpretative centres for tourists with some lodging capacity in any of its bases.”\textsuperscript{35}

Several National Antarctic Programs have practical arrangements with commercial tour operators: the E-Base (Table 1) describes itself as operating “in co-operation with the Russian Antarctic Division (sic)”\textsuperscript{36} but does not offer information about what this co-operation entails; the Aerovias DAP company uses several

\textsuperscript{27} According to the AHT’s website, “The Trust operates the site [Port Lockroy] as a ‘living museum’… This is made possible only by the proceeds of the small gift shop. Any surplus from the shop proceeds goes towards renovation of other historic sites in Antarctica… The Trust also runs the post-office at Port Lockroy on behalf of the Government of the British Antarctic Territory which donates a proportion of the Post Office revenue to the Trust.” http://www.ukahl.org/portlockroy.htm accessed April 2009.

\textsuperscript{28} For the latest figures available on visitor numbers at research stations see http://www.iaato.org/tourism_stats.html, file “2007-2008 Number of Tourists per Site per Vessel - All Antarctic Sites (6 Sheets in Total) - Rev 1”

\textsuperscript{29} For details about the types of activities at and around research stations, and about the number of tourists engaged in those activities, see www.iaato.org/tourism_stats.html, file “2007-2008 Number of Visits per Site/per Activity (6 Sheets - Sorted by All Sites, Continental and Peninsula) - Rev 1.”

\textsuperscript{30} Bastmeijer et al. 2008, p. 89.

\textsuperscript{31} IAATO policy is that its members’ activities should not interfere with research activity in any way (IAATO, personal communication February 2009).

\textsuperscript{32} USA 2006, p. 11.

\textsuperscript{33} Bastmeijer et al. 2008, p. 93.

\textsuperscript{34} See XXX ATCM Final Report, paragraph 173.

\textsuperscript{35} See http://ebase.2041.com/.
facilities operated by National Antarctic Programs at Fildes Peninsula, including the airstrip and other buildings. Among tourism operators, support for increasing land-based facilities is mixed. IAATO surveys of their members suggest that better landing facilities for ships or airplanes would be perceived as useful, but that hotels and similar permanent facilities that could alter the Antarctic wilderness would not. However, only one of the four companies with extensive land-based facilities (ANI) is a member of IAATO.

Policy makers should consider carefully the environmental impacts of land-based tourism facilities. For instance, White Desert states that it “go[es] further” than the Antarctic Treaty tourism guidelines with its “zero impact policy.” Although this is an admirable goal, it is questionable that one can operate in Antarctica causing “zero impact”. The number of tourism land-based facilities has not changed significantly in recent years, but the continued growth of Antarctic tourism makes an increase in land-based facilities more likely. Such facilities, in addition to potentially being more permanent and having a larger environmental footprint than ship-based tourism, could increase the numbers of tourists visiting previously inaccessible areas. Diversification of activities available to tourists would be more likely to occur if facilities were expanded. Of course, any such expansion should follow EIA procedures mandated under Annex I of the Protocol.

4. Closing remarks

ASOC has worked to the best of its ability to provide the information requested by Japan at ATCM XXXI. However, it is difficult to obtain detailed information on companies that are not IAATO members. As the use of land-based facilities for tourism diversifies and expands it will become increasingly difficult to control this form of tourism without legally binding regulations in place.

Parties, through their EIA and permitting procedures, are well placed to assess the use of land-based facilities by tour operators and paying tourists, including those that are embedded in their own operations. ASOC would appreciate Parties’ assistance in providing information at their disposal that sheds light on these matters.

In this context, we note recommendations by observers conducting inspections under Article VII of the Antarctic Treaty and Article 14 of the Protocol that Parties “… should prepare, and make publicly available, Policy Statements on tourism in relation to their Antarctic stations.” Japan requested all Parties involved [on land-based facilities currently used to support and/or manage tourism] to verify information and to provide supplementary information. It would be opportune for Parties to be fully transparent about their tourism-related activities, and to be proactive in managing land-based tourism in Antarctica.

38 IAATO 2008.
40 Both White Desert and The Antarctic Company have IAATO membership applications under review.
42 Parties are asked to return a questionnaire being circulated separately, so that ASOC can develop a more accurate database of land-based tourism.
43 Australia, Peru, and United Kingdom 2005, p. 10.
44 Final Report XXXI ATCM, paragraph (251).
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Appendix 1: Land-based facilities used to support and/or manage Antarctic tourism

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Facility</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Operator</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Adventure Network International/Antarctic Logistics and Expeditions base camp, Patriot Hills</td>
<td>Location: 80°19’ S 81°16’ W Private land-based tourism facility established in 1985. Currently bills itself as the “only company in the world offering travel into the Antarctic interior” and the “second largest air operator in the Antarctic.” ALE has been contracted by a number of National Operators to provide logistic services in the region. ALE received 260 tourists in 2007-08.</td>
<td>Companies registered in USA. IAATO member.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Antarctic Logistics Center International (ALCI)</td>
<td>Location: 70°49.52’ S 11°37.68’ E Operates flights to the Antarctic continent and provides logistical services to stations including waste management services.</td>
<td>Company registered in South Africa. Not an IAATO member.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. The Antarctic Company (TAC)</td>
<td>Location: Varies, but lands at ALCI location above. Semi-permanent camp near 70°46’0”S 11°44’0”E Provides a variety of overnight stay programs including ski trips. Some tour groups stay at &quot;guesthouse&quot; on Schirmacher Oasis, which includes a sauna. Transportation to and from the continent is provided by ALCI.</td>
<td>Company registered in South Africa. IAATO membership application under review</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. White Desert</td>
<td>Location: Near 70°46.43’ S 011°51.90’E Private land-based tourism facility established ca. 2007. Offers overnight camping. States that they have “zero impact” on environment because they dismantle camp every season and power camp with solar and wind energy. All waste is transported back to South Africa.</td>
<td>Company registered in the United Kingdom and South Africa. Field operations run by nationals from these and other ATCPs. Not an IAATO member.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Aerovías DAP “container hotel”, Fildes Peninsula, King George Island</td>
<td>Location: 62°12.00’S 058°57.85’W Private land-based accommodation and associated facilities in the Frei-Bellingshausen complex. The “container hotel” was installed by DAP. Tour packages include flights to Antarctic base on private aircraft and overnight stay in container hotel.</td>
<td>Company registered in Chile. Field operations run by mostly Chilean nationals. Not an IAATO member.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Hotel at Marsh/Frei, Fildes</td>
<td>Location: 62°12.00’S 058°57.85’W</td>
<td>Chilean Air Force</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

45 This is an updated version of a table first published in ASOC 2008.
46 It is assumed that the permitting authority corresponds to the state in which the operator is based.
49 ALCI appears to be a company consisting of the South African branch of the St. Petersburg-based company INTAARI (Russia) and The Antarctic Company. INTAARI is more oriented towards base logistics; TAC towards tourist logistics. See http://www.antarctic-company.com/alci.htm, accessed February 2009.
51 UK-registered company with offices in London and Cape Town. Staff members are nationals from UK, Russia, South Africa, Norway and Canada. See www.white-desert.com, accessed February 2009.
52 This is one of several different names by which the island is known. See ASOC 2007.
53 Chile-registered companies (Aerovías DAP and DAP Antártica) with main office in Punta Arenas, Chile. See www.aeroviasdap.cl, accessed February 2009.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Facility</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Operator</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Peninsula, King George Island</td>
<td>State-operated accommodation established in 1983. Formerly used for tourism accommodation, it is now used solely for official guests or scientific personnel.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Artigas Base, Fildes Peninsula, King George Island</td>
<td>Location: 62°11.07’S 058°54.15’W Visitor program at a national research station. Program was billed as &quot;scientific tourism&quot; that helped the base continued operations. Tourists also assisted with actual tasks at the base. Reportedly the base is not currently in use for tourism.</td>
<td>Uruguayan Antarctic Institute</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Airstrip at Marsh/Frei, Fildes Peninsula, King George Island</td>
<td>Location: 62°12.00’S 058°57.85’W National program airstrip used for a range of purposes including landing of tourism aircraft, such as those from the Chilean company Aerovias DAP.</td>
<td>Chilean Air Force</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Port Lockroy, Goudier Island</td>
<td>Location: 64°49´S 63°29´W Former year-round station designated as Historic Site and Monument 61, operating as a summer-only station and “living museum” since the late 1990s. Also has a gift shop and post office, whose proceeds support the maintenance of the site.</td>
<td>British Antarctic Survey. Now managed by the Antarctic Heritage Trust – UK.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Gabriel González Videla, Waterboat Point</td>
<td>Location: 64°49´S 62°52´W Former station with two associated Historic Sites and Monuments (30 and 56) refurbished to receive tourism visits, including the establishment of a museum.</td>
<td>Chilean Air Force</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Tourist Information Centre at Arctowski Station, King George Island</td>
<td>Location: 62°09.57´S 058°28.25´W Tourism management facility and souvenir shop at Arctowski Station.</td>
<td>Polish Academy of Sciences</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. E-Base/Inspire Antarctic Expeditions, Bellingshausen</td>
<td>Location: 62°12´S 58°58´W Corporate-sponsored private land based</td>
<td>British nationals “in cooperation with the Russian Antarctic</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

55 Bastmeijer et al. 2008, p. 89.  
56 See XXXI ATCM Final Report, paragraph 215 (Appendix 3 of this document).  
57 Uruguay 2005.  
58 The current status of Port Lockroy is described by the British Antarctic Survey as follows: “Designated as Historic Site No 61 under the Antarctic Treaty, 19 May 1995. Restored 14 Jan 1996-18 Mar 1996. Since Nov 1996 the station has been run as an Historic Site and is open to tourists and visitors during austral summer seasons.” [http://www.antarctica.ac.uk/about_bas/our_history/stations_and_refuges/port_lockroy.php](http://www.antarctica.ac.uk/about_bas/our_history/stations_and_refuges/port_lockroy.php), accessed April 2009. The Antarctic Heritage Trust–UK describes the current status of Port Lockroy as follows: “Port Lockroy is on Goudier Island (64°49’S, 63°29’W) in the Antarctic Peninsula. Following a conservation survey in 1994, British ‘Base A’ - Port Lockroy was recognised for its historical importance and designated as Historic Site and Monument No. 61 under the Antarctic Treaty. The buildings were renovated in 1996 by a team from the British Antarctic Survey (BAS) and since then opened to visitors during the Antarctic summer… The Trust operates the site as a ‘living museum’. This is made possible only by the proceeds of the small gift shop. Any surplus from the shop proceeds goes towards renovation of other historic sites in Antarctica…The Trust also runs the post-office at Port Lockroy on behalf of the Government of the British Antarctic Territory which donates a proportion of the Post Office revenue to the Trust.” [http://www.ukaht.org/portlockroy.htm](http://www.ukaht.org/portlockroy.htm), accessed April 2009.  
60 Chile 2007, 2008.  
61 UK et al. 1999, p. 11.  
62 Coca Cola Europe and the UK’s Npower. Coca Cola has been a sponsor for five years; Npower’s relationship with E-Base seems to have lasted only one year, August 2007 – August 2008. See [http://ebase.2041.com/2008/support/](http://ebase.2041.com/2008/support/), accessed March 2009.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Facility</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Operator</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Station, Fildes Peninsula, King George Island</td>
<td>facilities, composed of a building, a large tent and a Mongolian yurt, combining education activities with tourism targeted to corporate training. Expeditions take place once a year and last about two weeks.</td>
<td>Division (sic)” at Bellingshausen station.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. “Eco Nelson”, Nelson Island</td>
<td>Location: 62˚18′S 59˚03′W Private land based facility established in 1988. It has been occupied almost continuously since then. Conducts experiments in “green” living. Encourages participation of wide variety of people to provide a representative sample for their experiments.</td>
<td>Czech nationals</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. Planned museum, Esperanza Station, Hope Bay</td>
<td>Location: 63˚23.70′S 056˚59.77′W The base, was converting one of its buildings into a museum in late 2006 but further information on its current status was not found.</td>
<td>Argentine Army, in coordination with Argentina’s National Antarctic Directorate</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

65 In the early 1990s it was reported that Eco Nelson was organized by an outfit called the Czech Antarctic Environment Program, which received 10-15% of its funding from the Czech government (Greenpeace 1994).
66 USA 2006, p. 35.
Appendix 2 - Questionnaire on the use of land based facilities in Antarctica by tourists and/or tour operators

See next page.
QUESTIONNAIRE ON THE USE OF LAND BASED FACILITIES IN ANTARCTICA
BY TOURISTS AND/OR TOUR OPERATORS.

Distributed by The Antarctic and Southern Ocean Coalition at XXXII ATCM, Baltimore, April 2009

Institution name:
Address:
Officially represented by:
Position
Phone: E-mail:

1. **Does your program have a policy for tourism use of your land-based facilities?**
   - Yes
   - No
   Please provide details in a separate sheet.

2. **Please list the use or uses by tourists and/or tour operators of land based facilities operated by your program:**
   - Basic hospitality (i.e. brief station visits)
   - Gift shop
   - Post office
   - Bar/canteen services
   - Overnight accommodation in buildings
   - Camping
   - Airstrip use
   - Jetty use
   - Tourism transfers e.g. fly-sail
   - None
   - Other (specify)

   Please specify the locations (name, lat/long) in a separate sheet.

3. **Are these facilities used by tourists and/or tour operators on commercial bases (excluding purchases at gift shops and use of postal services)?**
   - Yes
   - No
   Other (specify)

4. **Are you aware of land-based facilities (not belonging to your program) that are used for tourism purposes in your area of operations?**
   - Yes
   - No
   Please specify the locations (name, lat/long) in a separate sheet.

5. **Any other comment about this topic? Please include in a separate sheet.**

**Thank you in advance.** Please send the questionnaire to: ASOC Secretariat, 1630 Connecticut Ave NW, Washington, DC 20009 USA; fax: 1-202-387-4823; Claire.christian@asoc.org.
Appendix 3: Extracts from the XXXI ATCM Final Report

(211) ASOC presented IP 41 *A Decade of Antarctic tourism: Status, change, and actions needed* summarizing tourism trends, concerns, and proposals for action. It noted that tourism over the past decade had been characterized by increases in total number and diversification of activities, and that the current management regime includes local and technical aspects, voluntary guidelines, and Measure 4 (2004), which had not yet become effective. The paper summarized these instruments, many of which had been in reaction to tourism developments. ASOC noted that tourism could become the predominant activity in Antarctica, and result in erosion of values in the Treaty and Protocol.

(212) ASOC noted that a range of actions is needed, including development of a strategic vision as a first priority, as well as development of new instruments and improvement in implementation of existing instruments. It was its view that a resolution concerning the ATCM’s views on the growth of tourism would be a concrete action that could be taken at this meeting. It also noted the importance of working with the IMO on shipping guidelines and taking action to prevent the establishment of new land-based tourism facilities. ASOC further suggested that the ATCM could build on existing tools, in particular ASMAs, site guidelines, and the environmental impact assessment process.

(213) Parties thanked ASOC for its useful and thought-provoking paper, noting this was an excellent synthesis of the status of the tourism issues in the Treaty area. One Party noted that it would be useful to clarify definitions of terms such as “government sponsored tourism”, “commercial tourism”, and “non-commercial tourism”.

(214) Parties discussed the reference in the ASOC paper to World Park Antarctica. Several Parties noted a variety of views on the management and role of “parks” vs. “reserves”. Some Parties recalled that under the Protocol Antarctica was designated a natural reserve devoted to peace and science and that in all cases, tourism needed to be consistent with environmental and aesthetic values in Antarctica and with the scope and purposes of the Treaty and Protocol.

(215) Chile thanked ASOC for the list of infrastructures already existent in Antarctica. Another Party requested clarification from Parties listed in IP 41 as the competent authorities for land-based tourism concerning certain descriptions in the report. Parties clarified their positions as follows: - Chile noted that the Air Force Hotel was currently used by staff from national programmes, not tourists. Chile noted that it had determined state-sponsored tourism at their stations would be unconstitutional and illegal.

- Uruguay clarified that all of their work in Antarctica is currently related to the International Polar Year, and that its land-based facilities are not currently in use for tourism. The visitors’ programme at BCAA was implemented on a small scale and like a non-commercial activity.

- The United Kingdom noted that it had undertaken an investigation of White Desert. It found that this company markets space already in use under other authorized programmes through other Parties. The United Kingdom also noted that Port Lockroy was a former base and was now a living museum, and a study location for human impacts.

- Argentina clarified that the planned museum referenced to Argentina’s Army was actually under management of Argentina’s national programme.

- The United States noted that the ALE operation at Patriot Hills was subject to US regulations, had undergone a thorough environmental impact assessment, and that it is a temporary field camp, which was subject to advance notification requirements.

(247) IAATO presented IP 84 *Land-Based Tourism and the Development of Land-Based Tourism Infrastructure in Antarctica: An IAATO Perspective*, hoping that it would make a constructive and practical contribution to the discussion on land-based tourism. IAATO welcomed the comments from various Parties that referred to IP 84 in previous discussions.

(248) IAATO recalled that it had supported the adoption of Resolution 5 (2007) and noted that it was not currently interested in promoting or funding the construction of major facilities, such as hotel accommodations.
(249) Parties thanked IAATO for its useful paper. They expressed encouragement to non-IAATO operators to provide data on their operations to the ATCM.

(250) The Meeting thanked IAATO and ASOC for their information in IPs 41 and 84 identifying land-based facilities currently used to support and/or manage tourism.

(251) Japan would welcome IAATO and ASOC to come to ATCM XXXII with as much information as possible and an analysis of land-based facilities. Japan also requested all Parties involved to verify such information and to provide supplementary information.