

## ACRONYMS AND ABBREVIATIONS

<b>ACAP</b>	Agreement on the Conservation of Albatrosses and Petrels
<b>ASOC</b>	Antarctic and Southern Ocean Coalition
<b>ASMA</b>	Antarctic Specially Managed Area
<b>ASPA</b>	Antarctic Specially Protected Area
<b>ATS</b>	Antarctic Treaty System; Antarctic Treaty Secretariat
<b>ATCM</b>	Antarctic Treaty Consultative Meeting
<b>ATCP</b>	Antarctic Treaty Consultative Party
<b>CAML</b>	Census of Antarctic Marine Life
<b>CCAMLR</b>	Convention on the Conservation of Antarctic Marine Living Resources and/or Commission for the Conservation of Antarctic Marine Living Resources
<b>CCAS</b>	Convention for the Conservation of Antarctic Seals
<b>CEE</b>	Comprehensive Environmental Evaluation
<b>CEP</b>	Committee for Environmental Protection
<b>COMNAP</b>	Council of Managers of National Antarctic Programmes
<b>EIA</b>	Environmental Impact Assessment
<b>HCA</b>	Hydrographic Committee on Antarctica
<b>HSM</b>	Historic Site and Monument
<b>IAATO</b>	International Association of Antarctica Tour Operators
<b>ICG</b>	Intersessional Contact Group
<b>ICSU</b>	International Council for Science
<b>IEE</b>	Initial Environmental Evaluation
<b>IHO</b>	International Hydrographic Organization
<b>IMO</b>	International Maritime Organization
<b>IOC</b>	Intergovernmental Oceanographic Commission.
<b>IP</b>	Information Paper
<b>IPY</b>	International Polar Year

<b>IPY-IPO</b>	IPY Programme Office
<b>IUCN</b>	International Union for Conservation of Nature and Natural Resources – The World Conservation Union
<b>RFMO</b>	Regional Fishery Management Organisation
<b>SATCM</b>	Special Antarctic Treaty Consultative Meeting
<b>SCAR</b>	Scientific Committee on Antarctic Research
<b>SCALOP</b>	Standing Committee for Antarctic Logistics and Operations
<b>SC-CCAMLR</b>	Scientific Committee of CCAMLR
<b>SPA</b>	Specially Protected Area
<b>SSSI</b>	Site of Special Scientific Interest
<b>UNEP</b>	United Nations Environment Programme
<b>WG</b>	Working Group
<b>WMO</b>	World Meteorological Organization
<b>WP</b>	Working Paper
<b>WTO</b>	World Tourism Organization
<b>WWF</b>	Worldwide Fund for Nature

# **PART I**

# **FINAL REPORT**

# Final Report of the Twenty-Ninth Antarctic Treaty Consultative Meeting

**Edinburgh, United Kingdom, 12-23 June 2006**

- (1) Pursuant to Article IX of the Antarctic Treaty, Representatives of the Consultative Parties (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 of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, the United States of America and Uruguay) met in Edinburgh from 12 to 23 June 2006, for the purpose of exchanging information, holding consultations, and considering and recommending to their Governments measures in furtherance of the principles and objectives of the Treaty.
- (2) The Meeting was also attended by Delegations from the following Contracting Parties to the Antarctic Treaty which are not Consultative Parties: Austria, Canada, the Czech Republic, Estonia, Greece, Romania and Switzerland. A delegation from Malaysia was present by invitation of ATCM XXVIII to observe the Meeting. A delegation from Belarus was present from 19 June 2006 to observe the Meeting by invitation of ATCM XXIX.
- (3) In accordance with Rules 2 and 31 of the Rules of Procedure, Observers from the Commission for the Conservation of Antarctic Marine Living Resources (CCAMLR), the Scientific Committee on Antarctic Research (SCAR), and the Council of Managers of National Antarctic Programmes (COMNAP) attended the Meeting.
- (4) In accordance with Rule 39 of the Rules of Procedure, Experts from the following International Organizations and Non-Governmental Organizations were invited to attend the Meeting: the interim secretariat of the Agreement on the Conservation of Albatrosses and Petrels (ACAP), the Antarctic and Southern Ocean Coalition (ASOC), the International Association of Antarctica Tour Operators (IAATO), the International Hydrographic Organization (IHO), the International Maritime Organization (IMO), the Intergovernmental Oceanographic Commission (IOC), the International Programme Office for the International Polar Year (IPY-IPO), the International Union for the Conservation of Nature (IUCN), the World Tourism Organization (WTO), the World Meteorological Organization (WMO) and the United Nations Environment Programme (UNEP).
- (5) The Host Country fulfilled its information requirements towards the Contracting Parties, Observers and Experts through Secretariat Circular Notes, letters and a website, which included both public and restricted areas.

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

- (6) In accordance with Rules 5 and 6 of the Rules of Procedure, Dr. Mike Richardson, Head of the United Kingdom Delegation, opened the Meeting and proposed Sir Michael Wood, KCMG as Chair of ATCM XXIX. The proposal was accepted. Sir Michael Wood made an opening statement (**Annex D, page XXX** of this Report).
- (7) The Chair recalled the loss of life in the field since the last ATCM, in particular the tragedies on King George Island and nearby on the Antarctic Peninsula; he also recalled the passing of Mr. Tore Gjelsvik of Norway and Dr John Heap of the United Kingdom, two leading figures of the Antarctic Treaty System. The Meeting observed a minute's silence.
- (8) Opening addresses were given by Her Royal Highness, the Princess Royal, and Lord Triesman, Parliamentary Under-Secretary of State at the United Kingdom's Foreign and Commonwealth Office.
- (9) Her Royal Highness expressed her delight at having the opportunity to welcome delegates to Edinburgh, and pointed out how appropriate the venue was given the recent celebrations of the centenary of the Scottish National Expedition to Antarctica. The Antarctic Treaty was a model for international dialogue and collaboration, that could usefully be used more widely. She stressed the importance of preserving the heritage of Antarctic exploration and honouring the fortitude and courage of the early explorers, and highlighted the work of the United Kingdom and New Zealand Heritage Trusts. She commended the work of the Antarctic Treaty System in protecting and preserving the continent. Her Royal Highness looked forward to the International Polar Year 2007 - 2008, both as a new commitment to scientific endeavour and as a commemoration of what went before, particularly the International Geophysical Year which was a major trigger for the negotiations of the Antarctic Treaty. Her Royal Highness' speech is at **Annex D, page XXX**.
- (10) Lord Triesman pointed out that the United Kingdom last hosted an ATCM in 1977, and was honoured and privileged to be doing so again. He highlighted the United Kingdom's long history of exploration and scientific endeavour in Antarctica and the activities of the British Antarctic Survey, which had contributed greatly to the success of international science in Antarctica. Lord Triesman stressed that climate change continued to be the most pressing global environmental priority and that the polar regions provided a barometer for such change. He emphasised the importance that the United Kingdom attached to the International Polar Year and expressed the hope that the Antarctic Treaty system would seek opportunities to work collaboratively with the Arctic Council. He highlighted the important work being carried out by the Antarctic Treaty system with regard to Antarctic tourism, but posed the question whether it was sensible to allow increasingly larger cruise ships access to Antarctic waters. Lord Triesman's speech is at **Annex D, page XXX**.
- (11) The Chair reported that Belarus had indicated that it intended to accede to the Antarctic Treaty and had asked to send a member of its National Academy of Sciences to the Meeting. The Parties agreed that Belarus should be invited "to observe" ATCM XXIX, on the understanding that it intends to accede to the Antarctic Treaty between now and ATCM XXX to be held in New Delhi, and that the invitation extends to ATCM XXIX only.

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

- (12) Dr Rasik Ravindra, Head of the Delegation of India (host country of ATCM XXX) was elected Vice-Chair. In accordance with Rule 7 of the Rules of Procedure, Mr. Jan Huber, Executive Secretary of the Antarctic Treaty Secretariat, acted as Secretary to the Meeting. Mr Paul Davies, head of the Host Country Secretariat, acted as Deputy Secretary.
- (13) Three Working Groups were established:
- Working Group on Legal and Institutional Affairs;
  - Working Group on Tourism and non-Governmental Activities;
  - Working Group on Operational Matters.
- (14) The following Chairs of the Working Groups were elected:
- Legal and Institutional Working Group: Professor Olav Orheim of Norway;
  - Tourism and non-Governmental Activities Working Group: Mr. Michel Trinquier of France;
  - Operational Matters Working Group: Dr. José Retamales of Chile.

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

- (15) The following Agenda was adopted:
1. Opening of the Meeting.
  2. Election of Officers and creation of Working Groups.
  3. Adoption of the Agenda and allocation of items.
  4. Operation of the Antarctic Treaty System: Reports by Parties, Observers and Experts.
  5. Operation of the Antarctic Treaty System: General matters.
  6. Operation of the Antarctic Treaty System: Review of the Secretariat's situation.
  7. Report of the Committee for Environmental Protection.
  8. Liability: Implementation of Decision 1 (2005).
  9. Safety and Operations in Antarctica.
  10. Relevance of Developments in the Arctic and in the Antarctic.
  11. The International Polar Year 2007-2008.
  12. Tourism and non-Governmental Activities in the Antarctic Treaty Area.
  13. Inspections under the Antarctic Treaty and the Environmental Protocol.
  14. Science Issues, particularly scientific co-operation and facilitation.

15. Operational issues.
16. Education issues.
17. Exchange of Information.
18. Biological Prospecting in Antarctica.
19. Preparation of the XXX Meeting
20. Adoption of the Final Report.

- (16) The Meeting adopted the following allocation of agenda items:

Plenary: Items 1, 2, 3, 4, 7, 19 and 20  
 Legal and Institutional Working Group: Items 5, 6, 8 and 18  
 Tourism and non-Governmental Activities Working Group: Item 12  
 Operational Matters Working Group: Items 9,10,11,13,14,15,16 and 17

The Meeting also decided to allocate draft instruments arising out of the work of the Committee for Environmental Protection to the Legal and Institutional Working Group for consideration of their legal and institutional aspects. The Meeting further decided to discuss agenda item 11, together with elements of agenda item 10, at a special plenary session on 19 June 2006 to discuss the International Polar Year.

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

- (17) Pursuant to Recommendation XIII-2, the Meeting received reports from:
- The United States Government as Depositary of the Antarctic Treaty;
  - The Australian Government as Depositary of the Convention on the Conservation of Antarctic Marine Living Resources (CCAMLR);
  - The United Kingdom Government as Depositary of the Convention for the Conservation of Antarctic Seals (CCAS);
  - The Australian Government as Depositary of the Agreement on the Conservation of Albatrosses and Petrels (ACAP);
  - Sweden, as the Treaty Parties' Representative at the United Nations General Assembly;
  - The Commission for the Conservation of Antarctic Marine Living Resources (CCAMLR);
  - The Scientific Committee on Antarctic Research (SCAR);
  - The Council of Managers of National Antarctic Programs (COMNAP).

These reports are reproduced at **Annex F**.

- (18) In relation to Article III-2 of the Antarctic Treaty, the Meeting also received reports from:
- The Antarctic and Southern Ocean Coalition (ASOC);
  - The International Association of Antarctica Tour Operators (IAATO);
  - The International Hydrographical Organization (IHO);
  - The International Union for the Conservation of Nature (IUCN).

These reports are reproduced at **Annex G**.

- (19) The United States, in its capacity as Depositary, reported on the status of the Antarctic Treaty and the Protocol on Environmental Protection (see Annex F, page xxx). In the previous year, no new countries had acceded to the Treaty or the Protocol. One Delegation noted that a number of Parties to the Treaty had not yet become party to the Environmental Protocol. It hoped that they would give consideration at this meeting or subsequently to becoming party to the Protocol.
- (20) Australia, in its capacity as Depositary for CCAMLR, reported that since ATCM XXVIII, the Cook Islands had acceded to the Convention (see Annex F, page xxx).
- (21) The United Kingdom, as Depositary of CCAS, was grateful that Parties had submitted their reports on time and requested that they continue to do so (see Annex F, page xxx).
- (22) In its capacity as the Depositary for ACAP, Australia reported that since ATCM XXVIII Chile, France and Peru had become parties to the Agreement (see Annex F, page xxx).
- (23) Sweden reported that, at the request of ATCM XXVIII, they had delivered a statement on behalf of the Treaty Parties to the United Nations General Assembly debate on the Question of Antarctica in November 2005. (see Annex F, page xxx).
- (24) The Executive Secretary CCAMLR introduced its report (see Annex F, page xxx), and emphasized the need for further dialogue and consistency of standards for the protection of the environment by all Parties.
- (25) The President of SCAR introduced its report (see Annex F, page xxx) and emphasised the fundamental importance of scientific endeavour to the Antarctic Treaty. He also reported that Portugal and Denmark had applied to become members of SCAR.
- (26) The representative of COMNAP drew attention to the following five aspects of its Report (see Annex F, page xxx): environmental monitoring; environmental protection; safety; international co-operation; exchange of information.
- (27) The representative of the IHO introduced its report (see Annex G, page xxx), and informed the Meeting of the first World Hydrology Day, to take place on 21 June 2006. He also drew the Parties' attention to the recommendations at the end of its report, highlighting in particular the priority shortlist of surveys of key marine corridors, which he hoped would receive extra attention during the IPY.
- (28) The Meeting acknowledged the increasing demand for hydrographic INT charts and the progress made so far made in their production. It welcomed the

procedure established for the collection and rendering of Hydrographic Data approved by the Hydrographic Committee for Antarctica (HCA), and the short-list of High Priority Surveys identified by the HCA. The Meeting further invited the IHO to continue efforts to increase the coverage of hydrographic information in Antarctica, especially in main passages and ports and where there are vulnerable or protected marine areas, and urged greater involvement in the work of the HCA by all Consultative Parties.

- (29) The representative of IAATO introduced the Report of IAATO 2005-2006 (see Annex G, page xxx). Membership has risen to 80 (up by five since the previous year) and IAATO has implemented a number of measures including improved ship scheduling, data collection and operating procedures to minimise environmental impact. IAATO will continue to cooperate with all groups and invited representatives to attend the next annual meeting in Hobart in June 2007. It was underlined that statistics on tourism could be misinterpreted; care was needed to avoid false impressions. Although tourism was increasing, in IAATO's view it was well-managed with a good environmental impact assessment system in place.
- (30) The representative of ASOC introduced its report (see Annex G, page xxx). She emphasized the need for substantive discussions over tourism, marine protected areas and environmental impact assessments. ASOC had participated in the stimulating CEP workshop and looked forward to concrete discussions about limiting the human footprint in Antarctica, sharing of scientific logistics, incorporating climate change into long-term strategies and developing of marine protected areas. ASOC stressed the urgent need to have substantive discussions on the scale and spread of commercial tourism, land-based tourism and a legally-based regulatory framework for tourism activities. ASOC noted that in view of the boom in infrastructure development in Antarctica, cumulative impacts needed to be accounted for more explicitly in environmental impact assessments. New scientific information, such as in the case of the connectivity of sub-glacial lakes, should be taken into account before proposed activities actually commence.

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

- (31) The Meeting decided to send a Message to stations in the Antarctic on Mid-Winter's Day (Southern Hemisphere) (**Annex J, page XXX**).

#### *CCAMLR in the Antarctic Treaty System*

- (32) New Zealand introduced WP 14 *CCAMLR in the Antarctic Treaty System* proposing stronger links between the ATCM and CCAMLR. New Zealand acknowledged that CCAMLR was a separate decision-making body with its own specific mandate but observed that it was not independent of the Consultative Parties. New Zealand took the view that the "special obligations" of the Consultative Parties, recognised in Article V of the Convention, required Consultative Parties to provide comment to the Commission on matters related to the protection of the Antarctic environment and matters having wider implications for the Antarctic Treaty system.

- (33) A number of delegations thanked New Zealand for its paper, agreeing in principle that there needed to be close synergy and cooperation between CCAMLR and the ATCM, and proposed various amendments to the draft resolution proposed by New Zealand, particularly to avoid any impression that CCAMLR was subservient to the ATCM. Some delegations were also in agreement that the composition of delegations to ATCMs and meetings of CCAMLR should reflect adequate expertise of the Antarctic Treaty system, although others pointed out that it was for the Parties themselves to determine the composition of their delegations.
- (34) The Meeting recalled that acceding states to CCAMLR are bound by the Convention to respect the principles and purposes of the Antarctic Treaty. Notwithstanding this, some delegations noted that there were acceding states to CCAMLR which were not Contracting Parties to the Antarctic Treaty and that this had contributed to a degree of asymmetry between CCAMLR and the ATCM. Many delegations considered that it would be useful for such states to accede to the Antarctic Treaty so ensuring a greater degree of consistency across the Antarctic Treaty system. Other delegations noted that since such states were bound to respect the principles and purposes of the Antarctic Treaty, they were not to that end in need to accede to it. Resolution 1 (2006) on CCAMLR in the Antarctic Treaty system was adopted.
- (35) The Meeting received with appreciation the information from China that it was in the process of acceding to CCAMLR, and noted the importance of Consultative Parties conducting or planning to conduct harvesting in the area of CCAMLR to accede to the Convention and seek subsequent membership of its Commission.
- (36) It was suggested that the New Zealand proposal be extended to consider the effectiveness of the relationship between organisations across the entire ATS. A number of countries expressed reservations about committing to such an initiative without further information. The IPY might provide a platform for an initiative to improve cooperation further.

*The Enquiry Procedure of Article 18 of the Environment Protocol*

- (37) Chile presented WP 43 *The Enquiry Procedure of Article 18*, which discussed the creation of a procedure for dealing with disputes under Article 3 of the Madrid Protocol. The Meeting congratulated Chile for this comprehensive analysis. It recalled the requirements in this respect recorded in the Final Act of the 1991 Madrid SATCM. It further noted that the Chilean Paper would be useful in certain situations that potentially might arise from the Liability Annex. However, for the present, there seemed to be no pressing need to develop the Enquiry Procedure further.

*Document Formatting Guidelines*

- (38) The Secretariat introduced SP 2 rev. 1 *Documents for ATCM XXIX and CEP IX: Formatting Guidelines*. The Meeting thanked the Secretariat for its work and requested that the document be converted into a manual to be available electronically. The Meeting also noted that papers were on occasion submitted

covering more than one agenda item. It was agreed that delegations should be encouraged to avoid this.

*Review of the Status of Recommendations and Measures*

- (39) The Meeting discussed the review of the status of Recommendations (prior to 1995) and Measures (1995 onwards), focusing in particular on SP5 *Legal status of the ATCM measures on protected areas*, presented by the Executive Secretary. It determined that the primary focus of the exercise, for the time being, should be on Recommendations and Measures related to area protection and management, taking into account Annex V to the Environmental Protocol. The Meeting expressed its desire to consider whether a resolution or decision might be adopted at ATCM XXX listing certain Recommendations and Measures that are not “current” (appropriate terminology to be further considered) and therefore require no further action by the Parties. Another list might specify all Recommendations and Measures regarding the operation of the system for area protection and management that are “current” and therefore require implementation. This would be particularly helpful for new Parties.
- (40) To facilitate its work in this regard, the Meeting requested that the US chair an open-ended inter-sessional email contact group to perform the following tasks, where feasible: (i) review in detail all Recommendations and Measures related to area protection and management; (ii) propose which Recommendations and Measures would be appropriate for citation in a resolution or decision on this subject; (iii) draft a proposed resolution or decision; and (iv) prepare a working paper on the subject for consideration by ATCM XXX. The Meeting requested the Secretariat to assist the contact group in performing the above tasks, particularly with respect to assembling appropriate documentation, as requested.
- (41) The Meeting underscored that the purpose of the exercise was to clarify the status of Recommendations and Measures relating to area protection and management, and not to alter the respective legal positions of the Parties regarding the Protocol and relevant Recommendations and Measures.
- (42) The Meeting agreed that, after completion of the review of Recommendations and Measures related to area protection and management, the status of past instruments related to all other aspects of environmental protection in the Antarctic Treaty area should be considered. It requested the Secretariat to prepare a paper for the consideration of ATCM XXX, providing a broad overview of all ATCM instruments, categorised by general subject matter, and a detailed analysis of past instruments related to all other aspects of environmental protection, similar in nature to SP5.

*Review of Annex II to the Protocol on Environmental Protection to the Antarctic Treaty*

- (43) The CEP Chair introduced a non-paper on Annex II prepared by the Secretariat, and indicated that this review was a re-issue of the CEP’s advice on Annex II revisions (see Appendix 9 attached to CEP Report VII (2004)). He suggested that a major issue was related to the scope of the Annex, i.e. whether it should address all Antarctic living organisms. If the title was not amended, the review of the revisions might be done fairly rapidly.

- (44) Some delegations felt that the advice from the CEP was insufficient to enable the Meeting to arrive at a conclusion on this matter. They believed that further technical and scientific work was needed with regard to the review of Annex II. Other delegations indicated that the advice of the CEP, though being comprehensive, did not reflect a consensus. They reminded the Meeting that the advice of the CEP need not be consensual. Some delegations did not believe that Annex II should be remitted back to the CEP. The Meeting concluded that this issue would need to be discussed at ATCM XXX.
- (45) The UK prepared a Working Paper (WP 44 *Review of Annex II of the Environmental Protocol*) to illustrate the consequences of not amending the title of Annex II, as advised by the CEP Chair, to assist consideration by Parties in the inter-sessional period. Australia underscored that any Working Paper on this issue would in no way change the advice of the CEP, which remains on the table. The UK stressed that, notwithstanding WP 44 the UK might produce a further Working Paper on the issue of Annex II for ATCM XXX setting out its own position.

*Other matters*

- (46) Chile introduced WP35 *Draft Elements for the Edinburgh Declaration. International Polar Year 2007-2009*. Delegations thanked Chile for its paper, which was discussed under Item 11 below.
- (47) Argentina rejected the incorrect references at this ATCM XXIX made in, *inter alia*, documents, reports, brochures, bibliography, and other publications, concerning the territorial status of the Malvinas (Falkland) Islands, South Georgia and South Sandwich Islands and the surrounding waters, subject to a sovereignty dispute between Argentina and the United Kingdom. This dispute has been recognised by several international organisations. Argentina reaffirmed that those islands and the surrounding waters are an integral part of the Argentine National Territory. Argentina also rejects elements in IP 86 *IAATO Overview of Antarctic Tourism 2005-2006 Antarctic Season* (pp 5, 14, 20) and IP 90 *Report of the International Association of Antarctica Tour Operators 2005-2006* (pp 3, 26) to which paras 47 and 49 of the Final Report of XXVIII ATCM, *mutatis mutandi*, apply.
- (48) In response to Argentina the United Kingdom indicated that it had no doubt about its sovereignty over the Falkland Islands, South Georgia and the South Sandwich Islands and their surrounding maritime areas and, with respect to Argentina's reference to paras 47 and 49 of last year's Final Report, the United Kingdom recalled its statement in paragraph 48 of that report.
- (49) Argentina rejected the statements by the UK and reiterated its well-known legal position. At the same time, while recalling what was stated at previous meetings, it suggested that, in order to make discussions easier, any reference to areas outside the Antarctic Treaty area should be avoided.

**Item 6: Operation of the Antarctic Treaty System: Situation of the Secretariat**

*Reports 2004/5 and 2005/6*

- (50) The Executive Secretary presented SP6 containing the revised Antarctic Treaty Secretariat Financial Report for 2004/05. Since the last ATCM external auditors had been appointed and the Report audited.
- (51) The Executive Secretary introduced SP 3 rev1 containing the Secretariat Report for 2005/6. Following comments from last year, the format of the Report had been altered to cover four main areas of activity: Support for ATCM/CEP; Information Exchange; Documentation; and Public Information.
- (52) The Meeting welcomed the valuable work that had been undertaken by the Secretariat. This included invaluable assistance to the host countries of ATCM XXVIII and XXIX and also to India as host for next year's Consultative Meeting. The Meeting also recognised specific achievements including plans to update the Antarctic Treaty Handbook and to transfer the CEP website to the Secretariat. The Executive Secretary indicated that the staff complement of the Secretariat was now complete. Several delegations acknowledged that, despite this, it would still take some time for all of the functions of the Secretariat to be addressed. Some Parties queried the scale of the representational costs listed in the account. The Executive Secretary noted those concerns and confirmed that he would follow Parties' advice.
- (53) Delegations noted that Rule 46 of the Rules of Procedure had been negotiated at length and needed to be fulfilled by the Secretariat. It was necessary for the Executive Secretary to "ensure that all Consultative Parties acknowledge receipt" pursuant to Rule 46 (b). The Meeting urged all Parties to acknowledge receipt of such communications promptly. Some delegations emphasised that adequate time should be provided to consider the matter before communicating a reply to the Secretariat.
- (54) A number of delegations stressed the need for increased transparency in the work of the Secretariat in respect of, e.g., budgets and accounting, work programmes, representational costs and foreign travel. With regard to the last, some delegations felt that insufficient details had been included in the Executive Secretary's reports of his attendance at overseas meetings. They requested that, in addition to more informative reports, relevant documents arising from such visits be available to all Parties. In that respect, the Meeting recalled the guidelines agreed at ATCM XXVIII.
- (55) Argentina stated that, regarding the situation of the Secretariat staff members, the Declaration of the Argentine Government in Annex 4 of SP3 rev 1 clarifies that the specific contractual regime established by Measure 1 (2003), Decision 2 (2003) and Decision 3 (2003) is applicable to the contractual relations between the Secretariat and its staff members. Argentina stated that therefore there are no divergences between such a regime and Argentine law. This conclusion is the result of a joint analysis with all the relevant areas of the Argentine Administration and the Secretariat. Consequently, as already explained by the Executive Secretary, it is not necessary to introduce any amendments to the provisions in force which regulate the contractual relations between the Secretariat and its staff members.

- (56) The Meeting expressed deep gratitude to Argentina for supporting the Secretariat in all its forms and for clarifying the legal working status of the Secretariat staff members and requested the Executive Secretary to convey the gratitude of the Meeting to the Argentine Government. The Declaration of the Argentine Government is included at **Annex H, page XXX**.
- (57) Sweden raised a question about social security, to ensure that the standard was equivalent to that which other good employers would provide. The Executive Secretary confirmed that the staff regulations were competitive.
- (58) The Meeting took note with appreciation of the Secretariat's report on its work for 2005/06.

*Programme and Budget 2006/7*

- (59) The Executive Secretary introduced SP 4 rev 1 containing the draft Programme and Budget for 2006/7. Delegations emphasised the need for the forecast and draft budgets to be identical. There was, however, agreement that staff replacement and terminations funds should be created.
- (60) Australia sought clarification on how the budget took account of the risk of shortfalls in the assessed voluntary contributions. The Executive Secretary said that these could be covered by the existing surplus. Some delegations said they were not prepared to allow surpluses arising from their contributions to be used to make up for shortfalls arising from non-payment by other Parties. Some delegations recalled the importance of all Consultative Parties paying their contributions in full and on time. The Meeting noted the serious consequences that would arise from a shortfall in contributions such as reduced effectiveness of the Secretariat and its capacity to support the ATCM. To address this possibility several delegations stressed the need for contingency planning and prioritisation of activities. The Executive Secretary provided an indication of the activities which could be dropped in response to possible shortfalls of \$100,000.
- (61) Japan asked whether the 7% increase in the 2007/08 budget was accounted for by inflation. The Executive Secretary said it was a combination of the estimated IMF world inflation figure of 2.1% and the domestic Argentine inflation rate of 15%. The Meeting agreed that office expenses and web and software development should be as originally proposed by the Secretariat. This would lead to a saving of \$14,000.
- (62) In response to questions about the travel budget, the Executive Secretary explained that most expenditure was in direct support of the ATCM. Over half of this year's budget would be accounted for by the Edinburgh ATCM. The next meeting in New Delhi would also take up significant funds. Some delegations asked for clarification on the projected allocations for 2007/8 travel and representation and made suggestions as to possible areas for savings. The Executive Secretary presented a revised text and data for SP 4: *Draft Work Programme 2006/7*, incorporating the changes requested by the Meeting.
- (63) The Secretariat provided revised budgets taking into account all of the above recommendations. One delegation raised questions regarding the surplus

accumulating from previous years and the practical application of Rule 6.3 of the Financial Regulations. The Meeting confirmed that it is not the intention of the Meeting to amend Rule 6.3.

- (64) The Executive Secretary presented SP11 *Contributions to the Secretariat 2004/7*, outlining voluntary assessed contributions to the Secretariat over the past two financial years and to date in the present financial year. Brazil, Norway, Peru, Spain and Uruguay stated that they were in the process of completing measures to ensure their voluntary assessed contributions were made for this year.
- (65) France noted that contributions remained voluntary until Measure 1 (2003) was approved by all the Consultative Parties and exhorted all Parties to approve the Measure as quickly as possible so that the financial uncertainties would be reduced. Spain recalled that the contributions remained voluntary and that it was of the same view as France. Other delegations noted that the contributions were assessed.
- (66) The Meeting urged all Parties to approve the Measure as quickly as possible so that financial uncertainties would be removed.
- (67) The Meeting approved Decision 1, which contained the Secretariat's Financial Reports on the year 2004/05 and the year 2005/06 and the Programme and Budget for 2006/07, as revised during the Meeting, in Annexes 1, 2 and 3 to Decision 1, respectively.
- (68) The Executive Secretary presented SP 12 rev.1 *Status of the Secretariat Archive of Final Reports*. He explained that the task of collecting the Final Reports of the ATCM had been more difficult than foreseen. The process of digitising and proof-reading electronic texts of final reports was time-consuming. He noted that some language versions were still outstanding and urged delegates to help locate any missing documents. Russia said it was near to completing its search and would be able to send photocopies of the missing Russian documents to the Secretariat by August.

#### **Item 7: Report of the Committee for Environmental Protection**

- (69) Dr Tony Press, Chair of the CEP IX, introduced the report of CEP IX (Annex E, page XXX), highlighting the Measures, Decisions and Resolutions that the ATCM should consider. Dr Press noted that the CEP's workload had increased considerably in recent years, and, should this trend continue, it would be difficult to cover the issues in the time allotted.
- (70) The Chair of the ATCM congratulated the CEP on their achievements, and noted that they had dealt with an impressive workload in the time allotted. The Meeting then considered the report section by section.
- (71) Concerning Item 3 in the CEP report (Strategic Discussions on the Future of the CEP), the UK welcomed this important initiative, requested that the ATCM

emphasise its importance, and asked that the ATCM be kept informed of progress.

- (72) Commenting on paragraphs 36 and 39 of the CEP report, ASOC noted the strong support by many Members of the CEP for the concepts set out in the ASOC paper IP 94 *Station Sharing in Antarctica*.
- (73) With respect to paragraph 39 of the CEP report, attention was drawn to the reiteration of the CEPs concern about the potential environmental consequences of an excessive concentration of stations in Antarctica. It was noted that these concerns can be addressed, in part, by increased cooperation in Antarctica and that some Parties are making efforts to share their facilities and encourage wider participation in their research programmes. The Meeting recalled Recommendation XV-17 (1989), which sets out the measures which Parties are urged to take when considering the establishment of new stations or facilities, to avoid excessive concentration of such installations. The Meeting also recalled that the Consultative Parties had taken the view that the construction of a station or base in Antarctica was not a pre-condition for attaining Consultative Party status, and reaffirmed this position.
- (74) It was noted that in the Edinburgh Antarctic Declaration on the International Polar Year 2007-2008, adopted by the Meeting (see Item 11 below), the Parties were committed to strengthening scientific and logistic cooperation and minimising the environmental impacts of their activities.
- (75) With respect to CEP Item 7a (Management Plans), and specifically on paragraphs 54 to 64 of the CEP report, the Meeting noted that the CEP had been unable to recommend the adoption of a management plan for an Antarctic Specially Managed Area in the Larsemann Hills because one Party was proposing to locate a new station outside the proposed infrastructure zone. Some delegations were concerned about the significant consequences of this late change in the long-running planning process. Disappointment was expressed that the management plan, which was intended to facilitate close cooperation in the area and had been developed through an open consultative process, had to be withdrawn at the final stage to address issues raised by this new station proposal.
- (76) On paragraph 206 of the CEP Report, replying to New Zealand's concern about the Environmental Impact Assessments of Indian operations in the Larsemann Hills area, India confirmed that it is working on a Comprehensive Environmental Evaluation (CEE) on this subject and the same would be presented at CEP X.
- (77) Germany expressed satisfaction on reaching agreement with Chile in principle on developing an ASMA for Fildes Peninsula and Ardley Island. They will jointly convene – via note verbale – an international working group (paragraph 74 of the CEP Report). Germany expressed the hope that a substantive outcome of the group's work would be presented to the next ATCM. Chile confirmed that it will host a workshop to prepare the input on this issue for discussion at CEP X.

- (78) The Meeting adopted Measure 1 (2006) on Antarctic Specially Protected Areas: Designations and Management Plans, and Measure 2 (2006), Antarctic Specially Managed Area: Designation and Management Plan: Admiralty Bay, King George Island (in Annex A, page XXX)
- (79) Concerning CEP Item 7b (Historic Sites and Monuments), the Meeting adopted Measure 3 (2006) on Antarctic Historic Sites and Monuments: Rocher du Débarquement (in Annex A, page XXX).
- (80) On CEP Item 7c (Marine Protected Areas), the CCAMLR Observer noted that both the Commission and the CEP recognise that the definition and designation of Antarctic Marine Protected Areas is urgent and needs to be timely. The work should start sooner rather than later and the first step will be the workshop next year. He undertook to convey the positive development between the CEP and SC-CCAMLR to CCAMLR.
- (81) The Meeting adopted Resolution 2 (2006) on Site Guidelines for Visitors (in Annex C, page XXX)
- (82) On CEP Item 8 (Quarantine and non-native species), the United States referred to the useful information reported from the New Zealand workshop on non-native species. It noted that in moving forward on matters related to non-native species, practical considerations and best practices must be taken into account.
- (83) The ATCM adopted Decision 2 (2006) on Ballast Water Exchange in the Antarctic Treaty Area and Resolution 3 (2006) on Ballast Water Exchange in the Antarctic Treaty Area (in Annex B, page xxx and Annex C, page xxx).
- (84) Item 8: Specially Protected Species. The Meeting adopted Resolution 4 (2006) on Conservation of Southern Giant Petrels (in Annex C, page XXX).
- (85) The Meeting noted that fur seals would continue to receive the comprehensive general protection afforded to all seal species under the Protocol, and that they would not be exposed to any potential threat of commercial exploitation in the future as a result of their delisting as Specially Protected Species. The Meeting also noted the value of CCAMLR implementing its Scheme of International Scientific Observation in the krill fishery in order to provide the necessary data for the monitoring of the fishery's impacts on fur seals. Norway thanked SCAR for their clear advice on fur seals and commented on the importance of taking account of expert advice.
- (86) The Meeting adopted Measure 4 (2006) on Specially Protected Species: Fur Seals (in Annex A, page XXX)
- (87) On CEP Item 14 (Cooperation with Other Organisations), New Zealand wished to record its pleasure at the positive progress on cooperation between the CEP and the Scientific Committee of CCAMLR.
- (88) The Meeting decided to urge CCAMLR and ACAP to work with the Secretariats of relevant Regional Fisheries Management Organisations, if

appropriate, in order to share information and best practice on ways to reduce seabird by-catch. The Meeting took note of paragraph 202 of the CEP report.

- (89) On CEP Item 16 (Election of Officers), the ATCM thanked Dr Tony Press for his excellent guidance of the CEP over the last four years. The Chair congratulated the incoming Chair, Dr Neil Gilbert (New Zealand), and Vice-Chair, Dr Tania Brito (Brazil) and wished them well.

#### **Item 8: Liability: Implementation of Decision 1 (2005)**

- (90) Sweden informed the Meeting that it had recently enacted a Statute so that it could implement Annex VI. It offered to distribute an English version of its law to other Parties by August. Argentina, Australia, Brazil, Chile, China, Finland, France, Germany, New Zealand, Norway, Russia, Spain, the UK, the USA and Uruguay all informed the Meeting that they had started their internal review process. Many delegations stated that they would probably need to pass domestic legislation to implement the Annex. The Meeting concluded that these developments were very encouraging steps towards the approval of Measure 1 (2005).
- (91) The USA indicated as Depositary Government that, in order to bring Annex VI into force, each Consultative Party must inform the Depositary in writing, at a minimum, that it has “approved Measure 1 (2005)” (Annex VI to the Protocol on Environmental Protection to the Antarctic Treaty: Liability Arising from Environmental Emergencies). In the absence of receipt of this information from a Consultative Party, the Depositary will not be able to consider that the Consultative Party has provided the requisite notice related to Annex VI. The US also said that it was willing to communicate informally to the Secretariat approval by Parties of Annex VI so that this information could be included on the Secretariat website. Parties were urged to approve Measure 1 (2005).
- (92) Sweden gave a presentation on their legislation implementing Annex VI which formed a platform for discussion. All delegations thanked Sweden for their presentation of the Swedish law and looked forward to receiving an English translation, which would be helpful for their own work on domestic legislation. There was discussion of several legal questions linked to the implementation of Annex VI.
- (93) It was agreed that the Swedish presentation and the general exchange of views and information had been very useful. The Meeting urged other delegations to come to New Delhi prepared to present information on their domestic implementation or work in progress, including any problems encountered. The Secretariat was asked to maintain an e-mail address list of Annex VI experts of Parties to the Environmental Protocol to facilitate informal inter-sessional contact on this subject and preparation for further exchanges of information at ATCM XXX.

#### **Item 9: Safety and Operations in Antarctica**

- (94) France introduced WP 17 *Contingency Planning and Emergency Response*, to provoke discussion on the risks to human safety and to the environment. France noted that, in respect of the competence of Parties to authorise activities in Antarctica, these Parties bear corresponding responsibilities for the security of persons as well as the environment. That should lead them to organise themselves formally through a global approach. France acknowledged the excellent work already undertaken by COMNAP, which should provide its expertise in this process.
- (95) New Zealand congratulated France on the paper and agreed that COMNAP already does a great deal of important work in this area. In addition to recording major incidents and accidents, New Zealand also kept a record of ‘near misses’.
- (96) The United Kingdom also thanked France for its paper. The United Kingdom agreed there was a need for co-ordination and training for emergency response in Antarctica. Increased co-ordination was vital given the number of scientific and tourist vessels now visiting the Antarctic region.
- (97) COMNAP explained that it had established an incident and accident database and that safety was already a priority area of its work. It referred the Meeting to its Annual Report (in **Annex F, page XXX**) outlining activities in the areas of accident prevention, particularly the review of fuel handling and storage guidelines (Section 3.7), safety of navigation, particularly its work in supporting the Hydrographic Committee on Antarctica (Section 3.8) and accident, incident and near-miss reporting (Section 3.9). All work is carried out in conjunction with the Antarctic Treaty Secretariat and the CEP. Effort was also focused on anticipating events, given media interest in any apparent dramatic situations. Alert/search and rescue globally was already coordinated by IMO and ICAO but discussions had taken place in Chile in April on improved communication between regional Rescue Co-ordination Centres in Chile, Argentina, South Africa, Australia and New Zealand, e.g. by establishing ships’ whereabouts and how they could be called on to help in time of need. Within COMNAP the Standing Committee for Antarctic Logistics and Operations (SCALOP) takes the lead on safety matters. Search and rescue issues would also be discussed at the July 2006 meeting in Hobart and COMNAP plans to establish a new working group to deal with safety issues, replacing the current case-by-case approach.
- (98) As in the CEP, the Meeting agreed that COMNAP was best placed to take this work forward. COMNAP agreed to submit a paper on the subject to the ATCM XXX.
- (99) The United Kingdom introduced IP 20 *Antarctic Polarview Programme to provide access to satellite observations for improved sea ice navigation*. Polarview is a satellite remote sensing service and part of the European Space Agency (ESA) Global Monitoring for Environment and Security (GMES) services programme. The British Antarctic Survey (BAS) is managing the promotion and delivery of the Antarctic services element of Polarview. Polarview will deliver near real-time sea ice information based on satellite observations direct to users, such as ships sailing in Antarctic waters. The United Kingdom explained that access to this information is currently open and free to all and invited Parties to take advantage of this new service. Further

information about Polarview can be found at [www.polarview.org](http://www.polarview.org) or, specifically concerning Antarctic operations, from Mr Andrew Fleming at BAS (email: [ahf@bas.ac.uk](mailto:ahf@bas.ac.uk)).

- (100) Japan introduced IP 101 *Selected Highlights of the Japanese Antarctic Research Expedition, 2005-2006*. It expressed gratitude to Norway and Sweden for providing assistance with a medical evacuation from Dome Fuji.
- (101) Russia outlined its experience of airdropping cargo to Vostok Station, contained in IP 71 *Measures for ensuring safety of life activity at the inland Antarctic Stations. Experience of airdropping of cargo to the Russian Vostok Station*. In November 2005 it successfully airdropped thirty tons of fuel using parachutes. The activity was environmentally friendly and the snow had proved to be a good receiving surface.
- (102) Russia presented IP 72 *Monitoring of pathogenic micro-biota in the Antarctic*, demonstrating the benefits of regular microbiological surveys at stations to determine both the anthropogenic impact on Antarctica and possible pathogenic effects on the environment and man.
- (103) Chile was grateful for Russia's work. It noted that the Chilean hospital at Frei base had no evidence of serious human illnesses apart from common colds. The Chilean Antarctic Institute was also carrying out a biomedical project to assess the health of personnel stationed in the Antarctic Peninsula. Chile said it would be interesting to carry out studies at sites where different national delegations worked in close proximity to each other. It noted that all Chilean aircraft departing from Punta Arenas for King George Island were disinfected before leaving.
- (104) In also thanking Russia, Argentina thought the work might be presented at COMNAP or SCAR, where the focus should be on potential forms of transmission.
- (105) France noted that the Russian paper raised an interesting issue, which had been little discussed to date. It said that the Franco-Italian Concordia base had maintained a micro-biological investigation programme since it had moved to year-round operation. There was a clear need for more information about micro-organisms in the Antarctic environment. France agreed that COMNAP and SCAR should look into the issue more deeply.
- (106) Sweden was grateful to Russia for raising an important issue. The spread of diseases by birds was also an important issue to consider, particularly in the context of fears about Avian Flu. Sweden hoped the issue would be considered by both COMNAP and SCAR, who should report back to a future Treaty meeting.
- (107) The United Kingdom also thanked Russia, noting that medical issues were infrequently raised at ATCMs. The United Kingdom had carried out research at Halley Research Station through the British Antarctic Survey Medical Unit. It was encouraged to hear that a number of delegations were working along similar lines. The United Kingdom supported the Argentine proposal that this

be dealt with by the COMNAP medical network - MediNet. There would also be read-across to the CEP and SCAR. The United Kingdom recommended that further discussions of the issue take place at ATCM XXX.

- (108) SCAR noted that there were a number of related complex issues: human health; the transport of non-native species into Antarctica; non-native species with the ability to attack infrastructure, e.g. fungi on wood; and the impact of human pathogens on native wildlife. Methods of alleviating the outbreak of disease were largely a question of management. Studies on immunity and disease outbreak together with the relationship to diet etc. had already been conducted by SCAR. However, the data were now old and did not take account of latest scientific methods, such as genomics. A number of scientific papers were currently under review on these topics and the issues should be discussed by SCAR and COMNAP.
- (109) New Zealand agreed that the issues were complex. The CEP led on the disease element but there were a number of other important policy issues that should be tackled in this forum. One such was Avian Flu and particularly the effects of a possible outbreak of the disease in New Zealand on flights to Antarctica. New Zealand was already developing response strategies and would be happy to share information with colleagues in due course.
- (110) Argentina clarified that the reason it had proposed that the COMNAP and SCAR medical groups take the issue forward was that they worked closely together and shared data and comprised scientists with experience of these issues.
- (111) COMNAP confirmed it was happy to consider the issue at its meeting next month in Hobart and would refer it to both its Medical and Environmental networks.
- (112) The Meeting concluded that this was an issue that merited greater attention and study and tasked COMNAP to follow up at its meeting next month and to report back at ATCM XXX.
- (113) Norway recalled that ATCM XXVIII had raised with the IMO the issue of the use of heavy fuel oil by ships in Antarctica. It informed the Meeting that Norway had taken the issue forward to the IMO Marine Environment Protection Committee at its last session. The Committee had been supportive of the restriction of the use of heavy fuel oil, but wanted to give the matter further consideration. Norway offered to keep the ATCM informed as this issue is progressed in the IMO.

#### **Item 10: Relevance of Developments in the Arctic and in the Antarctic**

- (114) No Working Papers were presented under this Agenda item, and IP 62 *The Antarctic and Climate Change* and IP 89 *Plans for an Antarctic Climate Assessment – Trends and Impacts* were taken as read.

#### **Item 11: The International Polar Year 2007-2008**

- (115) On 19 June the Meeting held a day-long special plenary on the International Polar Year 2007-2008. The day was divided into the following sessions: an open session for scientific presentations, a session on the Arctic approach to the International Polar Year (IPY), and a session for general discussion and the adoption of the Edinburgh Antarctic Declaration on the International Polar Year 2007-2008 (text at Annex I, page XXX )
- (116) In accordance with Rule 8 of the Rules of Procedures, the Meeting determined that the first session of the day (scientific presentations) should be an open meeting. The Meeting also agreed that this session should be chaired by Professor Rapley, CBE, Director of the British Antarctic Survey.
- (117) In the open session, the first speaker was Dr David Carlson, Director of the IPY International Programme Office, who gave an introduction to the IPY and the work of the Office. Dr Cecilie Mauritzen, of the Norwegian Meteorological Institute and co-leader of the European DAMOCLES programme, spoke on Ocean Observing Systems at Polar Latitudes – Challenges in the North and South. Dr Robert Bindshadler, Chief Scientist, Hydrospheric and Biospheric Sciences Laboratory, NASA Goddard Space Flight Center, USA, gave a talk entitled “Ice is Ice, Right?” Dr Jon Watkins of the British Antarctic Survey spoke on Marine Ecosystems in the Southern Ocean.
- (118) In the session devoted to the Arctic, Dr Dmitry Chumakov, Executive Secretary of the Russian Chairmanship of the Arctic Council, gave an overview of the Arctic Council’s approach to the IPY. The Council had planned the following three multilateral initiatives: the Arctic Human Health Initiative (AHHI) led by the USA; the Co-ordination and Monitoring in the Arctic for Assessment and Research (COMMAR) led by Sweden; and the Joint Atmospheric Climate Observatory in Tiksi led by the Russian Federation. In addition, there was a wide range of national activities planned by Arctic Council Member States
- (119) Norway noted that its two-year chairmanship of the Arctic Council would start in October 2006. The Chairmanship would then pass to Sweden, followed by Denmark. Norway explained that these three countries intend to co-ordinate their programme for the Council for the period 2006-12 and are actively considering a joint secretariat, possibly located in Tromsø, Norway. The three countries intend to focus on sustainable use of natural resources, climate change, and reviewing the Council’s structure.
- (120) The USA informed the Meeting of its research and educational activities planned for the IPY. Three main themes had been identified: Arctic environmental change; polar ice-sheet stability and dynamics; and life in the cold and dark.
- (121) New Zealand stressed the need for a focus on outreach and education, noting that the true scientific legacy of the projects probably would not emerge until several years after the IPY.
- (122) Dr Robert Corell, Senior Policy Fellow, American Meteorological Society, gave a presentation on the Arctic Climate Impact Assessment (ACIA), which was set up over a five-year period following the Barrow Declaration of the

Arctic Council to provide a scientific base which could lead to a political process on climate change.

- (123) In response to questions from the floor, Dr Corell noted it had not been easy to achieve a clear lexicon at the beginning of the process. The Steering Committee had to decide on a commonality of use of language and in mainly judgmental issues this had meant reaching collective agreement on the final wording. Similar processes on the science document gave a high comfort level. The content had been completed in January 2004 and the work of editing took a further eighteen months.
- (124) Dr Corell also explained that the scope of the study had been agreed, as with the lead authorship, by seeking the advice of all relevant governments and organisations. There had been over one hundred nominations for lead authorship and there had been a similar process with topics.
- (125) The Chair of the Meeting then introduced the draft Edinburgh Antarctic Declaration on the International Polar Year 2007-2008, which would champion the global importance of the polar regions in international fora, focusing on co-operation and outreach.
- (126) Chile referred to WP 35 *Draft Elements for the Edinburgh Declaration. International Polar Year 2007-2008*, which included suggestions on outreach from IPY and the SCAR action group on Antarctic research, in particular the workshop to be held in Santiago in 2006 for which the Chilean delegate called for increased participation. He reminded Parties of their commitment to provide access to archival information. He welcomed the strong sense of commitment to international collaboration from Parties apparent from the draft Edinburgh Antarctic Declaration. Future ATCMs should maintain the IPY on their agenda, and discussion of its progress and development should be provided in an overview by the IPY Programme Office. The Secretariat should include data on IPY 2007-2008 in the revised ATS Handbook.
- (127) With regard to the historical annex to WP 35, while highlighting its merits, Argentina reiterated its reservations on certain legal and historical elements which it does not share. Argentina also wished to recall that, at the time of the Second Polar Year, there was in fact already one station in Antarctica: Orcadas, which had been established by Argentina in 1904. A century of permanent and uninterrupted presence of Argentina in Antarctica was celebrated two years ago (see ATCM XXVIII IP 086).
- (128) Chile apologised for any omissions in the historical annex to WP 35. There was also no reference to the observatory established by Argentina on Año Nuevo Island. It stressed the importance of Argentina's input and also that of other pioneering countries, including Belgium, which established the first Congress for the Study of Polar Regions that led to the International Polar Commission, and Norway which attempted to organise a second congress in 1938.
- (129) Following a question from Austria on low latitude alpine studies, Professor Rapley (UK) noted that as long ago as 1882, Karl Weyprecht from Austria had stressed a need for unprecedented international co-operation in the IPY. This remained true today. The United Kingdom would like to see ever more co-

operation. For example, talks were in hand with Argentina on an exchange of scientists during IPY and the United Kingdom would welcome contact with other countries. Argentina expressed warm appreciation for past co-operation with the United Kingdom and welcomed the present invitation to renew collaboration.

- (130) Norway suggested there was a need to return to “big picture” thinking. In the early days of IPYs, decisions were made from the top down. The tendency now was to work from the bottom up. But this meant it was harder to discern the major issues. ATCMs were now mainly about technical issues. He suggested that in arranging work for ATCM XXX, a smaller number of issues should be included for discussion. There were plenty of examples of big science from Antarctica, for example, the discovery of the ozone hole, and the work on ice cores at Vostok Station and the linkage with greenhouse gases. These studies had had a notable effect on world politics. The challenge was now to understand how polar weather effected global warming. More data were needed from IPY. The importance of this work should be reflected at ATCMs.
- (131) The United Kingdom welcomed these useful presentations. The scale of the IPY projects was impressive. One of the main aims was to draw public attention to the importance of Antarctica. Outreach was important. The results of IPY needed to be disseminated as widely as possible. The scientific output would take place over twenty four months; delivery needed to be factored in early. There would need to be synthesis of the scientific results from the IPY. The role of the Antarctic Treaty system in policy-making stemming from such synthesis needed to be clarified and forward planning, perhaps as far ahead as 2012, put in hand. A Special ATCM following a science conference was one possibility. The Meeting needed to consider by 2007 what policy output was required from IPY.
- (132) Professor Michael Stoddart (Australia) gave a presentation on IP 24 *The Census of Antarctic Marine Life (CAML) – a SCAR-supported field activity for IPY 2007-2008*. He stressed the importance of CAML as a major international project for the IPY. He acknowledged the contribution of Belgium for the establishment of CAML’s Antarctic marine biodiversity information network portal, SCAR-MarBIN ([www.scarmarbin.be](http://www.scarmarbin.be)). Up to fifteen ships, including IAATO vessels, would be involved in the project. It was hoped that more ship time would be contributed by interested Parties.
- (133) Dr Rhian Salmon (IPY International Programme Office) outlined the public outreach activities planned for the IPY. These activities would be coordinated with individual country and regional association programmes. The Netherlands recalled the activity of the European Polar Board. Norway suggested that advantage be taken of the next ATCM being held in India to spread the IPY message more widely in Asia. Argentina mentioned that it had held an event in Ushuaia that had promoted the IPY. It also thanked the IPY International Programme Office for its contributions to ECOPOLAR Ushuaia 06. This preparatory activity for the IPY, which was hosted by the Provincial Government in Ushuaia in May 2006, focussed on Chapter III of IPY: outreach, education and communication. ASOC reminded the IPY International Programme Office that environmental and conservation groups should also be targeted in its public outreach activities.

- (134) SCAR introduced IP 87 *SCAR's Involvement in the International Polar Year 2007-2009*. 97 proposals of relevance to SCAR had been approved, 77% of which covered the natural sciences; 22% education and outreach; and 1% data management. SCAR noted with appreciation that most of its earlier recommendations had been achieved but highlighted the ongoing need to develop a benchmark series of geological and geophysical maps.
- (135) Argentina introduced IP 30 *The Argentine Antarctic Program in the International Polar Year*. Argentina was ready to use its assets and expertise to support other Parties' activities but reminded the Meeting that requests should be submitted well in advance in order to allow sufficient time for programming. Argentina agreed with SCAR on the need for greater mapping efforts. This would provide a sound base for further scientific work. Argentina had worked jointly with Spain to produce new geological maps of certain areas.
- (136) The United Kingdom thanked SCAR and Argentina for their papers. It agreed that the IPY provided enormous scientific opportunities and that mapping should be considered no less important than cutting-edge scientific work. The United Kingdom noted the importance of sharing with CAML information about any spare capacity available on research vessels. This could be a theme for discussion at the forthcoming SCAR-COMNAP meetings in Hobart. The United Kingdom would be setting aside some capacity on the *RRS James Clark Ross*. It hoped regular updates on IPY activity would be provided at future ATCMs.
- (137) Australia said that a clear mechanism for taking forward IPY projects was needed. The forthcoming COMNAP meeting might allow for greater consideration of projects that will require special international co-ordination mechanisms in order to deliver the required logistical support. Australia noted it had developed informal mechanisms with regard to the provision of ship-time for CAML. It also noted that the mapping exercise referred to by SCAR was an example of a project that could be achieved with a small amount of additional effort by a number of Parties.
- (138) COMNAP confirmed that it would be happy to receive information about multinational projects requiring specific co-ordination at its July 2006 meeting.
- (139) Sweden shared some of its experience of organising IPY in the Arctic arena, highlighting the link between science and logistics. Many large-scale projects would be competing for significant resources such as use of ship time. Sweden agreed that the COMNAP meeting offered an excellent opportunity to make progress.
- (140) Russia informed the Meeting of the latest developments in its national programme as set out in IP 74 *Research Program of Participation of the Russian Federation in holding the International Polar Year 2007-2008*. Its national programme had eight main priority areas. Most scientific projects were focused on the Arctic but Russia hoped to expand its number of research projects in the Antarctic and enlarge its number of observation points. Russia

supported the proposal for discussion of high-priority and large-scale projects at the COMNAP meeting.

- (141) Spain and Uruguay also supported co-ordination of projects by COMNAP and greater information sharing at the Hobart meeting. Spain noted that ships of opportunity could assist small projects. Uruguay planned to make capacity available on two ships and this would be discussed further at the forthcoming COMNAP meeting.
- (142) The Meeting confirmed support for the Edinburgh Declaration on the International Polar Year 2007-2008 and noted that Parties would conduct further discussion of priority projects for the IPY at the SCAR-COMNAP meetings in Hobart.
- (143) The Meeting adopted the Edinburgh Antarctic Declaration on the International Polar Year 2007-2008 and decided that the Declaration should be made public immediately (text at Annex I, page XXX).

## **Item 12: Tourism and Non-Governmental Activities in the Antarctic Treaty Area**

- (144) The issues discussed under this agenda item were divided into the following broad categories:
- Trends in Tourism
  - Site Guidelines for Visitors
  - Land-based infrastructure for Tourism in Antarctica
  - Strategic Issues
  - Accreditation
  - Other Issues

### *Trends in Tourism*

- (145) IAATO introduced IP 86, *IAATO Overview of Antarctic Tourism 2005-2006 Antarctic Season*. The Paper gave a broad picture of the tourism industry in Antarctica from the IAATO perspective. IAATO activities were listed and non-IAATO activities were included where possible. The 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.
- (146) Many Parties thanked IAATO for a comprehensive report which provided a basis for discussion of important issues. Some delegations raised concerns about the flagging of vessels to non-Treaty Parties and the contingency planning for search and rescue operations, particularly for large vessels. Other delegations noted the problems of non-IAATO operators with particular regard to the numbers of passengers landed ashore from vessels carrying over 500 people. They questioned how these activities might be regulated. They also highlighted the need to know the total number of persons on board each vessel (e.g. crew members, expedition leaders), and asked IAATO to include these figures in future reports.

- (147) In relation to the generic issue of large vessels, the Meeting focussed on three key issues, namely: cumulative impacts associated with landing activities, the potential environmental damage stemming from a major grounding or sinking of a vessel, and search and rescue. In relation to the last, the UK provided information on the IMO agreed criteria for determining what constitutes an area remote from search and rescue facilities.
- (148) Recognising the global application of IMO instruments, the Meeting noted that matters relating to large vessels might in due course be directed to the IMO. It was recognised however, that a clear proposal would need to be formulated before approaching the IMO. It was agreed this matter would be addressed at ATCM XXX.
- (149) Some delegations expressed concerns about third country-flagged vessels. It was noted that some 50% of tourist vessels were flagged to non-Treaty Parties. Attempts at earlier ATCMs to address the issue of third party flag-states through port state jurisdiction or direct interaction between the ATCM and such states had not been successful.
- (150) One delegation pointed out that, according to its national legislation, non-IAATO members organised or proceeding from its territory still needed to submit an IEE to its government.
- (151) The United Kingdom submitted a draft Resolution on limiting landings from large ships. Many delegations noted with concern the growing number of large tourist ships operating in Antarctica. While most ships carrying more than 500 passengers do not land passengers ashore, some large ships continue to land passengers. Concerned about the potential for undesirable environmental impacts, many delegations were prepared to recommend that when Parties assess activities, they should take a precautionary approach and refrain from allowing vessels carrying more than 500 passengers from making landings in Antarctica.
- (152) The Meeting recognised the complexity of this topic. Some delegations were of the view that more analysis and advice on potential environmental impacts was required to inform such decisions. To this end, the Meeting agreed to ask the CEP 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.
- (153) A delegation raised concerns that any delay in acting on these important issues risked the Parties being blamed if an incident occurred, and suggested that waiting for scientific advice could postpone an important decision.
- (154) The Meeting agreed to address the issue of landing passengers ashore from large ships at ATCM XXX once the advice from the CEP was available.

#### *Site Visitors Guidelines*

- (155) The United Kingdom introduced WP 2 *Policy Issues Arising from On-Site Review of Guidelines for Visitor Sites in the Antarctic Peninsula*, submitted by

the United Kingdom, Argentina, Australia, Norway and the United States. The United Kingdom thanked IAATO for its assistance and noted that the CEP would look at the monitoring and implementation aspects of the guidelines. The management provisions varied from site to site, but no site was found suitable for vessels of more than 500 passengers. There are currently twelve site specific guidelines, with the intention to produce more in the future. Many delegations commended the United Kingdom and the other Parties for their useful work.

- (156) ASOC introduced IP 65 *Managing Antarctic tourism: A critical overview of site-specific guidelines*, which noted some of the positive and negative aspects of the site-specific guidelines approach. Site-specific guidelines were useful to evaluate whether or not the use of a site for tourism purposes was appropriate and also helped to inform how activities should be conducted at specific sites. However, site-specific guidelines were a non-binding tactical response to tourism developments and currently covered a small percentage of sites visited by tourists, whereas in ASOC's view there was a need for strategic approaches to manage tourism, and for a global Antarctic tourism policy.
- (157) IAATO introduced IP 66 *Brief Update on the Antarctic Peninsula Landing Site Visits and Site Guidelines*, which outlined the latest site visit trends. IAATO offered to update the CEP on emerging trends over the next few years and announced they intended to propose additional site guidelines for a further fifteen sites over the next two years. IAATO emphasized the importance of experienced guides and informed the Meeting that a guide certification programme is being developed.
- (158) The Meeting welcomed the work that had been undertaken in the CEP on site guidelines and noted its plans to undertake further work on the monitoring and development of site guidelines. The Meeting noted that the Tourism and non-Governmental Activities Working Group should continue to receive updates on the work of the CEP on site guidelines
- (159) The Meeting also welcomed the guidelines as a useful tool but noted that it was only one component in the concept of an environmental management toolbox.
- (160) The Meeting stressed the importance of the implementation of the adopted site-specific guidelines.

#### *Land-Based Tourism*

- (161) New Zealand introduced WP 15 *Regulation of Land-Based Infrastructure to Support Tourism in Antarctica*, submitted by Australia and New Zealand in response to a request from ATCM XXVIII for a more in-depth analysis on land-based tourism. The paper raised various legal, jurisdictional and environmental impact concerns arising from land-based tourism and suggested topics for discussion, including the current situation, and potential implications of future developments. The paper canvassed the various approaches the ATCM could take to prevent the development of land-based infrastructure to support tourism.
- (162) One delegation noted that land-based tourism is not an entirely hypothetical proposition, and described a major land-based tourism proposal from the late

1980s, which envisaged hotel, airport, conference and other facilities on the Antarctic continent. The project was not endorsed and did not eventuate, but it did trigger a parliamentary enquiry on Antarctic tourism development. Another delegation confirmed the issue is not a hypothetical one, as some tourism infrastructure already exists in Antarctica..

- (163) Some delegations expressed concern about the environmental footprint of tourism, particularly the potential for rapid growth, and highlighted concern over the lack of legal provision in the Protocol to address land-based tourism. The view was also expressed that self regulation by states is a valid option to manage this issue.
- (164) Several delegations noted that science is the privileged activity in Antarctica. Some delegations added that tourism, as an example of a peaceful activity, is also a valid activity – although it remained secondary to science. It was suggested that better use of environmental impact assessments could be an alternative solution to regulating tourism. Some delegations expressed the view that clearer definitions of land-based tourism are needed to avoid some scientific research activities being perceived as tourism. One delegation also suggested that ship-borne tourism could have as great an impact on the environment as land-based tourism because, in its view, placing passengers ashore was equivalent to land-based tourism. One delegation called for a full survey of all current land-based activity in Antarctica.
- (165) Several Parties acknowledged various points raised in IP 85 *Land-Based Tourism and the Development of Land-based Tourism Infrastructure in Antarctica: An IAATO Perspective*, particularly in regard to definitions of land-based tourism
- (166) One delegation suggested taking a precautionary approach to the issues in WP 15 and emphasized the need to ensure any decision was based on practical considerations. The Environmental Protocol provides a legal framework on this issue and there are no legal grounds to prohibit activities which had passed a rigorous EIA. Other delegations commented that, due to differences in national legislation, the EIA process might not be sufficient in all cases.
- (167) One delegation noted with appreciation the options and questions posed in WP 15. Options were nevertheless too weak as voluntary restraints, or not appropriate as prohibitions which could clash with domestic legislation. This delegation considered tourism a legitimate peaceful use under the Treaty and the Protocol, unless an environmental impact assessment considered terrestrial tourism a threat to the Antarctic environment and ecosystems. A determination should be made, beyond the mere reference to Article 3 of the Protocol, that the establishment of permanent land-based infrastructure for tourist use was a breach of the obligations upheld by the Treaty and the Protocol.
- (168) Another delegation concurred that tourism is a peaceful activity and stated that they would not be able to accept a measure oriented to prohibit tourist activities in Antarctica.
- (169) One delegation emphasized the need to be proactive, and address these issues before they became a reality. A long-term strategy was required but, in the

interim, it proposed that the Meeting adopt a non-mandatory undertaking by Parties to discourage the development of permanent land-based infrastructure to support tourism. Many delegations supported this approach.

- (170) The United Kingdom tabled a draft Resolution on Limiting Permanent Non-Governmental Infrastructure in Antarctica. This proposed that Parties should refrain from authorizing permanent land-based facilities in Antarctica that are not in support of national Antarctic science programmes or associated with a government operator. Whilst many delegations supported the draft some delegations believed that clearer definitions were needed. Despite lengthy debate, consensus on the draft, or any alternative draft considered, could not be reached. The Meeting decided not to establish an inter-sessional contact group, but instead to address this issue again at ATCM XXX.
- (171) The Meeting observed that no delegation spoke in favour of the development of new permanent land-based infrastructure to support tourism in Antarctica. However, one delegation indicated that a Resolution which would have the effect of discouraging only future developments was not appropriate since the question needed to be addressed in its entirety, including existing infrastructure.
- (172) Germany informed the Meeting of a decision by its administrative court to refuse to issue a permit in relation to the installation, for an unlimited period, of a bronze sculpture in Antarctica. This issue illustrates new challenges in respect of the installation of ‘infrastructure’ for non-scientific purposes and Parties should consider whether such installations would be in line with the provisions of the Environmental Protocol or at least whether they would be ‘desirable’ in Antarctica.

#### *Strategic Issues*

- (173) France introduced WP 18 *Establishment of “areas of special tourism interest”* and recalled that WP 12 at XXVIII ATCM had also addressed this issue. It suggested that establishing dedicated areas of special tourism interest would avoid conflict of interests between science and tourism. Alternatively, the ASMA approach could be used with zones carefully selected to recognize sustainable management and safety, as well as limiting passenger numbers. France further suggested this approach could be tested through a pilot project.
- (174) Delegations thanked France for this Working Paper. However, many expressed doubts about setting up dedicated tourist areas. Some delegations felt that more rules were unnecessary, since most tourist activities comply with existing rules: the development of specialist tourist sites could be regarded as exploitation rather than preservation. Another delegation was concerned that tour companies might build permanent land-based infrastructure in such dedicated tourist zones.
- (175) Some delegations noted that the ASMA for Deception Island and the Dry Valleys each have tourist zones included in their management plans. In these cases it was possible to limit numbers of tourists, without setting aside any part of Antarctica exclusively for tourists.

- (176) Some delegations expressed the view that the strategic approach of the paper was of value, as, in the longer term, new policy approaches could be necessary to prevent cumulative impacts. One delegation also noted that climate change could make more areas accessible, and thus potentially create more tourist sites.
- (177) ASOC presented IP 120 *Strategic Issues posed by Commercial Tourism in the Antarctic Treaty Area*. This paper addressed the scale and trends of commercial tourism, and identified priority strategic issues including i) determining an acceptable rate of growth of the activity in the Antarctic Treaty area; ii) determining acceptable levels of tourism; iii) asking whether certain types of tourism be prohibited, e.g. onshore infrastructure or large vessels.
- (178) Several delegations welcomed the broad-ranging nature of the paper. One delegation remarked that the Antarctic contains many unique areas, and therefore it is difficult to apply a general policy on tourism. Another delegation asked if a broader intergovernmental framework, similar to the one covering the harvesting of marine resources, would be useful in taking forward the issue of tourism management.
- (179) An expert explained that while Antarctic tourism has increased in recent years, this has been largely confined to ship-borne tourism; the level of land-based and air-borne tourism has remained static. The Meeting was reminded of COMNAP's multi-annual survey, which identified little conflict between tourism and some aspects of national programmes operations.

#### *Accreditation*

- (180) IAATO presented IP 95 *An Update on the Antarctic Audit and Accreditation Scheme*, which outlined progress in developing an accreditation scheme. IAATO reported that it took as its starting point the report of the ICG on accreditation from ATCM XXVIII (WP 18), and has since held discussions with several Parties and experts on accreditation.
- (181) IP 95 noted that to be of any value, an accreditation scheme will need to be formal and contain a mandatory procedure that is independent and verifiable. IAATO identified a number of challenges in developing such a scheme, including the interaction between an accreditation scheme and Parties' domestic assessment processes. The scheme must also have sufficient flexibility to accommodate future regulations from ATCMs. A proposed way forward was outlined in IP 95.
- (182) Several delegations thanked IAATO for continuing work on this important issue. One delegation expressed disappointment that it had not been possible for IAATO members to trial a scheme in 2005-06, despite earlier indications that this would occur, and highlighted Parties' desire that a scheme is mandated and vetted by the ATCM. The Meeting looked forward to receiving further information on the scheme at ATCM XXX.

### **Item 13: Inspections under the Antarctic Treaty and the Environmental Protocol**

- (183) No documents were submitted under this agenda item.

**Item 14: Science Issues, particularly scientific co-operation and facilitation**

- (184) Ecuador introduced IP 5 *Ecuador fortalece la ciencia y los asuntos antárticos* highlighting the establishment in 2004 of the Ecuadorian Antarctic Institute (INAE). This had already resulted in progress in the form of a successful expedition to Antarctica from December 2005 to February 2006.
- (185) China introduced IP 33 *Chinese Grove Mountains Integrated Expedition 2005-2006*. It wished in particular to highlight its meteorite research.
- (186) Romania introduced IP 35 *Law-Racovita Base, an example of cooperation in Antarctica*, highlighting the new era of scientific collaboration and international friendship between Australia and Romania which marked the establishment of the first scientific Romanian base in Antarctica.
- (187) Romania also introduced IP 37 *Romanian Antarctic Medical Activities in Law-Racovita Base in cooperation with China*, highlighting its work with the Chinese Academy of Medical Sciences on the evaluation of metabolic, immunological and behavioural modifications of the 2006 Romanian Antarctic Expedition members.
- (188) Romania further introduced IP 38 *Results of Romanian Antarctic Scientific Research 2005-2006*, highlighting the results of its research focusing on studies of cryo-pedology, microbiology and environmental pollution.
- (189) SCAR welcomed the presentations by Romania as a new country to Antarctic research, noting that there are already close links with Australia and encouraged Romania to link its research into the wider Antarctic community through the new SCAR programmes. In this way Romania would benefit from access to a great deal of data as well as assistance with developments in scientific techniques and best practice.
- (190) Russia referred to IP 68 *Russian Studies of the subglacial Lake Vostok in the season of 2005-2006 and Work Plans for the season of 2006-2007* and IP 73 *Russian Antarctic Studies under the Subprogram "Study and Research of the Antarctic" in 2005* and gave a brief overview of progress to date on the deep ice core project at Lake Vostok, which had relevance for the entire Antarctic community. Drilling was continuing in stages with close attention being given to environmental impact. The proposed programme was currently undergoing domestic approval procedures. It was hoped to penetrate to the lake water level in season 2007/2008 and a Comprehensive Environmental Evaluation would be presented at the CEP in New Delhi, specifically covering points raised at ATCM XXVI.
- (191) The Republic of Korea introduced IP 96 *Collaborations with other Parties in Science and Related Activities during the 2005/2006 Season*, summarising co-operation with other Parties.

- (192) ASOC introduced IP 108 *Management of Antarctic Krill*. ASOC was working closely with The Pew Charitable Trusts (USA) to develop and implement an Antarctic krill campaign. While krill populations are not under immediate threat, the development of new harvesting and onboard processing methods, as well as the increasing use of krill for fish meal, pose potential problems for the future. It was necessary to take action now to regulate fisheries and manage krill stocks. In ASOC's view, CCAMLR should take responsibility for krill management and approve catch limits that will protect marine living resources dependent on krill. ASOC outlined possible measures for improving the management of the krill fishery. There was an opportunity for CCAMLR to become a model for full and effective application of the precautionary principle and ecosystem management. ASOC looked forward to working with all concerned Parties to achieve these aims.
- (193) Australia referred to IP 25 *Australia's key scientific activities during the 2005/06 Antarctic season*. Australia had carried out a considerable programme of krill research in eastern Antarctica, the data from which would be useful to CCAMLR. Australia welcomed, and supported, ASOC's proposals.
- (194) France agreed with Australia regarding ASOC's proposals and underscored the importance of krill as the basis of the Antarctic food chain, referring to concerns expressed at CEP VIII on environmental monitoring. The links between krill populations and marine ecosystems needed more extensive study. CCAMLR should continue to work on this very important issue.
- (195) The United Kingdom considered that the relevant expertise within the Antarctic Treaty system to discuss the management of Antarctic krill lay with CCAMLR, not the ATCM Working Group on Operational Matters. The United Kingdom suggested that ASOC send IP 108 to the Scientific Committee of CCAMLR.
- (196) Chile agreed with the United Kingdom and stated that it was not involved in the krill fishing industry for the aquaculture industry.
- (197) ASOC noted that early action would prevent the development of more serious problems later. ASOC noted that this matter will be directly presented to CCAMLR as suggested, but had wanted to take the opportunity to alert the Meeting to the need for early action at this stage.

#### **Item 15: Operational issues**

- (198) Uruguay introduced WP 6 *Extension on the use of the (AIS) Automatic Identification System for Antarctic Operations Safety and Security*, aimed at setting up an AIS system for mobile transportation equipment, on sea and on land. Its usefulness for search and rescue and for the support of field operations was emphasised. It noted that it was particularly suitable for operations in areas where stations and bases are concentrated.
- (199) Many Parties congratulated Uruguay for its very useful and interesting work and proposal. It was suggested that COMNAP may be best placed to build upon this work in collaboration with Uruguay, for example, to conduct further trials

and assessments on a voluntary basis and evaluate the applicability of the system to various National Programmes and types of operations.

- (200) COMNAP welcomed the very useful and practical work done by Uruguay and confirmed that it had already arranged to present and discuss this work in the upcoming COMNAP annual meeting in July 2006. COMNAP confirmed that it would work with Uruguay to assess further the system and would report back to ATCM XXX.
- (201) Argentina gave a presentation on its IP 111 *Acontecimientos y tareas realizadas por la patrulla de búsqueda y rescate en el continente antártico – año 2005*. Argentina expressed sincere thanks to the Governments of Chile, the Republic of Korea, Frei and King Sejong bases and other Antarctic Treaty Parties for their assistance.
- (202) Many delegations thanked Argentina for its presentation and expressed their condolences for the tragic loss of two members of the Argentine team.
- (203) Brazil informed the Meeting that the University of Porto Alegre, in conjunction with the Freiburg Geographical Institute, was in the process of drawing up maps of the ice cap containing crevasse data as a tool to support activities in King George Island / Isla 25 de Mayo.
- (204) Russia found use of GPS alone insufficient. It carried out regular aerial photography and used special markers to identify crevasses. It would be happy to share its experience with other Parties.
- (205) Australia said the Argentine presentation highlighted the high importance of safety of people working in Antarctica.
- (206) Bulgaria informed the Meeting that it and Spain had marked the route linking their adjoining bases. It also advised of the importance of including experienced mountaineers at stations.
- (207) South Africa introduced its IP 34 *Report of the Decommissioning of the Emergency Base (E Base) in Antarctica*, confirming the decommissioning and removal of the entire station during the 2005-06 summer season.

#### **Item 16: Education issues**

- (208) The United Kingdom gave a presentation of its IP 41 *Antarctic Education Website for Schools*. This is an interactive web-based resource called “Discovering Antarctica”, which is targeted at 11-16 year olds in UK schools. The website can be accessed at: [www.discoveringantarctica.org.uk](http://www.discoveringantarctica.org.uk). “Discovering Antarctica” contains background information and facts about Antarctica, and describes the environment, wildlife, science, and the Antarctic Treaty. It also includes comprehensive teachers’ notes and lesson ideas. The United Kingdom hoped it would be a valuable contribution to IPY. The site was copyright-free for educational purposes and therefore available to all Parties for use.

- (209) The Netherlands considered that the United Kingdom had again taken the lead in developing educational resources about Antarctica for young people. The Netherlands applauded the United Kingdom's leadership and effort in the field of education and outreach.
- (210) Australia, Chile, New Zealand, Russia and Sweden congratulated and thanked the United Kingdom. Chile offered to translate the website into Spanish for use throughout Latin America. New Zealand also thanked Russia, Argentina and the Republic of Korea for their Information Papers. It proposed the creation of an Antarctic web portal, linking all material. Australia suggested that COMNAP ask InfoNet to do this. COMNAP advised that it was happy to help but education was outside its remit. New Zealand suggested that the IPY International Programme Office might be better placed to co-ordinate. The United Kingdom proposed that the IPY Office be asked to report to ATCM XXX about its education and outreach activities.
- (211) SCAR informed the Meeting that its new objectives include education and outreach. The SCAR website contains a web page on education and training, and another web page on Antarctic Information. These pages operate like portals by incorporating links to many national education and outreach activities. SCAR intends to develop these portals during the IPY, and asked Parties to provide SCAR with web links to national education and outreach websites.
- (212) The Meeting recognised the significant opportunity created by IPY to advance Antarctic education, outreach and communication. The United Kingdom volunteered to explore options with COMNAP, SCAR, National Programmes, the Antarctic Treaty Secretariat, and the IPY International Programme Office as to how education and outreach and communication may be best considered by the ATCM. The United Kingdom agreed to report back on this topic to ATCM XXX.
- (213) Argentina introduced IP 109 *Educación Antártica Argentina* and IP 110 *Arte Antártico Argentino*. Whilst Argentina wanted to promote Antarctica through educational campaigns, it was also mindful of the need not to exploit the continent.
- (214) The Netherlands informed the Meeting that the European Polar Board is planning to set up an educational base camp in Svalbard. A similar educational base camp might be set up in Latin America or New Zealand. This would raise awareness whilst averting the risk of harmful activities in Antarctica itself.

### **Item 17: Exchange of Information**

- (215) The Executive Secretary introduced SP 9 *Electronic Information Exchange System*. ATCM XXVIII had instructed the Secretariat to start development of the system, which had been drawn up in consultation with COMNAP and Treaty Parties. The Executive Secretary pointed out that Parties provided data on their activities in a variety of ways. There was no intention to change any input requirements. The input forms included a number of optional fields.

Three types of data were required: pre-season, annual and permanent. Spain gave a practical demonstration of data input into the system.

- (216) The United States applauded the Secretariat's efforts. It welcomed the confirmation that information exchange requirements would not be expanded. It proposed an initial trial period to allow Parties to gain practical experience with the system.
- (217) Argentina, Australia, Chile, France, the Netherlands, New Zealand and the United Kingdom also thanked the Secretariat. Several supported the idea of a trial period and said they would be willing to participate. France and Argentina asked whether access to the system would be restricted or publicly available. The United Kingdom said the system had huge potential. It could help increase collaboration between Parties and allow for wider analysis of data. Australia asked whether co-ordination had taken place with SCAR on scientific reporting requirements.
- (218) The Executive Secretary said the system was designed as a data exchange tool for Parties. He acknowledged the system's wider potential as an analytical tool. He said access to the system would be limited to Parties but noted that most of them already placed their information on publicly available websites. He confirmed that SCAR would be consulted during the development of the scientific section of the system.
- (219) Germany expressed an interest in the compatibility of data formats (doc, pdf files) and proposed a download possibility for the purpose of publication on national websites.
- (220) COMNAP noted that a number of current requirements involved overlapping data and confirmed that it was working with the Antarctic Treaty Secretariat to avoid duplication of data entry. It agreed that a trial period would be desirable. Experience of its own system highlighted the value of user input during this phase. It had also found personal log-in to the system preferable to national log-in.
- (221) SCAR confirmed that it would be willing to consult with the Secretariat on reporting requirements for scientific information. It had recently changed its approach to requesting data from its members, asking them only to report on specific SCAR activities.
- (222) The Executive Secretary said that the system would be developed on a trial basis. He looked forward to hearing from Parties who wished to provide more detailed input in the development and hoped that the entire system would be functioning on a trial basis by ATCM XXX. He agreed that it would be important to keep track of authorisations to input or edit data. The Secretariat could also develop arrangements to remind Parties of the deadlines for data submission.
- (223) Germany introduced IP 43 *Start of the Antarctic Discussion Forum of Competent Authorities (DFCA)*, submitted by Germany and the Netherlands.

Germany invited Parties to register for the Forum and announced it would host a workshop in Berlin at the end of 2006.

### **Item 18: Biological Prospecting in Antarctica**

- (224) The Meeting thanked France, Argentina and UNEP for their respective Papers: IP 13 *In search of a legal regime for bioprospecting in Antarctica*; IP 112 *Argentine activities of bioprospecting and bioremediation in Antarctica* and IP116 *Recent Trends in the Biological Prospecting*. Some delegations noted that these were in keeping with the spirit of Resolution 7 (2005). They further noted with appreciation that IP 13 raised important legal issues, including a possible regime within the Antarctic Treaty system framework; that IP 112 responded to the wish expressed by the ATCM that Member States report their bioprospecting activities by incorporating valuable information, including the application of bioremediation; and IP 116 reflected in a comprehensive overview the growing interest in bioprospecting in Antarctica and the changing nature and dynamics of research in the industry that may affect the use of Antarctic compounds. The Meeting confirmed that bioprospecting would be discussed at ATCM XXX and urged Parties to continue to provide updates on their activities in this field.

### **Item 19: Preparation of ATCM XXX**

#### *a. Date and Place*

- (225) The Meeting welcomed the kind invitation of the Government of India to host ATCM XXX in New Delhi from 30 April to 11 May 2007.
- (226) For future planning, the Meeting took note of the following likely timetable of upcoming ATCMs :
- 2008: Ukraine
  - 2009: United States of America
  - 2010: Uruguay
  - 2011: Argentina
- (227) The Chairman informed the Meeting that, at Belgium's request, the issue of coordinating dates between ATCMs and the International Whaling Commission (IWC) had been discussed in the margins. This should not be an issue in 2007. For the future, it was suggested that the Antarctic Treaty Secretariat should seek to exchange early information on proposed dates with the Secretariat of the IWC, as well as with the United Nations Secretariat in charge of organising the Informal Consultative Process on the Law of the Sea and with other relevant organisations meeting at the same time of the year (such as CITES). To this end, it was further suggested that the expected host country for an ATCM should inform the Antarctic Treaty Secretariat of the proposed dates for the ATCM as soon as possible.

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

- (228) In accordance with established practice, the Meeting agreed that the following organisations having scientific or technical interest in Antarctica should be invited to send experts to attend ATCM XXX: the interim secretariat of ACAP,

ASOC, IAATO, IHO, IMO, IOC, the IPY International Programme Office, IUCN, UNEP, WMO and WTO.

*c. Invitation to Malaysia*

- (229) The Meeting decided, as on previous occasions, to invite the Malaysian Government to send representatives to observe ATCM XXX.
- (230) The Chair reported on contacts with the Delegation of Malaysia in the margins of ATCM XXIX. The Consultative Parties welcomed Malaysia's continued interest in the Antarctic Treaty, and hoped that Malaysia would take appropriate action to accede to the Treaty in the near future.

*d. Preparation of the Agenda for ATCM XXX*

- (231) The Meeting approved the preliminary agenda for ATCM XXX (**Annex K, page XXX**)

*e. The SCAR Lecture*

- (232) The Chairman recalled the lecture given by Dr. Valérie Masson-Delmotte on 14 June 2006 (summarised in Annex H, page XXX). Taking into account the valuable series of lectures given on the occasion of ATCMs, the Meeting decided to invite SCAR to give another lecture on scientific issues relevant to ATCM XXX.

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

- (233) The Meeting adopted the Final Report of the Twenty-ninth Antarctic Treaty Consultative Meeting.
- (234) After closing remarks by the Chair (in **Annex D, page XXX**), the Meeting was closed on 23 June 2006.