

Final Report of the Forty-fourth Antarctic Treaty Consultative Meeting

Berlin, Germany, 24 May – 2 June 2022

- (1) Pursuant to Article IX of the Antarctic Treaty, Representatives of the Consultative Parties (Argentina, Australia, Belgium, Brazil, Bulgaria, Chile, China, Czech Republic, Ecuador, Finland, France, Germany, India, Italy, Japan, the Republic of Korea, the Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway, Peru, Poland, the Russian Federation, South Africa, Spain, Sweden, Ukraine, the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, the United States of America, and Uruguay) met from 24 May to 2 June 2022, for the purpose of exchanging information, holding consultations, and formulating, considering, and recommending to their Governments, measures in furtherance of the principles and objectives of the Treaty. The Meeting was held in a hybrid format, with participants meeting either in person in Berlin, or virtually.
- (2) The Meeting was also attended by delegations from the following Contracting Parties to the Antarctic Treaty which are not Consultative Parties: Belarus, Canada, Colombia, Malaysia, Monaco, Portugal, Romania, Switzerland, Turkey, and Venezuela.
- (3) In accordance with Rules 2 and 31 of the ATCM Rules of Procedure, Observers from: the Commission for the Conservation of Antarctic Marine Living Resources (CCAMLR), the Scientific Committee on Antarctic Research (SCAR), and the Council of Managers of National Antarctic Programs (COMNAP) attended the meeting.
- (4) In accordance with Rule 39 and Rule 42 of the Rules of Procedure, Experts from the following international organisations and non-governmental organisations attended the Meeting: the International Hydrographic Organization (IHO), the International Union for Conservation of Nature (IUCN), the World Meteorological Organization (WMO), the Antarctic and Southern Ocean Coalition (ASOC), and the International Association of Antarctica Tour Operators (IAATO).
- (5) Germany, as Host Country of ATCM XLIV, fulfilled its information requirements towards the Contracting Parties, Observers and Experts through the Secretariat Notes, letters and a dedicated website.

Item 1: Opening of the Meeting

- (6) The Meeting was officially opened on 24 May 2022. On behalf of the Host Government, in accordance with Rules 5 and 6 of the Rules of Procedure, the Head of the Host Government Secretariat, Dr Manfred Reinke, called the Meeting to order and proposed the candidacy of Mrs Tania von Uslar-Gleichen as Chair of ATCM XLIV. The proposal was accepted and Mrs von Uslar-Gleichen was elected as Chair of ATCM XLIV in accordance with Rule 6.
- (7) The Chair warmly welcomed all Parties, Observers and Experts to Berlin and thanked them for their confidence in appointing her as Chair of the Meeting. The Chair expressed her hope that Parties would interact productively and act towards the good of Antarctica and the Treaty.
- (8) The Chair also noted that ATCM XLIV would be carried out in a hybrid format, in accordance with the Rules of Procedure and the *Ad-Hoc Guidelines for ATCM XLIV – CEP XXIV Hybrid Meeting*, which had been agreed to and adopted for ATCM XLIV by

all Consultative Parties, and which complemented, but were not intended to replace or have precedence over, the Rules of Procedure.

- (9) Delegates observed a minute of silence in honour of friends, colleagues and service members who were active in the Antarctic community and passed away in the previous year. The Chair mentioned especially the passing of Dr Yves Frenot, former director of the French Polar Institute and former Chair of the CEP (2010-14).
- (10) Ms Jennifer Lee Morgan, State Secretary and Special Envoy for International Climate Action at the Federal Foreign Office, welcomed delegates to Berlin, noting that this was the first physical ATCM after two years of pandemic. She noted that it was Antarctica and its vital role in humankind's efforts to live in balance with the earth and its protected status under the Environmental Protocol that drew Parties together, and highlighted the celebration of the 30th anniversary of the Environmental Protocol last year in Madrid. She thanked the scientists who had worked together over the decades to protect Antarctica, and reminded Parties of their important tasks to discuss and decide measures on the management and protection of Antarctica. She underlined that shifts in the Antarctic climate would have consequences for the climate around the world, noting that the mass loss of Antarctic ice sheet was projected to contribute substantially to global sea level rise. While encouraging Parties to move forward with their important work, Ms Lee Morgan recognised that it was not an easy decision to come together in Berlin while one Consultative Party was waging war on another Consultative Party. She stated that the Russian Federation was waging an unjustifiable, unprovoked and illegal war against Ukraine, violating the United Nations Charter and other fundamental principles of international law. She called on the Russian Federation to put an end to the war it had started and stop its military aggression, noting that this breach of international law was contrary to the spirit of the Antarctic Treaty, which was widely seen as a prominent example of well-functioning multilateralism. She also called on Parties to take responsibility for the protection of the unique and vulnerable ecosystem of the Antarctic and to not block important decisions for reasons not related to Antarctic interests. Ms Lee Morgan stressed that there was a strong urgency to care for the white continent, noting that Antarctica had recently sent out some worrisome signals to us. She highlighted the importance of understanding and monitoring the Antarctic climate for the survival of humankind. Based on scientific results, the right decisions for protection could be taken. She noted that the establishment of a network of protected areas was key to protecting and maintaining biodiversity in Antarctica as well as to counteract the effects of climate change. She noted that Parties would discuss proposals in this regard and also mentioned that, although in a different context, the work on new marine protected areas had to be continued as well. Noting the likely expansion of Antarctic tourism following the pandemic, she also encouraged Parties to be prudent and adopt a strategic approach on how to sustainably manage tourism in Antarctica, and to ensure that tourism activities met the strict requirements of environmental protection. Finally, Ms Lee Morgan stated that it was essential to maintain the integrity of the Antarctic Treaty System, in order to keep Antarctica a demilitarised continent, where peaceful and international cooperation prevailed. She affirmed that Germany was ready to accept this responsibility both by hosting this ATCM even in these difficult times, and by its commitment to strive, with all Parties, to ensure Antarctica would remain a beautiful, essential place.
- (11) Dr Bettina Hoffmann, Parliamentary State Secretary at the Federal Ministry for the Environment, Nature Conservation, Nuclear Safety and Consumer Protection, welcomed Parties and noted the hybrid nature of the Meeting, which allowed virtual participants to contribute across multiple time zones. She recalled that Antarctica had always been a continent that embodied the idea of peaceful use, even at times when nations were at great odds. During the Cold War, the Antarctic Treaty had served as a platform for different sides to meet and work together towards a common goal. Dr

Hoffmann stated that the Treaty faced new political challenges and condemned in the strongest possible terms the Russian Federation's war of aggression against Ukraine, which was a violation of international law. She added that the ATCM's work for peace, research and environmental protection should not be compromised because of the aggression of one Party against another. The global crises of climate change, biodiversity loss and pollution would not wait for the war to end. Dr Hoffmann recalled the 30th anniversary of the Environmental Protocol and underlined the need to protect and preserve what Parties have been working towards over the past 30 years. She noted that the Treaty principles, among them the precautionary principle, should continue to guide Parties. In this regard, she highlighted three priority issues requiring action from the ATCM. First, she highlighted the impact of the global climate crisis on Antarctica and, in particular, on the emperor penguin, and encouraged Parties to take immediate actions towards a stronger conservation status for it. Second, she emphasised the important role of area protection in preventing biodiversity loss, and encouraged Parties to further develop management plans to protect Antarctica's unique flora and fauna. She also referred to ongoing work under the German G7 Presidency on marine protected areas. Third, Dr Hoffmann emphasised that the global pollution crisis was also affecting Antarctica and noted that micro plastics posed a serious threat. She recalled the United Nations Environment Assembly, which mandated negotiations aimed to complete a draft legally binding agreement on plastics by the end of 2024. She also called on Parties to work towards the reduction of noise levels in Antarctic waters, noting it was particularly important to whales and other Antarctic wildlife. Finally, she highlighted the importance of working together collaboratively to further strengthen the preventative protection and preservation of Antarctica while setting an example for peaceful coexistence and multilateralism.

[[NEW PARA] The Russian Federation asserted its right to reply and they made a full statement on their position, which is recorded at paragraph 37.]

Item 2: Election of Officers and Creation of Working Groups

- (12) Ms Jenny Haukka, Head of Delegation of Finland, Host Country of ATCM XLV, was elected Vice-Chair. In accordance with Rule 7 of the Rules of Procedure, Mr Albert Lluberas Bonaba, Executive Secretary of the Antarctic Treaty Secretariat, acted as Secretary to the Meeting. Dr Manfred Reinke, head of the Host Country Secretariat, acted as Deputy Secretary.
- (13) The Meeting noted that the meeting of the Committee for Environmental Protection was led by its chair Ms Birgit Njåstad of Norway.
- (14) Two Working Groups were established:
 - Working Group 1: Policy, Legal and Institutional Issues;
 - Working Group 2: Operations, Science and Tourism; and
- (15) The following Chairs of the Working Groups were elected:
 - Working Group 1: Mr Theodore Kill from the United States;
 - Working Group 2: Ms Sonia Ramos García from Spain and Dr Phillip Tracey from Australia.

Item 3: Adoption of the Agenda and Allocation of Items

- (16) 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 to Working Groups and Consideration of the Multi-year Strategic Work Plan
 4. Operation of the Antarctic Treaty System: Reports by Parties, Observers and Experts
 5. Report of the Committee for Environmental Protection
 6. Operation of the Antarctic Treaty System
 - a. Request from Canada to become a Consultative Party
 - b. General matters
 7. Operation of the Antarctic Treaty System: Matters related to the Secretariat
 8. Liability
 9. Biological Prospecting in Antarctica
 10. Exchange of Information
 11. Education Issues
 12. Multi-year Strategic Work Plan
 13. Safety and Operations in Antarctica
 14. Inspections under the Antarctic Treaty and the Environment Protocol
 15. Science issues, future science challenges, scientific cooperation and facilitation
 16. Implications of Climate Change for Management of the Antarctic Treaty Area
 17. Tourism and Non-Governmental Activities in the Antarctic Treaty Area, including Competent Authorities Issues
 18. Preparation of ATCM XLV
 19. Any Other Business
 20. Adoption of the Final Report
 21. Close of the Meeting
- (17) The Meeting adopted the following allocation of agenda items:
- Plenary: Items 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6a, 18, 19, 20, 21.
 - Working Group 1: Items 6b, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12.
 - Working Group 2: 13, 14, 15, 16, 17.
- (18) The Meeting also decided to allocate draft instruments arising out of the work of the Committee for Environmental Protection and the Working Groups to a legal drafting group for consideration of their legal and institutional aspects.

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

- (19) Pursuant to Recommendation XIII-2, the Meeting received reports from depositary governments and secretariats.
- (20) The United States, in its capacity as Depositary Government of the Antarctic Treaty and its Environmental Protocol, reported on the status of the Antarctic Treaty and the Protocol on Environmental Protection to the Antarctic Treaty (IP 52). Since the last report, there had been no accessions to the Treaty and one approval of the Protocol. Austria had deposited an instrument of approval of the Protocol on 27 July 2021, and the Protocol had entered into force for Austria on 26 August 2021. The United States noted that there were currently 54 Parties to the Treaty and 42 Parties to the Protocol. It further noted that, in respect to Measure 1 (2005) recommending that Annex VI on Liability Arising from Environmental Emergencies form part of the Environmental Protocol, Chile and France approved Measure 1 (2005), respectively, on 15 June 2021 and 18 November 2021. It also reported that Canada deposited instruments of

acceptance of Annex V and the Amendment of Annex II to the Environmental Protocol on 23 February 2022.

- (21) Australia, in its capacity as Depositary for the Convention on the Conservation of Antarctic Marine Living Resources (CCAMLR), reported that there had been no new accessions to the Convention since ATCM XLIII. It noted that there were currently 36 Parties to the Convention (IP 46).
- (22) The United Kingdom, in its capacity as Depositary of the Convention for the Conservation of Antarctic Seals (CCAS), reported that it had not received any requests to accede to the Convention, or any instruments of accession, since ATCM XLIII (IP 18 rev. 2). The United Kingdom encouraged all Contracting Parties to CCAS to submit their returns on time.
- (23) Australia, in its capacity as Depositary for the Agreement on the Conservation of Albatrosses and Petrels (ACAP), reported that there had been no new accessions to the Agreement since ATCM XLIII, and that there were 13 Parties to the Agreement (IP 45). Australia encouraged Parties to join ACAP.
- (24) CCAMLR presented IP 14 *Report by the CCAMLR Observer to the Forty Fourth Antarctic Treaty Consultative Meeting*, which reported on the 40th annual CCAMLR Meeting, held online from 18 to 29 October 2021 and chaired by Dr Jakob Granit (Sweden). CCAMLR reported that SC-CAMLR and its working groups undertook significant work in 2021 on developing a revised krill management strategy. CCAMLR also reported that the Commission had added one vessel to the Non-Contracting Party IUU list and one vessel to the Contracting Party IUU list. It further noted that most compliance rates in the CCAMLR Summary Compliance Report were greater than 92%. CCAMLR noted the issue of seabird strikes on warps and net monitoring cables in the krill fishery as well as seal and humpback whale by-catch events. It reported that the Commission approved the reconvening of the Working Group on Incidental Mortality Associated with Fishing (WG-IMAF) to address this issue. CCAMLR also noted the establishment of two MPAs in South Orkney and the Ross Sea, as well as three additional proposals for MPAs, including an East Antarctica MPA, Weddell Sea MPA and an Antarctic Peninsula Region MPA. The Commission considered but could not reach agreement on a revised resolution on climate change, and agreed to reconsider the proposed revision of the resolution at CCAMLR 41. CCAMLR informed the Meeting that the Pine Island Glacier area had reduced by 22% since 2017, thus meeting the criteria for designation of a Special Area for Scientific Study. It was designated as Stage 1, pursuant to Conservation Measure 24-04, on 12 June 2021. CCAMLR concluded by reporting that the 41st Meeting of the Commission would be held in Hobart, Australia, from 24 October to 4 November 2022.
- (25) The Meeting thanked CCAMLR for its report, noting the significance of the 40th Meeting of the Commission and the common areas of work: climate change, non-native species, species protection, marine spatial management, and monitoring. The Meeting highlighted that the Declaration on the occasion of CCAMLR's 40th anniversary was attached to CCAMLR's report, and emphasised its relevance to the ATCM including, for example, the determination to further address the effects and impacts of climate change and the reaffirmation of the Commission's commitment to developing a representative network of marine protected areas.
- (26) SCAR presented IP 16 *The Scientific Committee on Antarctic Research Annual Report 2022 to the XLIV Antarctic Treaty Consultative Meeting*, which summarised its recent work to promote scientific knowledge, understanding and education on Antarctica. SCAR highlighted the work of its three scientific research programmes: the Integrated Science to Inform Antarctic and Southern Ocean Conservation (Ant-ICON); INStabilities and Thresholds in ANTarctica (INSTANT) and Near-term Variability and

Prediction of the Antarctic Climate System (AntClimnow). SCAR reported that, as part of the United Nations Decade of Ocean Science for Sustainable Development (2021-2030), it had coordinated the Southern Ocean Task Force which was established to develop the Southern Ocean Action Plan launched in April 2022. SCAR had also organised two events at the 26th United Nations Climate Change Conference of the Parties (COP26) in Glasgow in 2021: an official side event titled “Antarctic and Overshoot Scenarios: Risk of Irreversible Sea-Level Rise” and, as part of Polar Oceans Day at the Cryosphere Pavilion, an event titled “Antarctic Marine Ecosystems Under Pressure: Protection Needs Action Locally and Globally”. SCAR also referred to IP 5, noting that its Fellowship Programme aimed to encourage the active involvement of early career researchers in Antarctic scientific research and build new connections and further strengthen international capacity and cooperation in Antarctic research. SCAR highlighted its film, “Peace and Science” and encouraged Parties to access the film via the SCAR website. SCAR further reported on its work with intergovernmental fora, numerous capacity building and outreach initiatives as well as collaborative projects undertaken with IAATO for the development of a systematic conservation plan for the Antarctic Peninsula, which aimed to facilitate the concurrent management of biodiversity, science and tourism. Finally, SCAR reported that the 10th SCAR Open Science Conference would be a virtual event, hosted by India from 1-10 August 2022, with the theme “Antarctica in a Changing World”.

- (27) COMNAP presented IP 19 *Annual Report 2021/22 Council of Managers of National Antarctic Programs*, which summarised its activities during the previous year. Despite continued challenges presented by the COVID-19 pandemic, COMNAP had remained committed to its work facilitating the cooperation of national Antarctic programmes that supported approximately 500 scientific projects in Antarctica, and coordinating the maintenance and security of critical Antarctic infrastructures. During its 33rd Annual General Meeting, held in July 2021, COMNAP welcomed the TÜBITAK Marmara Research Center, Polar Research Institute of Turkey among its membership, making it COMNAP’s 31st member. COMNAP reported that it also renewed its *COVID-19 Outbreak Prevention and Management Guidelines for the 2021/22 Antarctic Season* to assist national Antarctic programmes in the preparation of their own protocols. Other highlights of the year included the widespread participation of the Antarctic community in the COMNAP aviation workshop and improvements in COMNAP air operations products such as the Antarctic Flight Information Manual and the COMNAP RPAS Operator’s Handbook. COMNAP also remarked that it was looking forward to further active participation and cooperation among its membership in the upcoming Search and Rescue workshop in 2023.
- (28) The Meeting thanked COMNAP for its report and, in particular, for its competent and steadfast work in coordinating the international response of Antarctic stations, researchers and personnel to the ongoing COVID-19 pandemic. The Parties noted the overall effectiveness of the sanitary measures taken by national Antarctic programmes under COMNAP guidance and leadership, and expressed particular gratitude to Executive Secretary, Michelle Rogan-Finnemore, for her efforts during the season.
- (29) In relation to Article III-2 of the Antarctic Treaty, the Meeting received reports from other international organisations.
- (30) WMO presented IP 21 rev.1 *WMO Annual Report*, which reported on a range of WMO activities of relevance to the Antarctic Treaty System. This included activities of the World Climate Research Programme, World Weather Research Programme, the Global Cryosphere Watch and the Antarctic Regional Climate Centre network. WMO highlighted its ongoing work in coordinating research and modelling activities on ice sheet mass balance and sea level, ice shelves and alpine glaciers, sea ice, and permafrost, often in collaboration with SCAR. Several modelling activities were also of

relevance to the ATCM, contributing science and climate scenarios used in the global assessment reports of the IPCC. The report also highlighted the ongoing Year of Polar Prediction, the final summit of which was to take place in August 2022, as well as WMO's research opportunities for early career researchers. WMO referred Parties to IP 71 and IP 74 for further information. WMO thanked all the Parties for their cooperation and support, and restated its continued commitment to further scientific and meteorological research, publications and other long-term collaboration with the ATCM.

- (31) The Meeting thanked WMO for its paper and took note of the broad and diverse engagement of its membership in vital research on climate change, weather prediction and cryosphere research.
- (32) ASOC presented IP 88 *ASOC report to the ATCM* and reported on its activities to promote Antarctic conservation over the past year. ASOC reported that it, and its members, had participated in CCAMLR meetings, meetings of the IMO, and the United Nations Conference of the Parties, where ASOC member WWF hosted an event on blue carbon and Antarctic krill. ASOC also noted its support for policy-relevant scientific research, including funding biodiversity indicators research for the Southern Ocean. In addition, ASOC member Greenpeace undertook an expedition to the Weddell Sea that included a number of scientific submarine dives. ASOC member, the Pew Charitable Trusts, organised a climate workshop that brought together international experts to discuss the global impact of changes to the Southern Ocean, and the policy responses needed to address these climate risks. ASOC highlighted the need to embark on a new era of Antarctic preservation and conservation, including designating new protected areas, assigning emperor penguins the status of Specially Protected Species, and taking action on climate change. ASOC therefore urged Parties, along with all Antarctic bodies and actors, to engage in international discussions to increase the conservation outcomes of the Antarctic Treaty System.
- (33) IAATO introduced IP 41 *Annual Report of the International Association of Antarctica Tour Operators*. In its report IAATO noted that its membership currently comprises 106 Operators and Associates, representing businesses based in 21 different Antarctic Treaty Party countries and that IAATO Operators annually carried nationals from nearly all Treaty Parties in addition to nationals from a further 44 non-Treaty Party countries. IAATO stated that the 2021-22 Antarctic season ran smoothly with no incidents to report. The 2020-21 and 2021-22 seasons saw reduced operations due to the challenges of the global pandemic. However, IAATO anticipated that the 2022-23 season would see the growth observed in prior years to continue. IAATO had invested in various tools during its history to manage the challenges that may occur during growth. During the annual meeting additional measures were agreed upon to enhance IAATO's response, such as extending the requirement for IAATO's online assessment to captains and certain officers. IAATO reported the tools and measures that it had implemented would further evolve with the continued growth.
- (34) Ukraine presented IP 85 rev.1 *Implementation of the National Antarctic Program of Ukraine in the Conditions of Hybrid Warfare and Open Military Aggression of the Russian Federation: Challenges and Lessons Learned*. The paper outlined the main challenges faced by Ukraine's national Antarctic programme in the context of a hybrid war and military intervention by the Russian Federation. Ukraine informed the Meeting that the Russian Federation's unfriendly actions had had a significant negative impact on the work and progress of its Antarctic programme. It reported that the *Noosfera* had set out on its first Antarctic voyage under the flag of Ukraine from the port of Odessa on 28 January 2022, and that, since February, Odessa has been under continuous missile and artillery fire, blocking the return to Ukraine of the vessel and all Ukrainian researchers in Antarctica. Ukraine also reported that, after the collapse of the Soviet

Union in 1991, the Russian Federation left all Soviet Antarctic stations under its jurisdiction, despite the fact that 16.37% of the assets of the Soviet Union should have been moved to Ukraine. It further noted that Russia's military actions had led to budget cuts in all areas of the economy, including the budget of Ukraine's national Antarctic programme. Ukraine expressed gratitude to those Parties whose governments and Antarctic programmes had offered their assistance. Ukraine called on Parties to initiate discussions over the proper response of the Antarctic community to the unfriendly actions of one Consultative Party towards another. It also urged the Meeting to deprive the Russian Federation of its right to vote in future ATCMs, to reject any initiatives made by the Russian Federation, to terminate ongoing joint projects with the Russian Federation, and to refuse to purchase services from, or supply services to, the Russian Federation or other actors directly or indirectly affiliated with the Russian Federation.

- (35) Most Parties expressed their solidarity with Ukraine and the Ukrainian people, and condemned the Russian Federation's unjustified, unprovoked and illegal war of aggression against Ukraine, noting that it violated international law and the United Nations Charter, and undermined international security and stability. [Many] Parties also condemned Belarus' involvement in this unlawful use of force against Ukraine. Most Parties thanked Ukraine for its time and effort in presenting its paper, noting that it raised international awareness of the plight of Ukrainian scientists working in Antarctica. Recalling previous collaboration with Ukraine, most Parties offered support to Ukraine's national Antarctic programme, and its efforts to make a full contribution to the Antarctic Treaty System. Most Parties noted the wider negative impacts of the Russian Federation's invasion of Ukraine on world and energy security, and multilateral cooperation in general. These Parties called for an immediate end to all hostilities against Ukraine, and urged the Russian Federation to withdraw its troops from Ukraine and to respect Ukraine's territorial integrity.
- (36) Several Parties reported that they had condemned the Russian Federation for the invasion of Ukrainian territory, and urged that the illegitimate use of force cease, in the relevant international fora. These Parties acknowledged the challenges facing the Ukrainian national Antarctic programme and some offered them help with regards to logistics in Antarctica. These Parties stressed that the Antarctic Treaty had overcome difficult political challenges throughout its 60-year history resorting to its basic principles, like peace and international cooperation, and that the Meeting should strive to advance pressing issues that fall within the mandate of the Antarctic Treaty System.
- (37) The Russian Federation condemned IP 85 rev. 1, stating that many of the statements in the paper were false. It noted that the paper, as well as comments made by many Parties posed a threat to the tradition of international cooperation that underpinned the Antarctic Treaty System. The Russian Federation expressed its outrage at the characterisation of its activities in Ukraine as unprovoked and unjustified also referring to parts of the opening addresses during the official opening ceremony of ATCM XLIV. It stated that its military operation in the Donetsk and Luhansk regions of Ukraine was necessary to protect Russians from Ukrainian aggression, and was being carried out in accordance with Article 51 of the United Nations Charter. The Russian Federation called on Parties to ignore the paper, refrain from any accusatory rhetoric, and remain within the bounds of the ATCM's mandate.
- (38) The Chair noted that a substantial number of Parties stood and walked out of the meeting room for the duration of the intervention of the Russian Federation.
- (39) While acknowledging the challenges facing the Ukrainian national Antarctic programme, China suggested that the ATCM is not an appropriate venue to discuss geopolitical issues. China cautioned that the ATCM should focus on its work and not go beyond its mandate, and reminded the Meeting that multilateral mechanisms like ATCM should not be politicised. China called for the peaceful settlement of the crisis

in Ukraine.

Item 5: Report of the Committee for Environmental Protection

- (40) Ms Birgit Njåstad, Chair of the Committee for Environmental Protection, introduced the report of CEP XXIV. The CEP had considered 44 Working Papers and 63 Information Papers. In addition, 4 Secretariat Papers and 4 Background Papers had been submitted under CEP agenda items.
- (41) Reflecting on the outcomes and achievements of CEP XXIV, the Meeting expressed its appreciation for the excellent leadership demonstrated by the CEP Chair and Vice-Chairs and the extensive amount of work the Committee had completed during its full work programme. In doing so, Parties stressed the importance of the Committee's responsibilities and roles: in the comprehensive protection of the Antarctic environment under the Environmental Protocol; in advising the ATCM using the best scientific advice available; and in the broader Antarctic Treaty System. Parties emphasised that the role of the CEP was growing increasingly urgent as Antarctica faced the impacts of climate change, non-native species introductions, and other pressures clearly articulated in reports such as those presented by SCAR, and where the effectiveness and timeliness of measures taken pursuant to the Protocol is critical.
- (42) Recalling the actions taken by one Member at CEP XXIII to undermine consensus, most Parties expressed frustration that similar actions had been taken again at CEP XXIV. Some Parties raised concerns that this Member had proposed parallel, or counter-proposals, rather than engaging constructively in related intersessional work that was open to all Members and had been developed over many years by many Members as part of agreed priority work or as part of the work of CEP Subsidiary Bodies. This placed obstacles in the way of agreed priority work, and led to a lack of agreement on otherwise critical outcomes.
- (43) Most Parties called on the Member to uphold the spirit of consensus and to move forward together, working constructively to maintain a regular flow of high quality advice to the ATCM, prevent any departure from science and technical discussion and ensure outcomes that benefited the Antarctic environment in accordance with Article 12 of the Protocol. Some Parties also recalled the Paris Declaration adopted at ATCM XLIII, in which all Parties reaffirmed their strong and unwavering commitment to the objectives of the Antarctic Treaty, its Environmental Protocol and other instruments of the Antarctic Treaty System, and also reaffirmed the commitment of drawing upon the best available scientific and technical advice.
- (44) China stated its continued commitment to the comprehensive protection of the Antarctic ecosystem and supported the decision-making system already established under the Antarctic Treaty System. In response to comments made by most Parties, China reiterated its willingness to work towards consensus in accordance with the Antarctic Treaty and Environmental Protocol on the basis of sound science, and emphasised that Parties needed to abide by those rules that had been agreed to, including those contained in the CEP and ATCM Rules and Procedures.

Opening of the Meeting (CEP Agenda Item 1)

- (45) The Chair of the CEP advised that the CEP had welcomed Austria as a new Member, following its accession to the Environmental Protocol on 26 August 2021, and had noted that the CEP now comprised 42 members.
- (46) The Meeting welcomed Austria as a new Member of the Committee and congratulated it for its accession to the Environmental Protocol.

- (47) The Committee had expressed sincere condolences for the passing of Dr Yves Frenot, who had served as CEP Chair from 2010 to 2014, and had acknowledged Dr Frenot's immense contributions to the Committee.
- (48) The Meeting also extended its sincere condolences for the passing of Dr Frenot and acknowledged his invaluable contributions to the Committee.

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

- (49) The Chair of the CEP advised that the Committee had discussed a proposal to revisit the CEP's strategic priorities and Five-year Work Plan. While emphasising that the CEP had been functioning well within the current Work Plan, and that it had been successfully delivering on its mandate as outlined in Article 12 of the Environmental Protocol, the Committee had recognised the timeliness of reviewing strategic priorities in light of changing circumstances and emerging issues.
- (50) The CEP had therefore agreed to advise the ATCM that it would revisit its priorities, the functioning of the Committee, and its Five-year Work Plan at CEP XXV. The Committee had noted that, during these considerations of CEP strategic priorities, efforts would be made to identify existing and new challenges. The CEP had agreed that this would take the form of a workshop hosted in collaboration with Finland prior to CEP XXV, and that Members and Observers would be encouraged to, where appropriate, facilitate broad participation in intersessional discussions to ensure diversity and inclusivity in the workshop. The Committee had further noted that participants would be guided by the principles of the Environmental Protocol, drawing on the best available science.
- (51) The Chair of CEP noted that the Committee had updated its Five-year Work Plan to incorporate actions arising from CEP XXIV.
- (52) The Meeting commended and appreciated the process initiated by the CEP to revisit its strategic priorities and Five-year Work Plan, in particular in light of changing pressures, the urgent action required to attend to the implications of climate change, and attending to the ATCM's requests for advice. The Meeting welcomed the workshop to be held in Helsinki, and looked forward to the outcomes which would also be relevant to the work of the ATCM.

Operation of the CEP (CEP Agenda Item 4)

- (53) The Chair of the CEP advised that the Committee had discussed the utility of providing information on its two subsidiary groups, the Subsidiary Group on Management Plans (SGMP) and the Subsidiary Group on Climate Change Response (SGCCR), on the Secretariat's website. The CEP had agreed that webpages would be useful tools for disseminating information to existing and new Members. The Committee had supported the development of individual dedicated Secretariat webpages for the two Subsidiary Groups, approved initial content for these webpages to be posted, and noted any future updates would need to be approved by consensus by the Committee.

Cooperation with other Organisations (CEP Agenda Item 5)

- (54) The Chair of the CEP reported that the Committee had received annual reports from SC-CAMLR, COMNAP, IAATO, SCAR and WMO and had nominated CEP representatives to attend the meetings of other organisations. The Committee had noted the importance of the Observers to the work of the CEP.

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

Strategic Approach

- (55) The Chair of the CEP noted that the Committee had considered the decadal update of the Antarctic Climate Change and the Environment report (ACCE) and discussed policy and research recommendations put forth by SCAR on the basis of this. The Committee had congratulated SCAR on its milestone decadal update. The Committee had noted that the update underscored the urgency to conduct further research to fill science gaps and to implement response actions. It had noted the important value of the ACCE report, which had drawn on the best available science, to support the Committee's deliberations on management responses to climate change in Antarctica and the relevance of the findings for the work of the SGCCR and for the CCRWP. Finally, the Committee had highlighted the importance of communicating and disseminating the findings of this report to the wider global community.
- (56) The Meeting thanked the CEP for its work and welcomed its advice. Parties also welcomed the ongoing work by SCAR to inform the CEP and ATCM on climate change in Antarctica using the best available science, noting that climate change had become one of the largest threats to Antarctica. Noting the outcomes of the ACCE Report, Parties highlighted the necessity of timely action on climate change.
- (57) SCAR reiterated its encouragement for strong action related to climate change, and its appreciation that Parties had acknowledged the need for urgency in this regard.

Implementation and Review of the Climate Change Response Work Programme

- (58) The Chair of the CEP noted that under this agenda item the Committee had considered a report relating to the communication, implementation and review of the Climate Change Response Work Programme (CCRWP) from the Subsidiary Group on Climate Change Response (SGCCR), as well as other papers relevant to this issue. The Committee had expressed support for the work undertaken by members of the SGCCR during the 2021-22 intersessional period and had asserted the need to continue to implement the CCRWP on the basis of knowledge of climate change and the challenges it presented. The Committee also had agreed to inform the ATCM on the progress in implementing CCRWP actions.
- (59) The Chair of the CEP reported that the Committee had not reached consensus on updates to the CCRWP proposed by the SGCCR, and that the SGCCR therefore would continue working in the coming intersessional period to implement the existing CCRWP (2016) in accordance with its current Terms of Reference.
- (60) The Meeting thanked the CEP and emphasised the importance of understanding the implications of climate change in Antarctica and the necessity of acting on the basis of the best available science. The Meeting welcomed the CEP's strategic approach and its focus on implementing the CCRWP. It also underscored the value of the CEP's annual progress reports to the ATCM.
- (61) The Meeting called on Parties to support the continuation of this work as a priority and encouraged all Parties to actively engage in the work of the SGCCR. Parties highlighted that intersessional exchanges should be pragmatic and promote understanding among participants, particularly when different views existed, in order to facilitate Members reaching consensus.
- (62) Most Parties expressed disappointment that consensus on an updated version of the CCRWP had not been reached. These Parties voiced their frustration that one Member had individually submitted a paper with different views than those of the SGCCR, rather than engaging constructively in the work of the SGCCR, and had not sought to build agreements on its proposals blocking the process of reaching consensus on this

matter. Most Parties supported keeping the CCRWP up-to-date, and emphasised that the CCRWP did not establish legally binding requirements. These Parties called for all CEP Members to engage in intersessional discussions and work towards consensus, as all Parties were obliged to do in accordance with the Antarctic Treaty.

- (63) In response to these comments, China stated that it had engaged constructively in intersessional discussions, where it had suggested that the CEP should focus on the implementation of the existing CCRWP rather than on its update. China stated that the Committee should focus on research and monitoring to narrow the knowledge gaps of the CCRWP. Given almost all of the gaps/needs and actions/tasks remained to be done under the current version of the CCRWP, China saw no need to update it at that stage. China emphasised the importance of recognising different opinions among CEP Members, and noted there is a need to improve the way to effectively and efficiently update the CCRWP.
- (64) The Chair of the CEP noted that the Committee had also agreed to advise the ATCM that it was moving to a phase more focused on CCRWP implementation, and had delivered or initiated work on almost all of the 34 Actions identified within the CCRWP, providing examples to this effect.
- (65) The Chair of the CEP further advised that the Committee had also agreed to report to the ATCM that much remained to be done to fully implement all the CCRWP Actions. The Committee had noted priority actions where effort may usefully be focused.
- (66) The Chair of the CEP reported that the Committee had noted that, for some of these priority actions work had been underway or planned for the 2022-23 intersessional period.
- (67) The Meeting commended the CEP for having delivered or initiated work on almost all of the 34 Actions identified within the CCRWP. In particular, it acknowledged the work undertaken by Kevin Hughes (United Kingdom) in convening and leading the work of the SGCCR. Parties noted that during the intersessional period great progress had been made to update the CCRWP, with many CEP Members engaging constructively in discussions.
- (68) The Chair of the CEP advised that under this agenda item the Committee had also considered a review of progress in the implementation of the recommendations identified at the Joint CEP/SC-CAMLR Workshop on Climate Change and Monitoring (2016). Emphasising the importance of collaboration and communication between the CEP and SC-CAMLR, the Committee had agreed to, during the next intersessional period, initiate a process to develop a next joint CEP/SC-CAMLR workshop to take place at the latest in 2024.
- (69) The Meeting welcomed the plans for a further Joint CEP/SC-CAMLR Workshop and emphasised the importance of the collaboration between the CEP and SC-CAMLR to address the challenges of climate change in the Antarctic region.
- (70) The Chair of the CEP noted that under this agenda item the Committee had also initiated discussions on the risk of climate change impacts on Antarctic heritage values and a proposed two-year work plan to progress the development of a climate change risk assessment tool for Antarctic heritage. The Committee had expressed full support for the proposed work.
- (71) The Meeting conveyed to the CEP Chair its decision to hold a joint session with the CEP, and also SCAR and COMNAP in the following year to consider the implementation of the recommendations of SCAR's Antarctic climate change and the environment (ACCE) report, and requested the CEP to provide input to the session on recommendations that fall within its functions. The CEP Chair indicated the CEP's

willingness and eagerness to engage.

Draft Comprehensive Environmental Evaluations

- (72) The Chair of the CEP reported that no Draft Comprehensive Environmental Evaluations had been submitted to the Committee for consideration at this Meeting.

Other EIA Matters

- (73) The Chair of the CEP reported that under this agenda item the Committee had considered a paper relating to the effectiveness of EIA in Antarctica, summarising the findings of an independent assessment on this matter. The Committee had underlined the importance of the EIA process for the protection of the Antarctic environment, and had engaged in a broad discussion on the topics highlighted in the full report. The Committee advised the ATCM that it had agreed to progress on this issue through informal discussion during the intersessional period and had agreed to a work plan to that effect, but that it also had agreed that opportunities for improving the Antarctic EIA system needed to be handled carefully so as not to cause additional challenges.
- (74) The Meeting thanked the United Kingdom for leading work on opportunities to improve EIA in Antarctica, including to modernise the EIA process taking into account current best practices. It encouraged all Parties to implement domestic legislation on EIA requirements for Antarctica. The Meeting agreed that the EIA process was a cornerstone of the Environmental Protocol. Some Parties also highlighted the value of keeping the Annexes up to date as a broader principle. The Meeting furthermore thanked CEP for its advice and looked forward to hearing the results from the further intersessional discussions to take place.
- (75) The Chair of the CEP noted that under this agenda item the Committee also had considered the preliminary results of a project aimed at mapping coastline sensitivity and to develop an oil spill sensitivity map for the coastline of the Antarctic Peninsula region. The Committee had agreed on the usefulness of the preliminary sensitivity map for assisting with oil spill contingency planning and response, and had encouraged Members and Observers to provide suggestions for improving the map's accuracy and utility to enhance the management of potential oil spills in the Antarctic Peninsula region. The CEP Chair also noted that the Committee had considered the preliminary sensitivity map a useful tool for the EIA processes.

Area Protection and Management Plans (CEP Agenda Item 9)

Management Plans

- (76) The CEP Chair reported that the Committee had considered papers that presented seventeen revised Antarctic Specially Protected Area (ASPA) management plans and one revised Antarctic Specially Managed Area (ASMA) management plan.
- (77) Accepting the CEP's advice, the Meeting adopted the following Measures on Protected Areas:
- **Measure A** (2022) *Antarctic Specially Managed Area ASMA No 7 (Southwest Anvers Island and Palmer Basin): Revised Management Plan*
 - **Measure B** (2022) *Antarctic Specially Protected Area ASPA No 149 (Cape Shirreff and San Telmo Island, Livingston Island, South Shetland Islands): Revised Management Plan.*
 - **Measure C** (2022) *Antarctic Specially Protected Area ASPA No 122 (Arrival Heights, Hut Point Peninsula, Ross Island): Revised Management Plan.*

- **Measure D** (2022) *Antarctic Specially Protected Area ASPA No 124 (Cape Crozier, Ross Island): Revised Management Plan.*
 - **Measure E** (2022) *Antarctic Specially Protected Area ASPA No 113 (Litchfield Island, Arthur Harbor, Anvers Island, Palmer Archipelago): Revised Management Plan.*
 - **Measure F** (2022) *Antarctic Specially Protected Area ASPA No 119 (Davis Valley and Forlidas Pond, Dufek Massif, Pensacola Mountains): Revised Management Plan.*
 - **Measure G** (2022) *Antarctic Specially Protected Area ASPA No 139 (Biscoe Point, Anvers Island, Palmer Archipelago): Revised Management Plan.*
 - **Measure K** (2022) *Antarctic Specially Protected Area ASPA No 164 Scullin and Murray Monoliths, Mac.Robertson Land: Revised Management Plan.]*
 - **Measure L** (2022) *Antarctic Specially Protected Area ASPA No 127 (Haswell Island): Revised Management Plan.*
 - **Measure N** (2022) *Antarctic Specially Protected Area ASPA 109 (Moe Island, South Orkney Islands): Revised Management Plan.*
 - **Measure O** (2022) *Antarctic Specially Protected Area ASPA No 110 (Lynch Island, South Orkney Islands): Revised Management Plan.*
 - **Measure P** (2022) *Antarctic Specially Protected Area ASPA No 111 (Southern Powell Island and adjacent islands, South Orkney Islands): Revised Management Plan.*
 - **Measure Q** (2022) *Antarctic Specially Protected Area ASPA No 115 (Lagotellerie Island, Marguerite Bay, Graham Land): Revised Management Plan.*
 - **Measure R** (2022) *Antarctic Specially Protected Area ASPA No 126 (Byers Peninsula, Livingston Island, South Shetland Islands): Revised Management Plan.*
 - **Measure S** (2022) *Antarctic Specially Protected Area ASPA No 129 (Rothera Point, Adelaide Island): Revised Management Plan.*
 - **Measure T** (2022) *Antarctic Specially Protected Area ASPA No 140 (Parts of Deception Island, South Shetland Islands): Revised Management Plan.*
 - **Measure W** (2022) *Antarctic Specially Protected Area ASPA No 133 (Harmony Point, Nelson Island, South Shetland Islands): Revised Management Plan.*
- (78) The Committee had agreed to forward the draft revised management plan for the suggested merger between ASPA 152 and ASPA 153 to the SGMP for review.
- (79) The Committee had not been able to endorse the revised management plans for ASPA 145, due to differing understandings of the requirements of Decision 9 (2005). The Committee had invited the CEP Observer to SC-CAMLR to draw SC-CAMLR's attention to the issue discussed with respect to the trigger criteria in Decision 9 (2005).
- (80) The Committee had also considered a draft management plan for a new protected area in Western Sør Rondane Mountains, Dronning Maud Land, East Antarctica and had reaffirmed that it had recognised that the outstanding values of the site warranted protection and had forwarded the draft management plan for the area to the SGMP for review.
- (81) Under this agenda item the Committee had also considered the prior assessment of three proposed new protected areas, in accordance with the *Guidelines: A prior assessment process for the designation of ASPAs and ASMAs*: i) Otto-von-Gruber-Gebirge (Dronning Maud Land, East Antarctica); ii) Danger Islands Archipelago

(North-eastern Antarctic Peninsula); and iii) Farrier Col, Horseshoe Island, Marguerite Bay. The Committee had agreed that the values of the three proposed ASPAs merited special protection and had endorsed the development of management plans for these areas. The Committee had further highlighted the usefulness of the prior assessment procedure, which had offered the opportunity to consider proposed new areas before the majority of work toward designation had been implemented.

- (82) Germany thanked the CEP for considering the prior assessments for the proposed ASPAs in Otto-von-Gruber-Gebirge (Dronning Maud Land, East Antarctica and the Danger Islands Archipelago (North-eastern Antarctic Peninsula). Referring to the results of the joint SCAR-CEP workshop held prior to CEP XXII (CEP XXII-WP 70), Germany expressed its willingness to further contribute to the systematic development of the Antarctic protected areas management system.

Historic Sites and Monuments

- (83) The CEP Chair noted that the Committee had agreed to forward proposals for modifications to sites 26, 29, 36, 38, 39, 40, 41, 42, 43 and 93 of the List of Historic Sites and Monuments to the ATCM for adoption by the way of a Measure, utilising the mechanisms of Decision 1 (2021) for the first time. The Committee furthermore advised that it had made additional updates in fields that do not require adoption through a Measure to the listing for HSM 93. The CEP Chair also highlighted the finding of the wreck of the *Endurance* (HSM 93).
- (84) Australia remarked that it was highly fitting to update the HSM details for the wreck of the *Endurance*, and congratulated the team of researchers on their work to locate it. The Meeting adopted **Measure U (2022) Revised List of Antarctic Historic Sites and Monuments: Updating information for Historic Sites and Monuments No 26, 29, 36, 38, 39, 40, 41, 42, 43 and 93.**
- (85) The Committee had also considered guidance to support Parties in developing conservation management plans as tools to protect Antarctic heritage. The Committee had highlighted that, although they were not required for all HSMs, conservation management plans were a useful tool for protecting HSMs. The Committee had agreed to update the *Guidelines for the assessment and management of Heritage in Antarctica*. The Committee had encouraged Members to continue to share their conservation management plans and expertise among each other so as to raise the standard of heritage stewardship and to consider how this could be facilitated.

- (86) The Meeting adopted Resolution B (2022) Revised Guidelines for the assessment and management of Heritage in Antarctica.**

Site Guidelines

- (87) Regarding the Committee's work on Site Guidelines, the CEP Chair reported that it had revised the site guidelines for one site, Wordie House, Winter Island, and that it had agreed to request Torgersen Island, Arthur Harbour be removed from the list of Site Guidelines maintained by the Secretariat, as they were no longer relevant due to the closing of the Visitor's zone in ASMA 7.
- (88) Accepting the CEP's advice, the Meeting considered and approved the revised Site Guidelines for Wordie House, Winter Island, agreed to remove Torgersen Island, Arthur Harbour from the list of Site Guidelines, and adopted Resolution D (2022) Site Guidelines for Visitors.**

Marine Spatial Protection and Management

- (89) The CEP Chair reported that no papers had been submitted under this item and made a note of the Committee's pending obligation to respond to the request from the ATCM

in Resolution 5 (2017).

Other Annex V Matters

- (90) The CEP Chair reported that the Committee had, recalling the positive experience the Committee had had with pre-meeting reviews on revised draft management plans prior to the virtual CEP XXIII meeting, considered and agreed to procedures for the efficient pre-meeting review of revised management plans submitted to the CEP within the remit of the SGMP. The Committee had agreed to revise the SGMP's Terms of Reference to reflect this regular task of pre-meeting review of management plans. The Committee had also adopted the SGMP work plan for 2022/23.
- (91) The CEP had also considered a report on recent research to develop an inventory of type localities for terrestrial and freshwater species on the Antarctic continent and offshore islands within the Antarctic Treaty area. The Committee had recognised the value of this work in enhancing the systematic protection of Antarctica and had encouraged Members to draw on this research, as well as other relevant tools, when reviewing management plans for existing ASPAs. The Committee had also encouraged Members to continue to support efforts to improve Antarctic biodiversity knowledge, including research to determine the distribution, as well as status and trends, of species with type localities in the Antarctic Treaty area.

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

Quarantine and Non-native Species

- (92) The CEP Chair reported that no Working Papers had been submitted under this agenda item. However, the Committee had been informed about ongoing work related to non-native species relevant to this priority item on the CEP Five-year Work Plan, and had been encouraged to see a great deal of commitment and engagement on the issue.

Specially Protected Species

- (93) The Chair of the CEP reported that under this agenda item the Committee had considered the report from the CEP Intersessional Contact Group established to develop a Specially Protected Species Action Plan for the emperor penguin to support this species' designation as a Specially Protected Species and other related papers. The Committee had emphasised the importance of drawing on best available science to support CEP management decisions such as listing specially protected species, and had recalled SCAR's advice on the need for the conservation of the emperor penguin. With one exception, Members voiced strong support for the recommendations that the emperor penguin should be designated a SPS under Annex II of the Protocol, and that the Action Plan should be implemented. The Committee did not, however, reach consensus on this matter despite receiving full support from all but one Member. With one exception, Members had also agreed that the current legal framework on SPS presented no impediments to advancing efforts to designate emperor penguins as SPS and that, although there was room to revisit some aspects of its guidance, the framework had not required further immediate consideration.
- (94) The Meeting commended the Committee and, in particular, the SGCCR convenor, Kevin Hughes (United Kingdom), for its work on this issue. Most Parties also expressed regret that an agreement could not be reached on designation of the emperor penguin as an Antarctic SPS.
- (95) Most Parties expressed full support to the recommendations put forward to designate the emperor penguin as a Specially Protected Species. These Parties noted this to be a reasonable recommendation, consistent with the provision of Annex II and the relevant

guidelines, and based on best available science as comprehensively synthesised by SCAR. Most Parties highlighted the high quality of SCAR's analysis based on peer-reviewed science as well as its impartial, multilateral approach to scientific research and collaboration, and that SCAR contributed its expertise and experience as an Observer to the ATCM in a manner consistent with the ATCM Rules of Procedure. Most Parties further emphasised that there was no legal or practical impediment to designating the emperor penguin as an SPS.

- (96) Most Parties noted with regret that, despite the extensive work of the ICG to seek common ground, and the compelling advice of SCAR, one CEP Member had submitted a parallel Working Paper with the goal of countering the ICG's recommendations, rather than engaging constructively in the ICG. Most Parties emphasised concerns about the unwillingness of that Party to engage in consensus-building and hoped that its submission of parallel papers did not establish precedent.
- (97) Several Parties commented that the information presented by this Member did not reflect the best available science, and further cautioned that, if the ATCM did not act on SCAR's clear advice to protect the emperor penguin, it might fail to meet its responsibilities under the Environmental Protocol. Most Parties indicated that they would take action to implement the advice of the ICG based on best available science and the precautionary approach, even if one Member continued to obstruct coordinated action to protect the species.
- (98) China thanked the convenor of the SGCCR for his work during the intersessional period, and expressed its willingness to join any consensus in accordance with ATCM and CEP Rules and Procedure, and on the basis of best available science. China noted that it worked with other CEP members and contributed a lot of data and information on emperor penguins to the draft Action Plan, which built on ATCM XLIII-WP 37 submitted by SCAR and thus constituted the real best available science on this matter. It also noted that according to the assessment process charter in the CEP Antarctic SPS Guidelines endorsed by the ATCM in 2005, the CEP should give further assessment to potential future threats to a species, which is listed on the IUCN Red List but at a lower extinction risk level than "Vulnerable". The draft Action Plan submitted by the ICG drew on the best available science both from the CEP members and SCAR, and clearly provided the following conclusion: the emperor penguins are currently listed as Near Threatened in the IUCN Red List; the observed population of the species had been increasing in the regional (Antarctic) scale; the known and emerging terrestrial and marine threats affecting emperor penguin were considered relatively small if not negligible; the threat assessment of climate change and sea ice reduction on the species was considerably uncertain; and the threat was predicted to take place only until after 2050. Following the scientific advice from SCAR in the paper ATCM XXVIII/CEP VIII-WP 34 and ATCM XXIX/CEP IX-WP 38, China reiterated its position that the emperor penguin was not currently eligible for such a designation, and recommended the ATCM develop a targeted research and management plan for the emperor penguins as a Near -Threatened species to provide early-warning.
- (99) ASOC expressed its regret that the Meeting could not agree to designate the emperor penguin as a Specially Protected Species. It commented that this would have been a precautionary, science-based, and concrete action that the ATCM could have taken to respond to the threat of climate change and to protect an important species. It highlighted that this action would be in full alignment with the Antarctic Treaty and Environmental Protocol. ASOC found it baffling that the ATCM could not agree to take this step.
- (100) SCAR reiterated its appreciation to the CEP for considering and supporting its scientific advice on the conservation status of the emperor penguin. SCAR thanked the Committee for its strong motivation to take action based on its advice. It reiterated that

SCAR's experts had undertaken a scientifically robust assessment concluding that designation of the emperor penguin as an SPS was warranted, based on the best available, peer-reviewed science and detailed consideration of the most up-to-date IUCN criteria and processes. SCAR further highlighted its understanding that there was no legal or practical impediment to designating the emperor penguin as an SPS. It noted that it would continue to advise the ATCM as further scientific information became available but cautioned that waiting for additional evidence before acting could mean missing the window of opportunity to protect the emperor penguin. SCAR further note that such a designation would have been a powerful signal from Parties on their level of concern about the impacts of climate change and the need to reduce greenhouse gas emissions.

- (101) Most Parties called for movement toward consensus on the issues outlined under this item and encouraged Parties to retain the conservation status of the emperor penguin as a priority for consideration at ATCM XLV–CEP XXV.

Other Annex II Matters

- (102) The CEP Chair reported that the Committee had considered a paper on Important Marine Mammals Areas (IMMAs), which had suggested that IMMAs could be a useful tool to assist Parties when planning and conducting a range of Antarctic activities. The CEP Chair reported that the Committee had encouraged Members to consider this matter further and revisit discussions on IMMAs in a future meeting, and that Members had expressed their interest in doing so.
- (103) The CEP Chair also reported that the Committee had considered a proposal suggesting that the *Environmental Guidelines for operation of Remotely Piloted Aircraft Systems in Antarctica*, adopted in Resolution 4 (2018), should be revised. The Committee had noted that the use of RPAS in Antarctica had been an increasingly frequent activity and that it required special attention, but the Committee had noted that there was no clear agreement on the immediate need to revise the RPAS guidelines. The Committee had encouraged further intersessional discussion between interested Members and a report from such discussions at a future CEP meeting.

Environmental Monitoring and Reporting (CEP Agenda Item 11)

- (104) The CEP Chair reported that the Committee had discussed and had considered recommendations on the Antarctic Environments Portal. The Committee had thanked SCAR for its work and had reiterated its continued support for the Portal, noting once more its value as a source of high-quality scientific information on subjects of relevance for the work of the Committee.
- (105) Recognising the value of the Portal also to the ATCM and the relevant information that SCAR provided to the Portal, New Zealand encouraged all Parties to make use of it.
- (106) The CEP Chair also reported that the Committee had considered a paper drawing Members' attention to the need for a more structured system of sampling and data collection for chemical contamination in the Antarctic. The Committee had acknowledged the value of enhancing collective efforts towards the development of a structured sample data base of environmental contamination in Antarctica. The Committee had expressed broad support for the recommendations in the paper, had requested SCAR to submit recommendations to CEP XXV on how a more systematic sampling and data collection of chemical contamination in the Antarctic could be delivered, and also had encouraged Members to intensify cooperation between all stakeholders, to initiate a more structured sample and data collection of environmental contamination in Antarctica.

- (107) Noting the CEP's growing emphasis on pollution in Antarctica, Germany expressed its broad support for systematic sampling and data collection in Antarctica, called for more collaboration on this issue and thanked SCAR for its willingness to submit scientific advice on the matter to a future ATCM.
- (108) In addition, the CEP Chair noted that the Committee had considered a paper regarding monitoring as a key tool for decision-making for an adaptive and sustainable management of Antarctic tourism. Following broad discussions, the Committee had highlighted the importance of developing programmes to assess impacts arising from tourism activities, had expressed its support for the recommendations in the paper, and had encouraged Members and Observers to work together to progress this work.

General Matters (CEP Agenda Item 13)

- (109) The Chair of the CEP advised that the Committee had considered a paper aiming to strengthen the communication of CEP science needs to researchers and national science funding agencies. The Committee had noted that the issues highlighted in the paper were relevant to all Members, especially those Members whose funding agencies and national Antarctic programmes were not closely linked. The Committee had agreed to: i) initiate a process to consider how the list of CEP science needs for Antarctic management, in the CEP Five-year Work Plan, could be further developed to clarify research needs in a way that could be more easily understood and actioned by researchers and funding agencies; and ii) advise the ATCM that Parties should ensure that CEP science needs are regularly communicated to national science funding agencies with the aim of supporting timely delivery of science to inform CEP advice to the ATCM.
- (110) Several Parties noted that good science required adequate funding and requested Parties communicate CEP needs to national science funding agencies. Parties also noted that the CEP's scientific priorities should be reported with clarity to appropriate funding agencies.
- (111) The CEP Chair also reported that the Committee had considered a paper from the Secretariat on an analysis of information in the EIES on Waste Management Plans and Contingency Plans. The Committee had highlighted the importance of having easily accessible information on waste management plans and contingency plans, and recalled that Article 9 (3) of Annex III to the Environmental Protocol clearly outlined Members' responsibilities to circulate and review waste management plans. The Committee had encouraged Members to share relevant information through the EIES tool.

Election of Officers (CEP Agenda Item 14)

- (112) The Chair of the CEP noted that the Committee had elected Dr Heike Herata (Germany) to serve a first two-year term as the Vice-Chair. The Committee had thanked Dr Kevin Hughes for his effective, friendly and systematic approach to the work he had completed during his four-year term of service.
- (113) The Meeting warmly thanked Dr Hughes for his excellent work and contributions as CEP Vice-Chair and SGCCR convenor. The Meeting also congratulated Dr Herata on her election as Vice-Chair.

Preparation for Next Meeting (CEP Agenda Item 15)

- (114) The Chair of the CEP noted that the Committee had adopted the Preliminary Agenda for CEP XXV, reflecting the agenda for CEP XXIV.
- (115) The Meeting expressed its appreciation to the CEP, noting the significance of the

Committee's advice and recommendations to the ATCM with respect to the implementation of the Environmental Protocol.

- (116) The Meeting warmly thanked Ms Birgit Njåstad for her excellent leadership of the Committee, which allowed for a productive CEP meeting. It also thanked her for her preparatory work and for facilitating the high quality of discussions despite the hybrid nature and difficult circumstances of the meeting.

Item 6a: Operation of the Antarctic Treaty System: Request from Canada to become a Consultative Party

- (117) Canada informed the Meeting that it had formally submitted a request for Consultative Party status to the Depositary Government on 21 October 2021. Canada had been a non-Consultative Party since 1988, and became a full Member to the Environmental Protocol in 2003. It had implemented all Annexes that were currently in force and was on a path to approve Annex VI, with which it was already in compliance.
- (118) The United States, in its capacity as Depositary Government of the Antarctic Treaty and the Environmental Protocol, confirmed that Canada had complied with the guidelines set out in Decision 2 (2017).
- (119) The Consultative Parties thanked Canada for its presentation. All but two Consultative Parties agreed that Canada's application met the requirements of the guidelines set out in Decision 2 (2017), including the requirement for substantial scientific research activity in accordance with paragraph 2 of Article IX to the Antarctic Treaty.
- (120) Two Consultative Parties raised concerns regarding Canada's request. Both China and the Russian Federation stated procedural as well as substantive grounds for not taking a decision at this ATCM.
- (121) Following discussions and consultations, the Consultative Parties did not take a position on Canada's request for Consultative Party status. They agreed that Canada's application would be placed on the agenda for further consideration and decision at ATCM XLV in Helsinki.

Item 6b: Operation of the Antarctic Treaty System: General Matters

- (122) The Executive Secretary presented SP 3 rev. 1 *List of measures with status "not yet effective"*, and reported that, according to the Antarctic Treaty database, several Measures were not yet effective. These included Measures adopted at ATCM XXVII (Cape Town, 2004), ATCM XXVIII (Stockholm, 2005) and ATCM XXXII (Baltimore, 2009).
- (123) The Russian Federation introduced WP 50 *Continuing Discussion on Relevant Issues, Trends and Challenges to the Antarctic Treaty System*. It recalled that ATCM XLII had added a new priority issue (number 16) to the Multi-year Strategic Work Plan to encourage Parties to proactively identify and address current and future trends related to the Antarctic Treaty System. This had been followed by two rounds of informal intersessional discussion in which many Parties had participated. Expressing the view that conditions allowed for the launch of a new, more practically focused, stage of work on the topic, the Russian Federation proposed that the first issue to be considered under this framework would be the challenge of climate change. The Russian Federation suggested that further deliberations on the issue focus both on the impacts of climate change on the Antarctic as well as on activities within the Antarctic Treaty area that affected global climate change. Referencing earlier climate change related work within the Antarctic Treaty System, the Russian Federation emphasised that relevant decisions of all Antarctic Treaty System bodies be taken into account in further deliberations. It stressed the need for the ATCM to decide on how to implement legal instruments of

certain relevance that were outside the Antarctic Treaty System such as the Paris Climate Agreement and the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change. The Russian Federation recommended that the Meeting: discuss further steps for considering relevant issues, trends and challenges to the Antarctic Treaty System; consider identification of climate change as a priority issue without prejudice to the scope of the topic as reflected in the Multi-year Strategic Work Plan of 2019 and of 2021; consider prolonging informal discussions at the ATCM Forum; and update the Multi-year Strategic Work Plan as appropriate.

- (124) Some Parties thanked the Russian Federation for its work during the intersessional period and underscored the importance of working together in a cooperative manner to address emerging issues and challenges to the Antarctic Treaty System. Parties also reiterated the need to address climate change in the Antarctic.
- (125) Some Parties expressed support for the proposed recommendations. Noting that climate change was already being addressed under other relevant ATCM and CEP agenda items, the Meeting agreed not to continue informal discussions on relevant issues, trends and challenges to the Antarctic Treaty System on the ATCM Forum.
- (126) While welcoming further efforts to address climate change, WMO highlighted that climate change was not only a natural phenomenon as had been noted in WP 50. WMO pointed out that even though natural variation was an important source of the changing climate, human influence was dominant, as confirmed by the IPCC Sixth Assessment Report.
- (127) The Republic of Korea presented IP 11 *The Act on the Promotion of Polar Activities of the Republic of Korea*, which described the Act on the Promotion of Polar Activities that the government of the Republic of Korea had enacted in April 2021. It indicated that its purpose was to promote and provide the institutional foundation for the activities of the Republic of Korea in the Arctic and Antarctic, and to enhance its contribution towards addressing the global challenges faced by humanity, such as climate change. The Republic of Korea expressed its interest in developing effective arrangements that could coordinate similar assets and resources utilised in dissimilar tasks, and learning from other Parties' experiences.
- (128) Argentina presented IP 34 *Commemoration of the 62nd Anniversary of the signing of the Antarctic Treaty by the APAL countries*, prepared jointly with Brazil, Chile, Ecuador, Peru, Uruguay, Colombia and Venezuela. The paper described the commemoration of the 62nd anniversary of the signing of the Antarctic Treaty in the Administrators of Latin American Antarctic Programs (APAL) countries. The commemorations had focused on public outreach activities and events, including the participation of the Secretariat, SCAR, COMNAP and other organisations.
- (129) The Meeting thanked the co-authors for their paper, and some Parties joined Argentina in emphasising the importance of public outreach and communication such as this and other similar events.
- (130) Ecuador presented IP 124 *Organización en Ecuador de la XXXIII Reunión de Administradores de Programas Antárticos Latinoamericanos - RAPAL 2022*. It reported that the 33rd meeting of the RAPAL countries would be held from 23 to 26 August 2022 in Quito.
- (131) China introduced WP 24 *An Overview on the Legal Framework on Antarctic Specially Protected Species and Its Application*, and referred to IP 44 *An Overview on the Legal Framework on Antarctic Specially Protected Species and Its Application*. China reported that it had reviewed the legal framework on Antarctic Specially Protected Species (SPS) and its application within the ATCM and the CEP, along with scientific advice from SCAR, with a view to providing useful guidance on future designation of

Antarctic SPS. It highlighted several observations of relevance to the legal framework on Antarctic SPS with examples from past ATCM processes. These observations included: that the designation of an SPS would normally be a temporary measure; that some protection of the species was already afforded by the Environmental Protocol and other treaties; and that the Antarctic SPS category should be applied for the whole of a species' Antarctic population. China further highlighted its views, both that the IUCN red list category "Vulnerable" or higher was the threshold for considering potential designation of Antarctic SPS, and that the ATCM decision-making and consultation processes were ultimately independent from the IUCN and other bodies. China recommended that the ATCM align the future designation of ASPs with its view of previous ATCM and CEP practices; encourage SCAR to assess the risk of extinction of species, using the most up-to-date IUCN criteria; and review and harmonise the inconsistency between the Guidelines and Annex II to the Protocol.

- (132) Most Parties indicated that the current legal framework on SPS presented no impediments to advancing efforts to designate emperor penguins as SPS. Responding to the concerns expressed in the paper, most Parties noted that they did not consider there were material inconsistencies between Annex II and the Guidelines, and that the legal framework did not require further immediate consideration. Most Parties further emphasised that, according to the Guidelines, an IUCN listing as "Vulnerable" was not a prerequisite for designation of an SPS. All Parties affirmed that the ATCM was an independent decision-making body that was not bound by IUCN's categorisation of a species, and affirmed the importance of designating Antarctic SPS consistent with Annex II and the Guidelines.
- (133) Highlighting that the information provided by SCAR indicated a need for urgent action, most Parties cautioned that further delay in designating the emperor penguin as an SPS would undermine the precautionary approach to decision making as a fundamental part of the Protocol and the work of the CEP. Most Parties emphasised the value of SCAR's expert advice as representative of best available science. Most Parties expressed specific concern that China's assertion that the emperor penguin was not currently threatened ignored projections of poor prospects for the species by the end of the century.
- (134) SCAR reiterated that its experts had assessed the risk to the emperor penguin based on the most up-to-date criteria and information, and determined its conservation status to be vulnerable. SCAR noted that it had accordingly advised the CEP that it should consider the designation of the emperor penguin as an SPS. It thanked many Parties for reaffirming that SCAR is the primary source of scientific information related to SPS designation. SCAR affirmed that it would continue to provide further scientific advice as it became available, consistent with Annex II and the current Guidelines.
- (135) China thanked Parties and SCAR for the comments and questions provided in respect of WP 24. China noted its conclusion that the emperor penguin was not threatened was drawn from the draft action plan provided to the CEP by the intersessional contact group considering this issue. China also clarified that SCAR was an important, but not the only, source of information for the decision making process of the ATCM. Although China considered that there were minor inconsistencies between the Guidelines and Annex II, it reiterated its support of designating Antarctic SPS consistent with Annex II and the Guidelines.
- (136) The Meeting thanked China for its paper and the accompanying IP. There was no consensus around the recommendations put forward in WP 24.
- (137) The United Kingdom introduced WP 33 *Report on Effectiveness of Environmental Impact Assessment in Antarctica*, prepared jointly with the Netherlands. It reported on the results of an independent assessment commissioned by the United Kingdom on the

effectiveness of EIA in Antarctica. The United Kingdom noted that the assessment report had found that the Antarctic EIA system remained a meaningful tool in helping to protect the Antarctic environment, but that the effectiveness of the system could be improved in response to increasing pressures on the Antarctic environment. The proponents had asked the CEP for its views on taking forward any of the improvement opportunities they had identified, and the Committee had advised that it agreed to review and progress work to improve the effectiveness of the EIA system through informal intersessional discussions. The United Kingdom and the Netherlands invited the ATCM to continue encouraging all Parties to the Environmental Protocol who had yet to do so, to develop and bring into force domestic implementing legislation, particularly in respect of the EIA requirements of Annex I. They also invited the ATCM, on reviewing the advice of the CEP, to consider any further actions which could improve the effectiveness of the Antarctic EIA system, and discuss whether any work should commence on preparing for a review of Annex I of the Environmental Protocol.

- (138) The Meeting thanked the United Kingdom and the Netherlands for their valuable work to review the effectiveness of the Antarctic EIA system. It confirmed that the Antarctic EIA system was an important tool to protect the Antarctic environment while agreeing that improvements could be made. Many Parties suggested that the EIA experiences gained by Parties as well as developments in national and international EIA and cumulative impact assessment processes could be considered as resources. Noting that the proponents had recommended that Parties who had not yet done so develop and bring into force domestic implementing legislation, several Parties offered to share their experience in this regard. Some Parties requested access to the document through which the conclusions, which were included in the Working Paper, had been reached. Some Parties also cautioned that further improvements to the EIA system should avoid imposing unnecessary burdens. The United Kingdom confirmed that it was ready to circulate the document to all interested Parties.
- (139) The Meeting expressed support for the course of action charted by the CEP on this topic and for the actions relevant to the ATCM. The Meeting agreed that it should proceed first with improvements that could be realised under the existing legal framework, and indicated that any suggestion of revising Annex I should proceed with caution. The Meeting noted improvements requiring revisions to the text of Annex I could be discussed at a later time. The Meeting looked forward to updates from the Committee after the intersessional period, and many Parties expressed their willingness to participate in future discussions and contribute to this ongoing work.
- (140) Spain noted that the current process for drafting CEP and ATCM papers could be simplified for the benefit of all Parties, especially new Parties that were not accustomed to submitting meeting documents. Spain also highlighted the high volumes of papers submitted, and the large amount of time and effort required by meeting chairs to consider and classify them for discussion. Spain proposed that the Secretariat prepare a dossier or guideline with relevant information to assist Parties in the submission of papers to the ATCM and CEP.
- (141) The Meeting thanked Spain and expressed support for its proposal. It agreed to request the Secretariat to develop a guide for the presentation of papers to the CEP and ATCM, to be presented for consideration at CEP XXV and ATCM XLV.
- (142) The following paper was also submitted under this agenda item and taken as presented:
- IP 51 *Communicating the Antarctic Treaty System to the United Nations* (Argentina, Australia, Chile, France, New Zealand, Norway, the United Kingdom, the United States).

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

- BP 8 *South Africa's Antarctic Treaties Regulations* (South Africa).
- BP 12 *Establishment of the Advisory Committee on the National Polar Policy* (Poland).
- BP 27 *Postergación de la XXVI Expedición Antártica Ecuatoriana* (Ecuador).

**Item 7: Operation of the Antarctic Treaty System:
Matters related to the Secretariat**

(144) The Executive Secretary introduced SP 4 *Secretariat Report 2021/2022*, which provided details on the Secretariat's activities in the Financial Year 2021/22 (1 April 2021 to 31 March 2022) including addressing challenges in preparation for the virtual ATCM XLIII and CEP XXIII meetings in France, and preparation for the hybrid ATCM XLIV and CEP XXIV in Berlin. The Executive Secretary drew the Meeting's attention to the redesign of the EIES, and other improvements on its website, including a new platform for submitting meeting documents. With regard to financial matters, the Executive Secretary provided an overview of contributions it had received and presented its externally audited financial report for the financial year 2020/21. He also presented the provisional Financial Report 2021/22, remarking that the appropriation lines, which had already been adjusted for the virtual format of ATCM XLIII, were further reduced given that many of its travel plans were cancelled due to the pandemic, and that the Secretariat ended with a provisional surplus for this period of USD 253,302. The Executive Secretary reported that there had been no changes to personnel and that progress had been made on updating its human resources policy. The Executive Secretary also mentioned that the organisational review process announced at previous meetings had been resumed in this period and several recommended actions had been applied.

(145) The Executive Secretary introduced SP 5 *Secretariat Programme 2022/2023*, which outlined the activities proposed for the Secretariat in the Financial Year 2022/23 (1 April 2022 to 31 March 2023). He outlined the Secretariat's regular activities such as the preparation of ATCM XLV, the publication of reports, and other tasks assigned to the Secretariat under Measure 1 (2003). The Executive Secretary did not foresee any personnel changes in the upcoming period. In accordance with Staff Regulation 6.3 (e), the Executive Secretary reported that he intended to renew the Assistant Executive Secretary's contract for an additional four years. With regard to financial matters, the Executive Secretary drew the Meeting's attention to the rising cost of living in Argentina, which was only minimally compensated by the US Dollar's rise against the Argentine Peso. The Executive Secretary reported that despite the impact of local and global inflation, a balanced budget was attained and that the contributions for the financial year 2023/24 would not rise. In terms of intersessional activities, he announced several website and information systems developments, such as the redesign of the Contacts Database, which would include improvements to delegates' registration to the meeting. The Secretariat also extended the offer for EIES virtual training and discussion sessions, which had been implemented following a request from several Parties at ATCM XLIII.

(146) The Executive Secretary introduced SP 6 *Five Year Forward Budget Profile 2023/2024 – 2027/28*, which provided the Secretariat's budget profile for the period 2023-28. He noted that, despite local and global inflation, the accumulated surplus in the General Fund allowed for a zero-nominal increase in contributions until 2027/28.

(147) The Meeting expressed its gratitude to the Secretariat for the support it had provided and continued to provide during a challenging time. It also commended the Executive Secretary for his calm leadership.

- (148) Reflecting on their positive experience with the EIES virtual training, a number of Parties encouraged Parties to utilise this opportunity. The Meeting also requested that the Secretariat prepare a paper for ATCM XLV on the utilisation of the EIES by Parties, in order to encourage transparency, which the Secretariat agreed to do.
- (149) Following further discussion the Meeting adopted **Decision A (2022) Secretariat Report, Programme and Budget.**

Item 8: Liability

- (150) The Executive Secretary introduced SP 9 *Limits of liability and environmental remediation*, which constituted a response to a request from ATCM XLII (ATCM XLII Final Report para. 174). The paper included two Annexes: a summary of all relevant Measures and Resolutions and previous advice from the CEP relating to environmental remediation and liability matters (Annex 1); and a report on the limits of liability in relevant international instruments (Annex 2), for the potential future amendment of the limits in Article 9(2) of Annex VI to the Protocol on Environmental Protection to the Antarctic Treaty.
- (151) The Meeting thanked the Secretariat for preparing the paper, noting that it contained valuable information for future discussions concerning the improvement of the Antarctic liability regime.
- (152) Consultative Parties provided updated information on the status of their approval of Annex VI of the Environmental Protocol, and implementation of Annex VI in domestic legislation. Chile and France informed the Meeting that they had approved Annex VI during the previous year. Several Parties congratulated Chile and France on the grounds of their approval and noted the positive progress made towards the entry into force of Annex VI. 19 Consultative Parties have approved Annex VI (Australia, Chile, Ecuador, Finland, France, Germany, Italy, the Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway, Peru, Poland, the Russian Federation, South Africa, Spain, Sweden, Ukraine, the United Kingdom and Uruguay). Five Consultative Parties reported that they were applying domestic legislation implementing Annex VI pending the entry into force of Annex VI (Belgium, Finland, Norway, South Africa and Sweden). Several Parties reported that they were in the process of implementing Annex VI in domestic legislation. Some Parties indicated they might complete implementation within their current legislative period.
- (153) Some Parties expressed their wish to obtain further information and advice from Parties that had already completed the adoption of Annex VI. Several Parties that had already approved Annex VI to the Protocol noted that they stood ready to share their experiences, as did those in the process of implementing Annex VI into their domestic legislation. Some of these Parties offered to share their experiences and were encouraged to do so via the EIES.
- (154) Several Parties noted that they considered the entry into force of Annex VI to be the current priority with respect to liability questions. Some Parties, citing possible difficulties in securing sufficient support from domestic legislatures, encouraged all Parties to continue a broader exchange on the subject while the adoption of the Annex was still ongoing.
- (155) .
- (156) The Meeting agreed to continue to evaluate the progress made by Consultative Parties to ratify and adopt Annex VI on Liability Arising from Environmental Emergencies and bring the Annex into effect in accordance with Article IX of the Antarctic Treaty. Parties that had not yet approved Annex VI were encouraged to do so as a matter of priority. The Meeting commended the efforts of Parties working towards

implementation and welcomed further reports on progress at ATCM XLV.

- (157) The Meeting noted that, under Decision 5 (2015), the ATCM was to take a decision in 2020 on the establishment of a timeframe for the resumption of negotiations on liability, and that discussions on this matter had been on hold for two years. It also noted the progress that was being made towards the entry into force of Annex VI, and that many Parties considered this to be the current priority with respect to liability. The Meeting agreed to return to the matter of establishing a timeframe for the resumption of negotiations on liability in 2025 and to update the Multi-year Strategic Work Plan accordingly.
- (158) Following further discussion, **the Meeting adopted Decision D (2022)** *Liability arising from environmental emergencies*.

Item 9: Biological Prospecting in Antarctica

- (159) The Meeting noted that biological prospecting in Antarctica remained an item on the Multi-year Strategic Work Plan, and recommended that the agenda item should remain a priority in future meetings. The Meeting also noted the recommendations that SCAR had provided in its Survey of Member Countries regarding the collection of biological samples (ATCM XLIII-IP 12). Most Parties supported retaining the item on the Multi-year Strategic Work Plan and retaining the ATCM Forum on bioprospecting to continue intersessional discussions.
- (160) One Party noted the absence of papers submitted to ATCM XLIV, and the low effectiveness of the ATCM Forum, and proposed closing the ATCM Forum on biological prospecting. Some Parties were not in favour of retaining the item in the Multi-year Strategic Work Plan in 2023. These Parties expressed readiness to consider re-inclusion of the issue on the Multi-year Strategic Work Plan in future meetings.
- (161) The Meeting reaffirmed that the Antarctic Treaty System was the appropriate framework for managing the collection of biological material in the Antarctic Treaty area and for considering its use. The Meeting agreed to retain the item on the agenda, but did not reach consensus on continuing the ATCM forum on biological prospecting or retaining this item on the Multi-year Strategic Work Plan. It was stated that Parties do not need a forum to continue exchanging views on this subject during the intersessional period. Some Parties expressed an interest in continuing discussions on the collection of biological material during informal intersessional consultations. Several Parties also stated that they were working on papers related to biological prospecting in Antarctica, which they planned to submit to a future ATCM.

Item 10: Exchange of Information

- (162) Spain introduced WP 9 *Review of the scientific information contained in the EIES*. It reminded the Meeting that information exchange was a commitment undertaken by the Parties under Article III (1) (a) and Article VII (5) of the Antarctic Treaty, as well as under Article 17 of the Environmental Protocol and its annexes. Spain recalled that ATCM XLIII-SP 10 had identified a gradual decrease in scientific information exchanged between Parties, and suggested that a review be conducted on the scientific information sent to the EIES. Spain proposed that the Meeting establish an ICG to initiate the review as well as to discuss and exchange ideas that would enable and encourage the development of useful tools for Parties. Spain encouraged Observers and Experts to contribute to this work to ensure the interoperability of data across different relevant databases.
- (163) The Meeting thanked Spain for its paper and underscored that the exchange of information was a cornerstone of the Antarctic Treaty System. The Meeting also noted

recent improvements made by the Secretariat to the EIES and thanked the Secretariat for this work. The Meeting highlighted that scientific data and information was already shared through a number of other national and international repositories such as the Antarctic Metadata Directory (AMD) managed by SCAR. The Meeting agreed that future work should aim to simplify information sharing and ensure interoperability between different systems.

- (164) SCAR thanked Spain for its paper and emphasised its long-standing interest in scientific information exchange and data management. SCAR reminded the Meeting of its Standing Committee on Antarctic Data Management (SCADM), which facilitated co-operation between scientists and Parties with regard to scientific data. SCAR further highlighted the principle of FAIR data, noting that data was only useful if it was Findable, Accessible, Interoperable, and Reusable. It stated that achieving data interoperability was particularly challenging. SCAR also welcomed Spain's invitation to participate in a potential ICG.
- (165) The Meeting requested the Secretariat to commission information from all Parties on how evidence of non-compliance with the Treaty or Protocol in Antarctica should be recorded and presented to their competent authorities. The Secretariat agreed to issue such a commission during the intersessional period and welcomed the offer of the United Kingdom to assist with drafting. The Secretariat noted it would collate responses and present a paper to ATCM XLV.
- (166) Welcoming the proposal in WP 9, IAATO noted its prior work with competent authorities to simplify data input in EIES and expressed its interest in participating in an ICG. Additionally, IAATO acknowledged the difficulties for national competent authorities to penalise unauthorised vessels, noting that it appeared some of these unauthorised vessels were becoming bolder in their activities, which continued to undermine the Antarctic Treaty System. IAATO offered its support in collecting appropriate information and requested additional guidance on what was needed.
- (167) The Executive Secretary noted that, in an effort to avoid redundancy and duplication with other existing efforts, the Secretariat would collaborate with SCAR, and provide updates of the information presented in SP 7 and ATCM XLIII-SP 10. On the matter of non-authorised activities, the Secretariat recalled that a specific forum had been created on the Secretariat website to allow communication among national competent authorities, as well as to make information on the denial of authorisations available as one of the Summarised Reports of the EIES.
- (168) The Meeting agreed to establish an ICG on Scientific Information in EIES with the aim of:
- Discussing the advisability of reporting on the existence of international scientific cooperation among the Parties;
 - Examining the fields contained in item 2.1.2. (Science Activities in Previous Year) of the Annex to Decision 7 (2021) to determine whether it is necessary to include other customisable fields that would allow to generate summarised reports and thematic maps;
 - Analysing the advisability of including a section in item 1 (Pre-season Information) of said Annex on science projects foreseen to be developed in the following year's campaign;
 - Avoiding duplicating information already submitted to prevent overload in fulfilling the exchange requirements;
 - Reporting on the results and proposals of the ICG at the ATCM XLV in order to update Decision 7 (2021); and

- Identifying any specific trends in EIES reporting by Parties with the view of increasing utilisation of the EIES.

(169) It was further agreed that:

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

(170) Ecuador presented IP 116 *Propuesta ecuatoriana de catálogo de objetos geográficos antárticos*. It highlighted the value of geo-object catalogues for defining geographic data by optimising the information production processes, increasing its consistency and logic, and harmonising information structuring. Ecuador highlighted examples in which spatial information on Antarctic geo-objects was being expanded by SCAR and Australia. Ecuador intended to present a catalogue and accompanying proposal on how to move this work forward to the 33rd Meeting of the Administrators of Latin American Antarctic Programmes (RAPAL).

(171) The Executive Secretary noted that the spatial information it made available on the Secretariat website was standardised according to international norms.

Item 11: Education Issues

(172) Bulgaria introduced WP 23 *Fifth report of the Intersessional Contact Group on Education and Outreach*, prepared jointly with Belgium, Brazil, Chile, Portugal, Spain and the United Kingdom. Bulgaria recalled that ATCM XLIII had supported the continuation of the ICG on Education and Outreach and reported on the ICG's work over the past year, which it had conducted via the online ATCM Discussion Forum. This forum included seven posts from four Parties focusing on national and international education and outreach activities. Highlights of the activities included celebrations surrounding the 30th anniversary of the signing of the Environmental Protocol, and "Polar Week" celebrations, which involved almost 3000 students. The ICG recommended that the ATCM: recognise the usefulness of the Forum on Education and Outreach and support the work of the ICG during one more intersessional period; advise Parties to keep promoting the use of the Forum and provide information on their activities related to education and outreach; and advise Parties to continue to promote, not only Antarctica and Antarctic research, but also the Antarctic Treaty and Environmental Protocol, through their education and outreach activities.

(173) The Meeting thanked the proponents for WP 23 and congratulated the ICG on its work through the intersessional period. Parties emphasised the essential role of education and outreach in increasing our understanding of Antarctica, particularly in the context of climate change impacts. Parties highlighted the importance of promoting inclusivity and diversity in Antarctic programmes and activities, and noted some of the initiatives already underway. Some Parties and Observers also highlighted the educational opportunities available through SCAR, COMNAP and IAATO, including various fellowship programs for early career researchers. One Party also noted its view that education and outreach efforts should follow the ATCM Rules of Procedure.

(174) The Meeting agreed to continue the ICG on Education and Outreach for another intersessional period with the aim of:

- Fostering collaboration at both the national and international level, on Education

and Outreach;

- Identifying key international activities/events related to education and outreach for possible engagement by the Antarctic Treaty Parties;
- Sharing results of education and outreach initiatives that demonstrate the work of Antarctic Treaty Parties in managing the Antarctic Treaty area;
- Emphasising ongoing environmental protection initiatives that had been informed by scientific observations and results, in order to reinforce the importance of the Antarctic Treaty and its Protocol on Environmental Protection;
- Promoting related education and outreach activities by Experts and Observers, and encouraging cooperation with these groups;
- Sharing best practices and encouraging, enhancing and promoting diversity and inclusion across the global Antarctic community, including among scientists, logisticians, policy-makers and all others engaged in Antarctic matters, in order to lower any barrier to the engagement of all the talents needed to tackle the challenges of the future of Antarctica;
- Encouraging Parties to provide the Secretariat with link(s) to their web page(s) with educational and outreach resources (the Secretariat will include these links in its “Educational Resources” section of the Secretariat webpage); and
- Inviting Parties, Observers and Experts to review, during the intersessional period at the ATCM Education and Outreach Forum, the work carried out by the ICG and discuss its future development.

(175) It was further agreed that:

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

(176) WMO presented IP 74 *Education and Outreach Activities of the World Climate Research Programme*, which discussed the education and outreach activities of WMO’s co-sponsored World Climate Research Programme (WCRP). WMO highlighted two new WCRP initiatives: the WCRP Climate Science Academy and the Climate and Cryosphere (CliC) Fellowships and Grants. These two initiatives aimed to ensure that the next generation of climate science leaders would be ready to take on important roles in guiding the climate research agenda and would equip scientists to engage with the public in the context of climate change.

(177) The following paper were also submitted and taken as presented under this agenda item:

- IP 17 *Celebración del 30º Aniversario del Protocolo al Tratado Antártico sobre Protección del Medio Ambiente entre Chile y España* (Chile, Spain).
- IP 105 *Education & Outreach Activities of Turkey in 2021-2022* (Turkey).
- IP 126 *Actividades en Educación y Comunicación Antártica* (Chile).

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

- BP 24 *Ventana de Tiempo: primera película colombiana filmada en la Antártica* (Colombia).
- BP 28 *Antarctic education and outreach activities along 2021* (Uruguay).
- BP 32 *Romanian Education and Outreach Activities in 2020-2022 Pandemic*

(Romania).

Item 12: Multi-year Strategic Work Plan

- (179) The Meeting considered the Multi-year Strategic Work Plan adopted at ATCM XLIII (SP 11). It considered how to take each priority item forward in the coming years, and whether to delete current priorities and add new priorities.
- (180) After discussion, the Meeting adopted **Decision B (2022) Multi-year Strategic Work Plan for the Antarctic Treaty Consultative Meeting.**
- (181) The Meeting reaffirmed that the Multi-year Strategic Work Plan is a useful tool to support its work. Noting that it had been ten years since the Work Plan had been first adopted at ATCM XXXV, the Meeting considered it timely to dedicate attention to the Work Plan by engaging the Secretariat to assist the Meeting in making the Work Plan more effective and efficient. It was also suggested that Parties consider bringing forward papers to ATCM XLV on how the Meeting could use, maintain and optimise the Work Plan.
- (182) The Meeting requested that the Secretariat review the ATCM's use of the Multi-year Strategic Work Plan and report its findings back to ATCM XLV.

Item 13: Safety and Operations in Antarctica

Safety and Operations: Aviation

- (183) COMNAP introduced WP 17 *Additional COMNAP advice in regards to ATCM review of Resolution on Air Safety in Antarctica*, referred to IP 6 *Antarctic Aviation Workshop 2022 Report*, and thanked all experts who contributed to the Workshop. The paper provided additional advice in regards to Resolution 6 (2021) *Air Safety in Antarctica*. COMNAP suggested updates based on the outcomes of the Antarctic Aviation project and Workshop 2022. Key recommendations included: the removal of the words “hard copy”; consider the addition of a new operative sub-paragraph in regards to requiring transponders be turned on in all aircraft operating in the Antarctic Treaty area and in regards to strongly recommending ADS-B In technology on all aircraft operating in the area; to add the words “and other operators” to paragraph 8; and to add a new operative paragraph to refer to minimum recommended survival equipment on-board aircraft.
- (184) IAATO stated that it strongly supported COMNAP's work on air safety, and noted that IAATO air operators had been pleased to contribute to the workshop and intercessional discussions. IAATO supported the proposal that all operators, both non-governmental and governmental, should install technologies to support safe air operations.
- (185) Many Parties congratulated COMNAP on the air safety work and for convening the Antarctic Aviation Workshop 2022. The Meeting welcomed this additional advice from COMNAP in support of the ATCM review of Air Safety in Antarctica Resolution. After discussion, and consultation, the Meeting broadly agreed to the recommendations as presented by COMNAP in WP 17
- (186) **The Meeting adopted Resolution A (2022) Air Safety in Antarctica.**
- (187) Colombia presented IP 110 *Identificación de peligros de la operación aérea en la Antártida para gestionar la seguridad operacional de la Fuerza Aérea Colombiana - Fase II*. It reported on an ongoing study by the Colombian Air Force aimed at identifying potential risks involved in aerial operations on the Antarctic Peninsula. The objective of the study was to effectively design procedures to improve the safety of aerial activities in the area. Colombia noted that the study had paid particular attention

to the improvement and maintenance of runways, and the use of aerial photography and drones to acquire more detailed knowledge about flight conditions on the Antarctic Peninsula.

Operations: Maritime

- (188) Brazil presented IP 64 *Hydrographic and Cartographic Activities of Brazil in the Antarctic Region carried out during the last two campaigns of the Brazilian Antarctic Program (OPERANTAR XXXIX e XL)*. It reported on the recent work of the Directorate of Hydrography and Navigation (DHN), the agency representing Brazil in the IHO. It also presented an overview of bathymetric and hydrographic surveys undertaken and the nautical publications and charts that the Brazilian Antarctic programme updated during the last two seasons.
- (189) Argentina presented IP 87 *Report on the 24th edition of the Joint Antarctic Naval Patrol between Argentina and Chile – 2021/2022*, prepared jointly with Chile. Argentina noted that its joint Antarctic naval patrols with Chile had been ongoing since 1998. The patrols included search and rescue activities, salvaging operations, pollution monitoring, and remediation actions to safeguard navigation and the environment.
- (190) Bulgaria informed the Meeting that it would be sending a Bulgarian vessel to the Bulgarian St. Kliment Ohridski station in the upcoming Antarctic season.
- (191) Referring to IP 92, the United Kingdom noted that its researchers had observed large volumes of plastic pollution deriving from fishing vessels in the Southern Ocean. The United Kingdom encouraged ASOC to continue reporting on this issue.
- (192) Regarding the papers presented on maritime matters, the Meeting reflected on the importance of strengthening the exchanging of points of view on national experiences of hydrographic surveys, as well as on the implementation of the Polar Code in Antarctica. The Meeting therefore invited Parties to share papers on these matters at the next ATCM. Following a proposal from Finland, the Meeting supported the organisation of a topical session to the agenda of the ATCM XLV to enhance and support harmonised implementation of the IMO Polar Code in waters around both poles.
- (193) The following paper was submitted and taken as presented under this agenda item:
- IP 92 *Developments to enhance the safety of pleasure yachts and fishing boats operating in the Antarctic Treaty area (ASOC)*.

Safety and Operations: Stations

- (194) COMNAP introduced WP 18 *Report on emergency plans and implementation of natural disaster risk assessment at Antarctic stations*. It recalled that Resolution 7 (2021) invited COMNAP to present a report to assess the general situation of emergency plans at Antarctic bases and its support operations, and the degree of implementation of natural disaster risk assessment programmes. COMNAP reported that it undertook a survey to assess the general situation of emergency and evacuation plans, procedures and the availability of shelters or evacuation locations in case of a natural disaster affecting Antarctic stations and their support operations. All Member programmes with stations responded to the survey. Survey results indicated that 20 of the 29 COMNAP Member national Antarctic programmes with one or more stations in the Antarctic Treaty area had emergency plans in the event of a natural disaster. They also indicated that 23 of these national Antarctic programmes had shelters in case of a natural disaster. COMNAP invited the Parties to consider these results during any review of their emergency management plans and future work within the ATCM on this topic. COMNAP also stressed that this survey was a first step to a larger project on these issues.

- (195) The Meeting thanked COMNAP for its comprehensive paper on emergency plans and natural disaster risk assessment at Antarctic stations. Many Parties emphasised the importance of this work and stated that they would consider these results in developing future emergency plans. Many Parties and IAATO also expressed a willingness to continue working with COMNAP on this issue.
- (196) The United Kingdom and Argentina noted that, when further assessing the situation of emergency and evacuation plans, procedures and the availability of shelters or evacuation locations in Antarctic stations, the risk of occurrence of natural disasters at such stations should be taken into account, so as to concentrate efforts on the stations that need it most. It was suggested that this work could be expanded to other natural disasters.
- (197) Finally, the Meeting stressed the importance of promoting wide participation in the Technical Collaboration Group that COMNAP would organize to identify knowledge gaps and be prepared to respond to the risks associated with seismic activity. COMNAP agreed to bring further information on this work to a future ATCM.
- (198) Germany presented IP 59 *Report on Refurbishment and Modernization of the German Antarctic Receiving Station GARS O'Higgins*. It highlighted the need for the modernisation of GARS O'Higgins Station to reduce the human footprint, and noted that the station had been in operation for more than 30 years. Germany noted that crane access had only been allowed to the east of the station, where the Chilean site was located, to protect the breeding Gentoo Penguin colonies in immediate vicinity of the station buildings. Efforts to protect the Gentoo Penguin also included a penguin protection fence. Germany thanked in particular Chile and also Brazil for their logistic support.
- (199) Germany presented IP 70 *Energetic modernisation of the German Neumayer-Station III*, which investigated the possibilities of modernising the energy infrastructure, enhancing renewable energy technologies, and reducing operational costs. Although Neumayer-Station III was considerably larger than Neumayer-Station II, it consumed 50 per cent less fuel due to energy optimisation. It also informed the Meeting that as the start of the upgrade a new wind turbine planned with a nominal power of 50 kW will be installed in January 2023 and tested for at least one year.
- (200) The Meeting thanked Germany for its papers, and highlighted its interest in cooperating and learning from Germany regarding future modernisation plans in order to collectively reduce the human footprint in Antarctica.
- (201) Several Parties mentioned that, in addition to modernisation, joining stations or sharing logistics in the future could also be a way forward in combatting climate change. Noting the increased amount of construction work in Antarctica, the Meeting suggested that Parties should continue sharing information and experiences on the environmental, safety and cultural aspects of their construction work for the benefit of all Parties.
- (202) COMNAP referred the Meeting to its ATCM XLII-IP 47 and to the COMNAP Symposium Proceedings on Station Modernization. COMNAP also noted its willingness to continue to provide practical and technical advice to assist the ATCM in its decision-making on the modernisation topic.
- (203) Ecuador presented IP 115 *Análisis de riesgos de desastres naturales en la zona de influencia de la Estación Científica "Pedro Vicente Maldonado"* which proposed an analysis of climatic, environmental, and anthropic aspects to reduce the risk of possible natural disasters at its scientific station. Ecuador highlighted COMNAP's initiative on the evaluation of the status of emergency plans in Antarctic bases and their implementation of disaster risk programmes, as set out in Resolution 7 (2021). Ecuador reported that it planned to cooperate with Chile to establish joint emergency procedures as both Parties had experience regarding tsunami alerts.

- (204) Uruguay presented IP 33 *Proyecto Cambio de matriz energética Base Científica Antártica Artigas. Instalación de Generador Eólico* which reported on the installation of a portable wind turbine at the General Artigas Station. Uruguay stated that it was currently undertaking a trial period to be assessed in the 2022/23 season, and that it intended to eventually construct a wind park in order to minimise its greenhouse gas emissions and eliminate the use of fossil fuels in Antarctica.
- (205) The Secretariat presented SP 7 *Waste Management Plans and Contingency Plans: Analysis of the information provided by the Parties in the EIES*. This paper analysed the status and evolution of the data that corresponded to the information exchange requirements for waste management plans and contingency plans contained in the annual report and permanent information that Parties submitted to the EIES during the period 2012-2021. This study revealed that, regarding the provisions of Annex III and Annex IV to the Protocol, the data submitted on waste management and contingency plans appeared to be incomplete and was not consistent among the Parties. The Secretariat noted that the general lack of accessible and updated waste management plans and contingency plans on the EIES did not necessarily preclude the existence of such plans. The Secretariat mentioned that it stood ready to assist Parties in the utilisation of the EIES.
- (206) IAATO welcomed the exchange of information on waste management and contingency plans. It noted that Annex III and IV also applied to non-governmental operators and IAATO operators were keen to have their contingency plans and, where relevant, waste management plans accessible through the EIES.
- (207) The Meeting thanked the Secretariat for its analysis and encouraged it to keep presenting these kind of reports. It observed that waste management was an essential aspect of the Environmental Protocol and required continuous improvement. Further, the Meeting reaffirmed the importance of information exchange in complying with transparency requirements of the Antarctic Treaty System and the need to continue working on its enhancement. The Meeting also encouraged Parties to make use of the Secretariat's offer of virtual training sessions in using the EIES.
- (208) The following papers were also submitted under this agenda item:
- BP 1 *Indoor Farming Facility at the Antarctic King Sejong Station* (the Republic of Korea).
 - BP 4 *Resumen sobre la Campaña Antártica de Verano 2021-2022* (Uruguay).
 - BP 5 *Update of the Information on the Progress of the Renovation of the Henryk Arctowski Polish Antarctic Station on King George Island, South Shetland Islands*. (Poland).
 - BP 6 *40th Brazilian Antarctic Operation (OPERANTAR XL) – 2021/2022* (Brazil).
 - BP 7 *Celebrating the 40 years of the Brazilian Antarctic Program (PROANTAR)* (Brazil).
 - BP 16 *Monitoring of hazardous objects on the glacier in the Larsemann Hills region (East Antarctica)* (the Russian Federation).
 - BP 20 *Installation of the VHF Repeater Module on Horseshoe Island* (Turkey).
 - BP 22 *On the Progress of Work on the Assembly of a New Wintering Complex at Vostok Station in the 2021/2022 Season* (the Russian Federation).
 - BP 27 *Postergación de la XXVI Expedición Antártica Ecuatoriana* (Ecuador).

Issues relating to the management of the COVID-19 pandemic

- (209) COMNAP presented IP 94 *National Antarctic Programs' operations as the global pandemic continued*. COMNAP stated that national Antarctic programmes working together to respond to the COVID-19 challenge might have been the greatest example of international collaboration in relation to Antarctic activities that it had witnessed in recent times. The paper reported on the 2021/22 season, the COMNAP COVID-19 guidance, and the implementation of that guidance by national Antarctic programmes in order to facilitate Antarctic science. It commended all national Antarctic programmes for their commitment to the implementation of the protocols.
- (210) The Meeting thanked COMNAP for the update and highlighted the extraordinarily challenging circumstances for research in Antarctica during 2021/22 season. The Meeting commended COMNAP for its leadership in facilitating exchange of experiences and in establishing recommendations that had helped Parties to facilitate world-leading science through the pandemic. Particular reference was made to the SCAR-COMNAP Joint Expert Group on Human Biology & Medicine and the COMNAP COVID-19 ad-hoc Subcommittee for its excellent and tireless work during the pandemic.
- (211) The Meeting extended a special thanks to all scientists and personnel of national Antarctic programmes who had worked collaboratively to save lives and to ensure that science could continue regardless of the pandemic. It acknowledged the work of the national Antarctic programmes in the gateways of Argentina, Australia, Chile, New Zealand and South Africa in facilitating and liaising for the safe passage of other programmes through their airports and ports while also managing their own complex programmes. The Meeting also recognised the valuable work of the Joint Expert Group on Human Biology & Medicine, with leadership from the British Antarctic Survey Medical Unit, and the COMNAP COVID-19 ad hoc Subcommittee, with leadership from the Alfred Wegener Institute, Helmholtz Centre for Polar and Marine Research.
- (212) IAATO thanked COMNAP for its close collaboration and communication during the pandemic. While IAATO operators did not conduct tourist visits to research stations during the 2020-21 season, five IAATO operators had provided logistical assistance to national Antarctic programmes. IAATO noted that these operators followed COMNAP and national Antarctic programme protocols and would continue to do so in the future. IAATO also noted the collaborative work and communication with Parties with Gateways cities to Antarctica.
- (213) SCAR noted that long-term research was essential for understanding the current and future conditions of Antarctic and Southern Ocean environments, the dynamics of our solar system, and the fundamentals of how the universe worked. On behalf of the scientific community, SCAR thanked COMNAP and the national Antarctic programmes for enabling such long-term science to continue under the challenging circumstances of the pandemic, and for keeping the scientific community safe during an extraordinary time.
- (214) COMNAP thanked the Parties for their overwhelming support and noted that responding to pandemic challenges was only possible to achieve because of the engagement of national Antarctic programmes and with open communication with the IAATO Secretariat. COMNAP confirmed that it was already working on updated guidance for the 2022/23 season.
- (215) The following papers were also submitted and taken as presented under this agenda item:
- IP 57 *DROMLAN's efforts to prevent the spread of SARS-CoV-2 virus within the Dronning Maud Land, Antarctica* (Germany, India).
 - IP 58 rev.1 *Efficiently and Safely Conducting Expeditions in the Arctic and Antarctic During the SARS-CoV-2 Pandemic* (Germany).
- (216) The following paper was also submitted under this agenda item:

- BP 29 *Outcome of the application of the Sanitary Protocol for Uruguay's Antarctic activities during 2021-2022, and its update* (Uruguay).

Item 14: Inspections under the Antarctic Treaty and the Environment Protocol

- (217) Chile presented IP 29 *Seminario sobre inspecciones Antárticas*. The paper highlighted inspections as a key mechanism of the Antarctic Treaty System and introduced the concept of a seminar to allow Parties that had carried out Antarctic inspections to share their learning and create opportunities to cooperate. Chile informed the Meeting that, together with Argentina, it would organize an Antarctic Inspection Seminar in November 2022, and would circulate its terms of reference to other Parties in due course.
- (218) The Meeting recalled that, during ATCM XLII, it had agreed to informally discuss items linked to inspections. The Meeting thanked Chile and Argentina for organising the seminar in response to that request. Many Parties noted they would be willing to attend the seminar.

Item 15: Science Issues, Scientific Cooperation and Facilitation

Scientific cooperation and facilitation

- (219) Turkey presented IP 99 *Czechia-Turkey Scientific and Logistic Collaboration in Antarctica*, prepared jointly with the Czech Republic, which presented information on the collaboration between the Czech Republic and Turkey during the 6th Turkish Antarctic Expedition (TAE-VI). Turkey also presented IP 102 *Bulgaria-Turkey Scientific and Logistic Collaboration in Antarctica*, prepared jointly with Bulgaria, which presented information on the collaboration between the 30th Bulgarian Antarctic Expedition and TAE-VI. Turkey reported that all Parties to these collaborations had fulfilled their commitments well and carried out their joint operations in a spirit of solidarity and mutual support. Turkey noted that international scientific collaboration enhanced not only the interests of individual research projects but also helped reduce carbon footprints in Antarctica.
- (220) Turkey presented IP 103 *A Memorandum of Understanding between the Ministry of Science and Innovation of the Kingdom of Spain and the Scientific and Technological Research Council of Turkey*, prepared jointly with Spain, which reported on the signing of a memorandum of understanding between Spain and Turkey regarding cooperation in polar sciences and logistics. Turkey also presented IP 104 *A Memorandum of Understanding between the Scientific and Technological Research Council of Turkey, Marmara Research Center, Polar Research Institute and the National Institute of Polar Research, the Research Organization of Information and Systems*, prepared jointly with Japan, which reported on the signing of a memorandum of understanding between the national competent institutions of Turkey and Japan dealing with polar research. Turkey informed the Meeting that it looked forward to cooperative polar research, joint coordination of intellectual activities, improved utilisation of resources, cooperation in polar logistics, and enhanced exchange of scientific information and research materials.
- (221) The Meeting thanked Turkey and noted the usefulness of keeping the ATCM informed about the formal agreements they conclude in matters of Antarctic or polar scientific cooperation.
- (222) WMO presented IP 106 *WMO Unified Data Policy and the Global Basic Observing Network (GBON)*, which reported on the adoption of a reviewed and updated data policy and information sharing network following the 2021 Extraordinary Session of the World Meteorological Congress. WMO reported that the Unified Data Policy established the general purposes, scope, and intent of data exchange between all WMO members, while

the GBON was expected to significantly strengthen the global availability of observational data. The Policy sought to expand WMO information exchange practices to cover all relevant WMO earth data, going beyond weather, climate and water data to include domains such as atmospheric composition, oceanography, the cryosphere, and space weather. WMO reported that the new instruments aimed to facilitate free and open exchange of data and measurements between various meteorological organisations, enhance numerical prediction models, and help meteorological institutions worldwide access critically-needed observations.

- (223) The Meeting thanked WMO for its presentation and noted the potential of the newly implemented policy and network to benefit vital research and meteorological institutions worldwide.
- (224) COMNAP presented IP 5 *Early Career Opportunities: Antarctic Fellowships & Scholarships*, prepared jointly with CCAMLR, SCAR and IAATO. The paper identified the joint work of the four proponents to support early career persons in their Antarctic research and engineering projects. COMNAP emphasised the importance of early career opportunities, both for aspiring scientists and engineers, as well as for the general wellbeing of Antarctic research. COMNAP encouraged all Parties to bring these opportunities to the attention of their early career persons.
- (225) The Meeting thanked the co-authors for IP 5 and noted the great value of the past twenty years of collaboration in supporting early career persons in Antarctic research, science and engineering.
- (226) Uruguay presented IP 28 *Uruguay, país anfitrión de la XXXII Reunión de Administradores de Programas Antárticos Latinoamericanos*, which reported on the latest joint RAPAL meeting in September 2021. Uruguay introduced RAPAL's key functions as a forum facilitating discussions and exchanges about Antarctic scientific, logistic and research matters between the Latin American countries and other invited parties. It noted that the collaboration had been carried out for over two decades in a spirit of solidarity that warmly complemented the spirit of cooperation within the Antarctic Treaty system.
- (227) The Meeting thanked Uruguay for its paper. Argentina thanked Uruguay for hosting the event and highlighted the role of RAPAL among all Latin American national Antarctic programmes.
- (228) The Meeting thanked Parties for their papers and reiterated its support for all further international collaboration in scientific cooperation and facilitation in Antarctica.
- (229) The following papers were also submitted and taken as presented under this agenda item:
- IP 12 *Scientific and Science-related Cooperation with the Antarctic Community and Responses to COVID-19* (the Republic of Korea).
 - IP 13 *Korea-Chile Collaboration in Antarctic Research* (the Republic of Korea, Chile).
- (230) The following papers were submitted under this agenda item:
- BP 2 *Icebreaking polar class research vessels: New Antarctic fleet capabilities* (COMNAP).
 - BP 17 *Colombia avanza en los propósitos de su Programa Antártico con la construcción de un buque de investigación científico-marina Ice Class IC* (Colombia).
 - BP 31 *Antarctic research skills acquired under cooperation between Romania and Republic of Korea 2015-2020* (Romania).

Science issues and future science challenges

- (231) The United States presented IP 26 *International Thwaites Glacier Collaboration: The Future of Thwaites Glacier and its Contribution to Sea-Level Rise*, prepared jointly with the United Kingdom. The paper provided an update on a joint research programme of the US National Science Foundation (NSF) and the UK Natural Environment Research Council (NERC), which sought to obtain reliable longer-term projections of ice loss and sea-level rise originating from Thwaites Glacier. It stressed the important role of Thwaites Glacier as an area of interest in the ongoing process of climate change. Current estimates suggested that the melting of the glacier alone had contributed up to four millimetres in global sea-level rise, of the total three metres of global sea-level rise that could result from a general loss of the West Antarctic ice sheet. The results of the project had been published through various channels and were made widely available to the global scientific community. In conclusion, the United States highlighted the importance of international cooperation in sustaining long-term research projects and reiterated its full commitment to advancing the scientific understanding of marine ice sheets and the climate conditions in the Thwaites Glacier area.
- (232) The United Kingdom stressed the importance of international collaboration in carrying out research projects of this magnitude and noted that, in order to address crucial and complex questions related to global climate change, it was essential to engage in thorough collaboration with respect to science, logistics and information exchange.
- (233) Norway presented IP 73 *Troll Observing Network (TONE) – A new research infrastructure supporting Earth System science with data from Dronning Maud Land*, which described a new research infrastructure project funded by the Norwegian Research Council. Norway highlighted that the Troll Observing Network (TONE) was a response to Resolution 8 (2021), which had called for Parties to support efforts to undertake research about Antarctic climate change and its impacts. It noted that TONE had benefited from a number of Norwegian and international stakeholders, and that data collected by TONE observatories would be openly available to the entire scientific community in line with Article III of the Antarctic Treaty.
- (234) Switzerland presented IP 119 *Switzerland's contribution to snow research in Antarctica 2011-2021*, which summarised the past decade of research activities conducted by Swiss scientists concerning snow and firn in Antarctica at different host stations. Reviewing the various scientific contributions and achievements, Switzerland extended its thanks to all its international collaborators and, in particular, the Parties whose stations had hosted Swiss expeditions and researchers.
- (235) WMO presented IP 71 *Winter Targeted Observing Periods and Further Plans of the Year of Polar Prediction in the Southern Hemisphere (YOPP-SH)*. The paper provided an update on the activities undertaken in the Antarctic as part of the WMO's Polar Prediction Project since ATCM XLII. The paper described how the Year of Polar Prediction (YOPP), a hallmark activity of the PPP, had galvanised extra observation and modelling efforts in both the Arctic and Antarctic. WMO reported that the ongoing activities under YOPP included a second Antarctic Special Observing Period whose goal was to improve forecast capabilities during the non-summer months. The work and analysis of the results would continue until the season 2023-24. WMO noted that the upcoming YOPP Final Summit was scheduled to be held in Montreal in August 2022. In conclusion, WMO requested all Parties to share information about the YOPP data portal with their meteorological actors and networks in order to help create a comprehensive meteorological database for mutual benefit.
- (236) The Meeting thanked WMO for its valuable contribution and highlighted the importance of the Year of Polar Prediction for the entire Antarctic community. It also

congratulated WMO for its public outreach work and for its broad sharing of polar weather data.

- (237) Ecuador presented IP 113 *Avances del proyecto de generación de un robot submarino para su uso en la Antártida*, which provided an overview of the development of a submarine robot suitable for Antarctic deep-sea research. Developed by a dedicated researcher in cooperation with universities in Ecuador, New Zealand and Australia, the device could be used to reach depths of up to 8000 metres with remote guidance combining submarine robotics and artificial intelligence. Ecuador invited other Parties to consider assisting Ecuador to transport the submarine to Antarctic waters and to assist in facilitating its testing in Antarctic conditions.
- (238) China presented IP 122 *Group-size effect on vigilance and flight initiation distances of Adélie penguins in south-eastern Antarctica*, which described the findings of the 36th Chinese National Antarctic Research Expedition in regards to the vigilance initiation distances and flight initiation distances of Adélie penguins to potential disturbances from human activities. Reporting its results that could help improve navigation practices and environmental protection in the Antarctic, China remained determined to continue to support this research. It concluded by inviting other Parties with similar interests to join it in further collaboration.
- (239) Germany presented IP 60 *Information about the German concept paper “Polar Regions in Transition”*. The paper summarised the findings and recommendations of a detailed polar research concept paper composed by a new, dedicated advisory board commissioned by the German Federal Ministry of Education and Research. Germany directed the attention of other Parties to the structure of the concept paper, which sought to approach Antarctic research by presenting a number of guiding questions and providing concrete recommendations for further research agendas. It noted that the document had been made publicly available online in English for all interested Parties.
- (240) The United States presented IP 27 *The Value of Long-term Ecological Datasets to Evaluate Ecosystem Response to Environmental Change along the Antarctic Peninsula*. The report highlighted the need to carry out research on the complex climatic feedbacks between the atmosphere, ice and oceans controlling the Antarctic ecosystem dynamics and evolution. It emphasised the value of long-term research programmes seeking to anticipate how global change might evolve over the coming decades and to build a scientific foundation for guiding future action plans towards enhancing the sustainability of ecosystems. The United States noted that its Long-Term Ecological Research (LTER) programme had been developed since the 1980s, with five polar sites of which two were in Antarctica. It was, therefore, able to provide unique information regarding regional environmental changes over three decades. Among the notable long-term results, in addition to data about the direct loss of ice sheets, were observations of critical impacts of the loss of sea ice leading to changes in habitats favouring some species and endangering others. The results had been published widely, and the United States welcomed all interested Parties to contact the US Antarctic Research Data Centre for further information.
- (241) SCAR presented IP 107 rev. 1 *The Southern Ocean contribution to the United Nations Decade of Ocean Science for Sustainable Development*, prepared jointly with Belgium, the Netherlands, IAATO, WMO, and more generally, the Southern Ocean Task Force. It reported that the Task Force included organisations from across the scientific research community, industry sectors, and national and international management bodies. SCAR reported that the UN Decade of Ocean Science aimed to gather ocean stakeholders worldwide behind a common framework for research to support a sustainable future for the world’s oceans. The Southern Ocean community had engaged in stakeholder-oriented processes to develop a Southern Ocean Action Plan, published in April 2022. SCAR noted that the Decade of Ocean Science was a unique opportunity

to mobilise stakeholders together to focus on the research needs of the Southern Ocean. It further noted that the Action Plan aimed to identify research challenges, to strengthen the links between science, industry and policy, and to encourage internationally collaborative activities to address gaps in knowledge and data coverage. The Southern Ocean Action Plan was now freely available to download as indicated in the Information Paper.

- (242) Colombia presented IP 109 *II Congreso Internacional “Colombia y su proyección en la Antártica”*, which introduced an annual international congress held in Colombia on the protection of Antarctica as a space of academic research and scientific collaboration. In 2021, the congress had taken place in hybrid format and had aimed to promote discussions and awareness about Antarctic matters, as well as to help in formulating national Antarctic policy. Noting the participation of international partners from Brazil, Chile, Ecuador and elsewhere, Colombia expressed its gratitude to all national and international Antarctic institutes for their active cooperation.
- (243) Turkey presented IP 101 *Turkish Polar Science Workshops*, which reported on the annual National Polar Science Workshops held in Turkey since 2017. Turkey observed that the 5th National Polar Science Workshop had hosted over 500 participants, that over 100 abstracts had been submitted, and that over 80 institutions had been involved in the proceedings, with lectures by internationally noted speakers receiving considerable attention online.
- (244) The Meeting thanked all the Parties and SCAR for their presentations on science issues and noted the many achievements and advancements which had been discussed.
- (245) The following papers were submitted and taken as presented under this agenda item:
- IP 95 *Progress of glaciological research activities at the Dome Fuji station and its vicinity* (Japan).
 - IP 108 *The Ice Memory Programme* (France, Italy).
- (246) The following papers were also submitted under this item:
- BP 15 *Russian glaciological investigations at Vostok station during the 67th Russian Antarctic Expedition (January 2022)* (Russian Federation).
 - BP 18 *Seeds for Future - Global Wild Plant Seed Vault* (Italy).

National Programmes’ main scientific activities and results

- (247) As a preliminary comment, the Chair suggested to Parties that, pursuant to the provisions of the ATCM Rules of Procedure (particularly rules 50 and 51), the documents that provide information on the activities and results of their national Antarctic programmes should be presented to the Meeting in the form of Background Papers. She also noted that, as for those that present scientific priorities in the medium and long term, and given the implications that they may have for identifying opportunities for cooperation, it would be appropriate to present them as Information Papers.
- (248) Australia presented IP 50 *Australian Antarctic Science Program 2021-22*, which reported on highlights from its 2021/22 science programme. These included the arrival of Australia’s new icebreaker RSV Nuyina and the testing and commissioning of the vessel’s science systems; fieldwork to support projects on climate processes and change, and Southern Ocean ecosystems and environment protection and management; and the publication of a number of significant papers. Australia reported that it had begun developing a decadal plan for Antarctic science that would set out priority science questions and research priorities. Australia emphasised that the Australian Antarctic Science Program continued to benefit from national and international

research and operational collaborations.

- (249) Malaysia presented IP 63 *Malaysia's activities and achievements in Antarctic research and diplomacy*, which presented an update on its research activities and diplomatic efforts in the 2021/22 season. Malaysia thanked Chile, the Republic of Korea, and the United Kingdom for their continued support of its activities in Antarctica.
- (250) Malaysia presented IP 69 *Report from Asian Forum of Polar Sciences to the ATCM XLIV*, which reported on the activities of the Asian Forum for Polar Sciences (AFoPS) to advance cooperation among Asian polar science institutions. Highlighting Malaysia's chairmanship of AFoPS from 2021-22, it informed the Meeting that its recent work included: a webinar on capacity building; the 2021 AFoPS annual general meeting, held online 28 – 29 October 2021, where an MoU was signed between SCAR, the International Arctic Scientific Committee (IASC) and AFoPS; and a special meeting held online on 28 March 2022 in conjunction with the Arctic Science Summit Week (ASSW). Malaysia thanked AFoPS' members for their work.
- (251) Japan presented IP 96 *Japan's Antarctic Research Highlights 2021- 22*. It outlined the research highlights of the 2021-22 season including high-resolution observations of the Antarctic atmosphere with the Program of the Antarctic Syowa Mesosphere, Stratosphere, and Troposphere/Incoherent Scatter (PANSY) radar and complementary instruments, and advanced balloon-borne observations of the Antarctic upper troposphere and lower stratosphere and hot water drilling at Laghovde Glacier. Japan noted that its scientific activities had returned to pre-pandemic levels.
- (252) The Secretariat reminded Parties that, in response to a request made at the ATCM XLII (ATCM XLII final report, para 311) it had created a section on its website to highlight the key science priorities of national Antarctic programmes so as to make these easily accessible to all Parties. The Meeting encouraged Parties that have not yet done so, to provide information to the Secretariat to display on the website.
- (253) The following papers were submitted and taken as presented:
- IP 78 *Update on the Australian Antarctic Strategy and 20 Year Action Plan and major initiatives* (Australia).
 - IP 125 *Actividad de Chile en Glaciar Unión* (Chile).
- (254) The following papers were submitted under this agenda item:
- BP 3 *Aotearoa New Zealand Antarctic Research Directions and Priorities 2021 - 2030* (New Zealand).
 - BP 9 *Expedición Científica del Perú a la Antártida* (Peru).
 - BP 10 *Actividades del Programa Nacional Antártico de Perú Período 2021 – 2022* (Peru).
 - BP 19 *Antarctic Publications by Turkish Scientists (2021/2022 Update)* (Turkey).
 - BP 21 *The Sixth Turkish Antarctic Expedition (TAE-VI)* (Turkey).
 - BP 23 *Report on the scientific activity of the Argentine Antarctic Institute – 2021* (Argentina).
 - BP 25 *VIII Expedición Científica de Colombia a la Antártica, verano austral 2020-2021* (Colombia).
 - BP 30 *Indian Antarctic Scientific Activities During 2021-22* (India).

Diversity issues in Antarctic science

- (255) Australia presented IP 55 *Diversity and inclusion in the Australian Antarctic program*,

which described a range of activities aimed at increasing diversity across all aspects of the Australian Antarctic Program (AAP) over recent years. It welcomed the discussion on equality, diversity and inclusion at the Meeting. Australia noted that the AAP's diversity and inclusion activities aimed to ensure that all employees and expeditioners felt safe, welcome and respected as well as free from any discrimination. Australia highlighted that the Australian Antarctic Division was committed to increasing diversity across all aspects of the AAP.

- (256) Argentina presented IP 114 rev.1 *Gender approach in the National Antarctic Program of Argentina*, which reported on the activities of Argentina's Antarctic Program with regard to gender equality. It reported that women working within the National Directorate of the Antarctic and the Argentine Antarctic Institute held leadership positions as directors and managers. As for scientific personnel, Argentina noted that there had been gender parity among the personnel who carried out tasks in different Argentine Antarctic stations for several years. Regarding logistical support staff, it noted that women are being commissioned as motorists and drivers, and that parity had been achieved at the Carlini Station.
- (257) SCAR welcomed the papers by Australia and Argentina and referred to its efforts to further equality, diversity and inclusion through the establishment of its Equality, Diversity, and Inclusion (EDI) Action Group in January 2022.
- (258) COMNAP thanked the Meeting for acknowledging its efforts on improving gender equality, inclusivity, and in developing recommendations that allowed for the safe reporting and communication of harassment, unwanted advances and inappropriate behaviour in Antarctica. It referred to its Preventing Harassment in Antarctica Safety Expert Group workshop held in 2018, and noted that it worked together with SCAR, IAATO and CCAMLR to ensure that its early-career opportunities also promoted equality, diversity and inclusion.
- (259) The Meeting thanked Australia and Argentina for their papers, and recognised the increasing international interest in factors related to intersectionality and diversity. The Meeting also expressed its desire to ensure that everyone working on Antarctic matters is safe, welcomed, respected and free from discrimination. The Meeting expressed a firm commitment to this issue and welcomed further sharing of information on activities as well as best practices by Parties, Observers and Experts. The Meeting also commended SCAR and COMNAP for their extensive work on these matters.

Item 16: Implications of Climate Change for Management of the Antarctic Treaty Area

- (260) The United Kingdom introduced WP 29 *Antarctica in a Changing Climate – Implementing ATCM Resolution 8 (2021)*, prepared jointly with Australia, Belgium, Finland, France, Germany, the Netherlands, Norway, Sweden, the United States, SCAR and ASOC. The paper provided an update on the implementation of Resolution 8 (2021), which was adopted at ATCM XLIII in response to the IPCC Special Report on the Ocean and Cryosphere in a Changing Climate (SROCC). It highlighted the many briefings and events undertaken since ATCM XLIII to share current science and to inform decision-makers about the implications of climate change in Antarctica. The United Kingdom thanked SCAR, the International Cryosphere Climate Initiative (ICCI), the Association of Polar Early Career Scientists (APECS), the UK Arctic and Antarctic Partnership (UKAAP) and ASOC member, World Wide Fund for Nature (WWF), for their support. The proponents highlighted the need for urgent action to mitigate climate change by focusing on two broad themes: the contribution of Antarctic ice sheets to irreversible global sea level rise with implications for coastal

communities; and Southern Ocean ecosystems (including krill) under pressure from acidification and freshening and their role in helping to maintain a stable climate. The proponents also recommended that the ATCM: support research on the actual and potential implications of climate change; continue to support SCAR in the communication of the latest research and information on climate change and its impacts through its regular and valued updates to the ATCM; and support the work of the CEP to consider the environmental implications of climate change through the CCRWP. The United Kingdom also highlighted its IP 23 *Antarctic Blue Carbon*.

- (261) ASOC thanked the proponents, expressed its support for the recommendations and its interest in contributing to the implementation of a resolution. In support, ASOC also presented a short film titled “Krill: Superheroes of the Southern Ocean”, produced by WWF.
- (262) The Meeting thanked ASOC for its film presentation and, reflecting on the innovative nature of the film, emphasised the need for modern communication methods when interacting with the broader public on issues of climate change.
- (263) Expressing its support for the recommendations outlined in the paper, WMO stated that it would continue working with Parties and SCAR as well as prepare papers relating to the issue of climate change. It also drew the Meeting’s attention to the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (IPCC)-WMO Pavilion at the 2021 United Nations Climate Change Conference (COP26) in Glasgow, and noted that it was planning similar events for the 2022 United Nations Climate Change Conference (COP27) in Egypt.
- (264) SCAR thanked the Meeting for its support and highlighted its participation in many events at COP26.
- (265) The Meeting thanked the proponents and expressed support for their recommendations. It further encouraged all Parties to communicate the urgency of taking actions to address climate change to governments, the economic sector, and civil society. Several Parties informed the Meeting of additional activities they were undertaking as part of implementing Resolution 8 (2021).
- (266) The Meeting endorsed the recommendations in WP 29, and agreed to continue working to implement Resolution 8 (2021). With respect to the second recommendation in WP 29, which called on the ATCM to continue to support SCAR in the communication of the latest research and information on climate change and its impacts, the Meeting agreed to also support national Antarctic programmes in this endeavour.
- (267) SCAR introduced WP 30 rev. 1 *Antarctic Climate Change and the Environment: A Decadal Synopsis. Findings and Policy Recommendations* and referred to IP 72 *Antarctic Climate Change and the Environment: A Decadal Synopsis and Recommendations for Action*. SCAR also introduced WP 31 rev. *Antarctic Climate Change and the Environment: A Decadal Synopsis. Research Imperatives*. SCAR reported on the significant update to the ACCE Report, stating that the synopsis was based mainly on the findings of the IPCC’s Sixth Assessment Report and drew on reports of the Intergovernmental Science-Policy Platform on Biodiversity and Ecosystem Services (IPBES). The ACCE Report included additional environmental research findings and outcomes of research prioritisation, undertaken by SCAR through its Antarctic and Southern Ocean Horizon Scan and through priorities identified by the SCAR Scientific Research Programs and other activities. SCAR emphasised that the report provided a global consensus, agreed by thousands of scientists, on the current physical and living environmental situation in the Antarctic, especially with respect to ice sheets, projections for the future, and implications, both globally, such as for sea level rise, and regionally, such as for Antarctic and Southern Ocean biodiversity. SCAR also presented a series of policy recommendations for Parties to consider based on the

evidence presented in the synopsis.

- (268) SCAR drew the Meeting's attention to several key messages that derived from its recommendations including: the urgency for action, both regional and global, for mitigating projected impacts of climate change; that the requirement for urgent action was not constrained by the need to reduce the uncertainty associated with future projections; the need to develop, with due urgency, large-scale integrated research approaches across national Antarctic programmes to reduce uncertainties in key areas, including improving projections of Antarctic cryosphere change, especially in a global mean sea-level rise context, improving understanding of, and projections for, Antarctic biodiversity change, especially systems and species that were likely to be most vulnerable, and furthering the understanding of tropical-high latitude climate teleconnections and climate models, especially the Southern Annular Mode. The fourth and final key message was the requirement to develop clear, timely and regular communication about environmental changes in the Antarctic, and their implications for both Antarctic environments and the earth system, to governments, parties to related international agreements, the economic sector and to civil society. Finally, SCAR stressed that the report was based on an extraordinary body of internationally collaborative research, much of which had been supported by national Antarctic programmes, and the large majority of which had been drawn together through the voluntary work of researchers from most of the world's nations.
- (269) The Meeting thanked SCAR for its significant update to the ACCE Report, and commended the scientists that had contributed to this considerable joint body of work. The Meeting also emphasised the value of receiving high-quality science syntheses. Many Parties highlighted the usefulness of the infographic attached to the papers and noted the teleconnections between Antarctica and the rest of the world, as well as the challenges the associated changed weather patterns posed for the stability of research infrastructure in Antarctica. Many Parties commended the ATCM XLIV Host Country for appropriately choosing "from science via policy to -protection" as the theme of the Meeting. Parties highlighted the value of the report for the CCRWP and agreed on the urgent need to take action to limit global warming to 1.5°C above pre-industrial levels.
- (270) China, while generally supportive of the recommendations put forward in the papers, noted the scientific uncertainties in the rate of sea level rise trends, biodiversity and climate models SCAR had raised in its report, as well as the achievability of the proposed management goal to preserve the Southern Ocean environment in a state close to that known in the past 200 years. Recognising the crucial role of SCAR in providing independent and objective scientific advice to support and inform the work of the ATCM and CEP, as expressed in Resolution 7 (2019), China expressed concerns on whether SCAR was the appropriate body to provide policy recommendations.
- (271) In response to China, many Parties recalled SCAR's important and long-standing role in providing for over sixty years sound advice and best available science to the Antarctic Treaty System, as reflected in Article 10 (2) of the Protocol.
- (272) WMO thanked SCAR for the papers and informed the Meeting of its role in climate related research, including within the World Climate Research Programme (WCRP).
- (273) ASOC thanked SCAR for its paper and stressed that Antarctica was of vital importance in combatting climate change, and that the need for curtailing emissions was present and urgent.
- (274) COMNAP remarked that it would be sharing the SCAR report with its Science Facilitation Expert Group. It noted that maintaining sufficient government funding of national Antarctic programmes was imperative in order to meet science priorities.
- (275) SCAR thanked Parties for their comments and their positive response the paper and the

Decadal Synopsis. SCAR appreciated Parties' recognition of the urgency of these matters, including the research requirements and the need to meet Nationally Determined Contributions in keeping the world to 1.5 degrees of warming. In responding to the questions about preserving a state known for the past 200 years, SCAR made clear that system dynamics were included in such a state. In responding to the questions raised about whether it was an appropriate body to provide policy recommendations, SCAR noted that these were evidence-based recommendations and that it would be irresponsible not to put these recommendations forward.

- (276) The Meeting welcomed SCAR's report and adopted **Resolution E (2022)** *Antarctic Climate Change and the Environment: A Decadal Synopsis and Recommendations for Action report*, recommending the dissemination of the report to departments and agencies charged with climate change negotiations, to Antarctic science and research bodies and funding agencies, and to the general public and media. The Meeting also continued to welcome updates from SCAR on climate change and its implications.
- (277) The Meeting also adopted **Decision E (2022)** *Letters on Antarctic Climate Change and the Environment: A Decadal Synopsis and Recommendations for Action report* to send letters to the UNFCCC, IPCC, WMO, IPBES and IMO forwarding SCAR's Decadal Synopsis.
- (278) The Meeting agreed to hold a full-day joint session of the CEP and the ATCM, with SCAR and COMNAP, to consider the implementation of the ACCE recommendations at ATCM XLV. The Meeting encouraged Parties, Observers and Experts to submit papers on the topic to ATCM XLV, and to bring experts to the meeting to support this work.
- (279) China introduced WP 48 *The Implementation of the Climate Change Response Working Programme*. China recalled that Resolution 4 (2015) encouraged the CEP to begin to implement the CCRWP as a matter of priority. China noted that the CEP established the SGCCR to facilitate the efficient and timely implementation of the CCRWP. On the basis of its initial review of the work of ATCM and the CEP in the past years, China recommended that the CEP focus its efforts on the implementation of the CCRWP and: adopt the reformatted CCRWP using the new format agreed in 2019; emphasise the important role of scientific research and monitoring as a centre piece of the implementation of CCRWP; re-confirm that SGCCR should draft annual progress reports on the implementation of the CCRWP to the CEP, including the extent to which the related monitoring, research or management gaps/needs were fulfilled; and ask the SGCCR to update the CCRWP in accordance with the decisions of the ATCM or CEP, and report back the following year to further discuss the implementation of the CEP's CCRWP and the role of the SGCCR.
- (280) The Meeting thanked China for its paper. While Parties agreed with the crucial role of scientific research and monitoring in reacting to climate change, they did not support the specific recommendations advanced by China in WP 48. Parties recalled the extensive discussions of WP 48 under CEP and expressed widespread support for the work of the SGCCR and its recommendations for revising the CCRWP as laid out in WP 37 *Report of the CEP Subsidiary Group on Climate Change Response (SGCCR) 2021-2022*. Reiterating the urgency of responding decisively to climate change, the Parties stressed the importance of moving forward in a productive manner towards further action.
- (281) ASOC presented IP 90 *Ice Sheet Instability, Long-term Sea-level Rise, and Southern Ocean Acidification: Time for Coordinated Action by Antarctic Treaty Parties*, which advocated that the clear communication of the rapidly evolving findings of Antarctic science should comprise a matter of the highest concern to the Antarctic Treaty System. In particular, ASOC recommended that all participants should increasingly focus not

only on the impacts of climate change on Antarctica but on the impact of these changes on the entire planet. To change the course of actions, ASOC proposed: that Parties should bring the findings of Antarctic science to strong global attention at the UNFCCC; that SCAR should do its utmost to voice the findings of Antarctic science at the upcoming COP27 and 2023 United Nations Climate Change Conference (COP28) meetings; and that the ATCM should regularly revise and communicate its priorities relating to the irreversible effects of climate change.

- (282) The Meeting thanked ASOC for its paper. Many Parties expressed support for ASOC's efforts to enhance the communication of Antarctic research and policy priorities, as well as advancing global awareness about the role of the Antarctic in the global impacts of climate change. The Meeting commended ASOC on the examples of public communication and outreach it presented at ATCM XLIV, and noted ASOC's strong position as a facilitator for the public communication of Antarctic priorities, actions and findings.
- (283) SCAR welcomed ASOC's paper and commended ASOC for its ongoing work in science and policy communication. It also thanked ASOC for its recommendations and agreed to continue to represent Antarctic science in the COP meetings in cooperation with other accompanying experts and participants such as the WMO.
- (284) The following paper was submitted under this agenda item:
- IP 89 *Banning Hydrocarbon Extraction in Antarctica Now: Reducing the Risks and Impacts of Global Climate Change* (ASOC).

Item 17: Tourism and Non-Governmental Activities in the Antarctic Treaty Area

Policy and Management

- (285) Spain introduced WP 22 *Towards adaptive and sustainable management of Antarctic tourism: Monitoring as a key tool for decision-making*, prepared jointly with Ecuador and the United States. It recalled that tourism and non-governmental activities in the Antarctic had grown steadily since the 1960s, and recalled ATCM Recommendations IV-27 and VI-7, which recognised that tourism activities could jeopardise the conduct of scientific research, hinder the conservation of flora and fauna, and do lasting damage to the Antarctic environment. Noting the paucity of data on tourism impacts, the proponents proposed that: Parties promote the establishment of monitoring programmes to assess the actual impacts arising from tourism activities; the CEP promote the development of these monitoring programmes and continue with its work to understand the cumulative impacts of tourism on the environment; that monitoring programs involve multiple stakeholders, including bodies such as SCAR, COMNAP and IAATO, which could contribute to the development and implementation of monitoring programmes; and that monitoring programmes consider the needs identified in this document.
- (286) The Meeting thanked the proponents and expressed support for the recommendations in WP 22.
- (287) The Meeting emphasised the importance of data collection that contributed to the understanding and management of tourism and non-governmental activities and their cumulative impacts, particularly in the context of renewed growth of tourism activity. The Meeting emphasised the importance of monitoring in the detection of change, assessing the effectiveness of management measures, supporting the requirement to assess and verify impacts, and to understand the sensitivity of sites. The Meeting underscored the desirability of concrete action on the monitoring of tourism impacts to ensure the sustainability of tourism while protecting the Antarctic environment, and

welcomed the attention of the CEP, and of SCAR, to monitoring issues. Several Parties highlighted national initiatives and projects that had collected data on tourism and carried out systematic monitoring over many decades and could serve as a basis of coordinated long-term monitoring programmes. The Meeting noted the challenges associated with establishing strategic long-term monitoring, including design of monitoring schemes, questions of spatial and temporal scale, funding, access to monitoring locations, and coordination across Parties and projects. Several Parties reflected on the importance of local scale monitoring efforts, in addition to coordinated large-scale monitoring schemes.

- (288) IAATO welcomed the recommendation to engage with a wide range of stakeholders, and noted the support provided by IAATO members for existing long-term monitoring programmes. It observed that it was not always easy to differentiate between the impacts arising from tourism, other activities, and climate change in Antarctica. IAATO noted the importance of a collaborative approach to help address practical and logistical challenges and offered its support in the development of a long-term monitoring programme.
- (289) ASOC supported the initiatives proposed in WP 22 and noted that it was important for Parties to develop dedicated programmes for monitoring tourism impacts. ASOC emphasised that monitoring is important for collecting the scientific information needed to inform tourism management and policy development, and how tourism contributes to cumulative impacts. ASOC also noted its appreciation for data provided by IAATO and by Parties which complements other kinds of monitoring data.
- (290) SCAR welcomed the recommendations and highlighted its long-standing history of undertaking science that sought to distinguish natural variability from anthropogenic forcing. It also noted many other international programmes undertaking focused work to develop effective monitoring that was financially and logistically efficient.
- (291) The Netherlands introduced WP 36 *Report of the Intersessional Contact Group on Permanent Facilities for Tourism and other Non-Governmental Activities in Antarctica*, reporting on work in an ICG established at ATCM XLIII and convened by the Netherlands. The Netherlands noted the broad participation in the intersessional discussions and that they had covered a wide range of topics including: information on previous proposals to establish permanent tourism facilities in Antarctica; the definition of “permanent facilities”; and concerns related to the potential establishment of permanent facilities raised at previous meetings. The Netherlands indicated that even though interest in the development of these types of facilities remained limited, Parties had encountered some inquiries, and that there was a clear urgency to act. The ICG report recommended that the Meeting adopt a resolution on permanent facilities for tourism and other non-governmental activities in Antarctica, and further proposed that the ICG continue, with the intention of conducting an inventory of existing facilities supporting tourism and other non-governmental activities, and discussing further regulation, including a possible Measure on this topic.
- (292) The Meeting thanked the Netherlands for leading the intersessional discussions and expressed general support for the recommendations of WP 36. The Meeting welcomed the recommendation for a Resolution to prevent such projects, and supported the proposal for further discussion in an ICG, including conducting an inventory of tourism and non-governmental facilities to inform further discussion.
- (293) Several additional points were raised by Parties, including: the importance of ensuring that tourism in Antarctica had no more than a minor or transitory impact; ensuring tourism and non-government activities were conducted in a safe manner; the implications of increased air traffic in support of land-based tourism activities including safety risks and potential search and rescue impacts; the potential contribution of

tourism activities to cumulative impacts; potential impacts on wilderness values; and new challenges and threats to the environment posed by the growth and diversification of tourism and other non-governmental activities.

- (294) Some Parties, while recognising the legitimate concerns arising from activities that might be associated with permanent facilities, suggested that further discussion should remain focused on key issues arising from such facilities, rather than seeking to consider the large number of related or secondary issues as part of the same discussion.
- (295) Many Parties highlighted the importance of following a precautionary approach, and some expressed their support for adopting a legally binding Measure on this topic. Parties recalled Article 3 of the Environmental Protocol and its fundamental role in protecting the Antarctic environment, its dependent and associated ecosystems, and its intrinsic values, including its wilderness and aesthetic values. Some Parties expressed the view that the establishment of permanent facilities in Antarctica was against the fundamental principle of preserving Antarctica as a continent for peace and science. One Party observed that the benefits citizens experience from Antarctic tourism could be achieved without establishing permanent facilities.
- (296) IAATO thanked the Netherlands and expressed its support for the draft Resolution, noting that the establishment of permanent facilities in Antarctica would conflict with IAATO's by-laws and would threaten the wilderness and aesthetic values that motivated many tourists to visit Antarctica. IAATO also expressed its appreciation for the definition of "permanent facilities" used in the ICG and WP 36, recalling that it drew on its paper ATCM XXXII-IP 101, which made explicit reference to tourism having no more than a minor or transitory impact, and was in harmony with IAATO's existing by-laws. IAATO noted that, in the face of unauthorised tourism activities, it was helpful to strengthen requirements by Parties, and noted that collaboration and cooperation were key in the successful management of tourism. It emphasised the need for further developing clear definitions and agreed that any further expansion in scope should not leave grey areas open to interpretation, as this could lead to a de-harmonisation of the authorisation or permitting system.
- (297) ASOC thanked the Netherlands for its paper, and expressed support for WP 36 and the adoption of the proposed Resolution. ASOC looked forward to the continuation of discussions on this topic.
- (298) The Meeting agreed that the ICG on permanent facilities for tourism and other non-governmental activities in Antarctica should continue its work during the next intersessional period, with the following terms of reference:
- To make an inventory of already existing infrastructure supporting tourism and other non-governmental activities in Antarctica;
 - To discuss concerns relating to such infrastructure, including, for instance, environmental concerns and pressure on the search and rescue capacity of national programs;
 - To discuss and prioritise further action by the ATCM relating to such infrastructure and future plans, including, if appropriate, the adoption of a legally binding measure;
 - To report back to ATCM XLV.
- (299) The ATCM agreed that Observers and Experts participating in the ATCM would be invited to provide input and that in particular ASOC and IAATO were encouraged to contribute.
- (300) The ATCM welcomed the offer from the Netherlands to serve as convener of this ICG.

- (301) The Meeting adopted Resolution C (2022) *Permanent facilities for tourism and other non-governmental activities in Antarctica*.
- (302) Germany presented IP 8 *Tourism monitoring in Antarctica - Development of a concept for the analysis of the impacts of tourism on the assets to be protected in the Antarctic*. It provided details of a research project to develop a concept to investigate and monitor the long-term impacts of tourism in Antarctica. In the course of the project, the German Environment Agency had hosted a workshop on the Estrel premises to get stakeholders involved in the early stages.
- (303) Parties welcomed Germany's initiative in IP 8 as an example of concrete action and noted other specific activities recently launched relating to monitoring efforts, including a research programme on tourism, including consideration of monitoring issues, established by the Netherlands.
- (304) France presented IP 56 *Feedback on a monitoring conducted on a tourist vessel according to Resolution 9 (2021)*. It reported on the outcomes of a tourism monitoring mission led by the French NCA according to the framework set up by Resolution 9 (2021), noting that France's intention was to assess the framework's effectiveness in the field. France noted that the paper presented several critical lessons learned during the implementation of the monitoring scheme, and identified benefits and limitations of the monitoring framework. France concluded that Resolution 9 (2021) was effective in enabling NCAs to better understand activities under their jurisdiction and monitor compliance with the relevant national and international instruments. It also noted that the experience indicated that a monitoring mission could be organised in a short time and at low cost. France encouraged Parties to implement Resolution 9 (2021) and to share their experiences.
- (305) IAATO thanked France for its paper and highlighted that the sharing of information would make all observation programmes more robust. IAATO reported that over the previous two seasons it had performed two virtual dockside observations on superyachts. IAATO highlighted some lessons arising in the conduct of virtual observations, noting the need for advanced coordination and flexibility from all involved, including the operator, the vessel and the observer, and sufficient internet capability to support virtual walk-throughs and interviews. IAATO advised that the virtual inspections had been successful in observing superyacht operations, even during the ongoing pandemic. IAATO reported that it planned to conduct approximately 30 observations on yachts and cruise-only vessels in the 2022-2023 season, and due to potential passenger numbers on vessels near capacity, were working to schedule observations as far in advance as possible. IAATO expressed its willingness to continue sharing its experiences of tourism monitoring and observation.
- (306) The Meeting commended France for providing this useful information and encouraged Parties to consider conducting monitoring activities on tourist vessels, as recommended in Resolution 9 (2021), and share information and experiences of tourism monitoring activities with the ATCM.
- (307) The United States presented IP 61 *Expeditions within Expeditions: Authorizing Non-Governmental Organization Activities Associated with Tourist and other Non-Governmental Expedition Organizers*, and IP 62 *Authorization of Science Activities Associated with Tourist and Other Non-governmental Expedition Organizers*. IP 61 discussed the recent changes in the types of requests and subsequent authorisations of non-governmental, non-scientific expeditions to Antarctica, which relied on tour operators for logistical support. IP 61 outlined the approach and procedures taken by the United States to these activities. IP 62 presented information on how the United States manages authorisation of science activities associated with tourist and other non-governmental expedition organisers as an example of best practice and to promote

awareness of potential challenges in how non-governmental activities were authorised and managed by NCAs.

- (308) IAATO thanked the United States for its papers and encouraged harmonisation of authorisation processes across NCAs. IAATO expressed its continued commitment to support operators in complying with NCA processes and facilitate communication between operators and NCAs.
- (309) The Meeting thanked the United States and acknowledged the importance of discussing emerging challenges for competent authorities. Parties noted the issues that can arise in authorising complex activities, particularly the challenge of conducting a full assessment of the overall impacts, when different activities are supported by one vessel. The Meeting supported efforts to harmonise authorisation processes as far as possible within differing national systems, and called for enhanced discussion between the Parties, for example using the NCA Forum on the Secretariat website.
- (310) The Chair presented IP 79 *Competent authorities discussion forum on tourism regulatory activities: report by the convener*, which outlined the work of the ATCM web-based forum for Competent Authorities to discuss tourism regulatory activities and exchange knowledge and experience, convened by the Chair. It reported on the commencement of discussion of five issues identified as a priority for initial focus, in accordance with the agreed scope and purpose of the forum. The Chair encouraged Parties to have their NCAs participate in the work of the group as appropriate. The Chair noted that the authorisation of multiple linked or nested activities, sometimes by different Parties was one of the issues under discussion in the forum and highlighted that the forum provided one opportunity to discuss these specific topics.
- (311) Argentina presented IP 86 *Actualización del "Plan Estratégico de Turismo Sustentable de la Provincia de Tierra del Fuego" (PETS-TDF 2025)*, which reported on the recent update of the "Strategic Plan for Sustainable Tourism in the Province of Tierra del Fuego". It noted that the plan included issues related to the role of Ushuaia as a gateway city to Antarctica and the main port of support for Antarctic cruise ship tourism activity. Argentina invited the Meeting and, in particular, Parties with gateway cities to Antarctica, to consider the paper with a view to articulating possible joint actions framed in strategic plans for the development of Antarctic tourism.
- (312) India noted that the IP reflected the importance of acting strategically on tourism issues, and that deliberation on the importance of gateway cities and port controls had been on the agenda of the ATCM for several years. India highlighted that it is important to further collaborate on this issue.
- (313) IAATO thanked Argentina and all other gateway Parties for their continued cooperation with IAATO operators, and noted that its IAATO Gateway Committee looked forward to continue working with those Parties in strategic planning and other issues.
- (314) ASOC introduced IP 91 *Antarctic tourism policies after the "pandemic pause"*, which examined potential Antarctic tourism developments following the coronavirus pandemic. The paper included recommendations for next steps by the ATCM, including: expanding area protection under Annex V; ensuring consistent assessment of tourism activities under Annex I; developing dedicated monitoring programmes; evaluating the effectiveness of existing regulations; and encouraging low-impact modalities of tourism.
- (315) The Meeting thanked ASOC for its valuable paper. It acknowledged the importance of reflecting on tourism activities as they recommenced following the pandemic-related pause and, in a broader sense, of thinking about what kind of tourism was most desirable in Antarctica.

- (316) In relation to its call for low impact modalities of tourism, ASOC clarified that it was inspired by the concept of “slow tourism”. ASOC noted that it was working to further develop the concept of “slow tourism” as applicable to the Antarctic.
- (317) India presented IP 117 *‘Building Back [and forth] Better’ for Antarctic Tourism: Enduring Concerns in Pursuit of a Strategic Vision*. It provided an update of ATCM XXXVIII-IP 104 rev.1, which had summarised recommendations in relation to tourism and non-governmental activities in the Antarctic Treaty area. India encouraged the ATCM to adopt a strategic vision in order to address long-standing, long-discussed concerns related to Antarctic tourism. In doing so, India invited Parties to discuss what the concept ‘building back better’ could and should mean for Antarctic governance, in general, and Antarctic tourism regulation in particular. India hoped that future directions would build consensus on more sustainable pathways through best practice environmental management.
- (318) The Meeting thanked India for its thought-provoking paper. The Meeting noted the value of the paper for its current work, as it reflected on relevant issues and perspectives in the context of a strategic vision.

Information, activities and trends

- (319) Argentina introduced WP 51 *Report of the Informal Discussion on Post-Visit Reports*. It recalled the discussion at ATCM XLIII on Post-Visit Reports (PVR), and to the agreement to continue informal discussions on PVR during the intersessional period. The discussions focused on methods for ensuring that the list of sites and activities in the PVR and EIES were appropriately updated, and on specifying types of unusual incidents that might be reported through the PVR form. In the discussions, participants considered a definition for unusual incidents, and options for the addition of new sites and activities to the PVR. Based on the discussions, suggested changes to section D "Report on Expedition by Expedition Leader" in Part 1 of the PVR form were developed, along with a proposal to update the reporting requirements of the EIES. Argentina recommended that: the Meeting agree a definition of unusual incidents; agree on mechanisms to deal with new sites and activities; and make modifications to the PVR form and to the information exchange requirements.
- (320) IAATO thanked Argentina for the paper and noted the value of participating in the discussions. It remarked that it would continue to work with the Secretariat to ensure that Pre-Visit and Post-Visit EIES Reports exports in its databases complied with requirements set by Parties, and undertook to continue to facilitate data exchange between the IAATO and EIES databases. IAATO also noted that current PVRs focused on sea borne tourism activities, and suggested it might be useful to also develop PVRs for deep-field and air activities.
- (321) The Meeting thanked Argentina for its paper and for leading intersessional discussions on this important topic. The Meeting supported the recommendations proposed in the paper and highlighted the value of PVRs as a tool to support the understanding and management of Antarctic tourism.
- (322) The Meeting welcomed Argentina’s offer to coordinate informal intersessional discussions on PVRs.
- (323) The Meeting adopted Decision F (2022) *Exchange of information requirements*, and Resolution F (2022) *Revised standard Post Visit Report Form*
- (324) IAATO presented IP 42 *IAATO Overview of Antarctic Tourism: A Historical Review of Growth, the 2021-22 Season, and Preliminary Estimates for 2022-23*. In addition to historical data around visitors and activities, IAATO provided data compiled from PVR for the 2021/22 season and noted that the numbers reported reflected only those

travelling with IAATO Operator companies and did not include those individuals taking part in research projects that had been supported by IAATO Operators. IAATO reported that the overall number of visitors in 2021/22 was 23,023. IAATO's estimates for 2022/23 indicate that passenger numbers would rise to approximately 70,289 making landings, and 35,717 passengers travelling on cruise only vessels which do not make landings. IAATO emphasised that all IAATO member and operator activities were planned to have no more than a minor or transitory impact on the Antarctic environment and continued to be conducted safely.

- (325) The Meeting thanked IAATO for continuing to provide it with important information on tourism activities in Antarctica. Parties noted that the information provided could be used to anticipate management needs and support a sustainable and strategic vision for Antarctic tourism. Parties reiterated the importance of tourism not having a more than minor or transitory impact, and underscored the need for a coordinated approach to tourism management in Antarctica. Several Parties also highlighted the importance of Parties ratifying Measure 15 (2009).
- (326) Several Parties highlighted IAATO's estimate that the total number of visitors to Antarctica would exceed 100,000 in the 2022/23 season, and expressed concerns about whether such a large number of visitors would translate into greater pressure on the environment. Some Parties suggested that a precautionary approach should underpin a strategic and coordinated approach to ensuring that there is not an increasing pressure on the environment as a result of the expected growth, noting also the importance of the work and advice of the CEP on this issue. In response to the comment made that visitor numbers did not necessarily equate directly to pressure on the Antarctic environment, it was suggested that IAATO might provide guidance on which indicators might suggest trends which could increase risks to effective management or present a risk to the Antarctic environment.
- (327) IAATO thanked Parties for their comments. It noted that IAATO, as a trade organisation, was not in a position to limit tourism trade or cap tourist numbers. IAATO looked to the Parties to provide a consistent management framework through ATS tools. IAATO noted the continued evolution of the tools it has developed to support environmentally responsible travel, including: a live ship-scheduler to manage visits to sites; mandatory field staff assessments; whale collision avoidance procedures; and the mandatory IAATO observer scheme. IAATO reiterated the importance of the alignment of permitting and authorisation standards, and the ratification of Measure 4 (2004) and Measure 15 (2009). IAATO expressed its willingness to present further information on tourism trends and the evolution of its management tools to the ATCM.
- (328) Noting that IAATO's report covered activities of IAATO operators, Parties reiterated the need to include information on activities by non-IAATO vessels in the reporting by Parties using the EIES, in order to better understand the activities of non-IAATO operators. It was suggested the Secretariat could provide brief summaries of this data, in order to provide Parties with a more comprehensive view of tourism activities carried out in the Antarctic Treaty area.
- (329) ASOC thanked IAATO for continuing to provide the information in IP 42. ASOC noted that tourist numbers are a significant factor, but that tourism dynamics and patterns of development are also significant. For instance, some niche activities may have larger risk or impact. ASOC echoed other interventions that had mentioned the need to bring existing measures into force, and to approach tourism from a strategic perspective.
- (330) IAATO presented IP 43 *A Five-Year Overview and 2021–22 Season Report on IAATO Operator Use of Antarctic Peninsula Landing Sites and ATCM Visitor Site Guidelines*, which reported the data collected by IAATO from IAATO Operator Post Visit Report

Forms for the 2021-22 season as well as historical data. It informed the Committee that the 2021-22 total number of passengers from ships making landings in the Antarctic Peninsula was 22,979. The total number of IAATO SOLAS vessels making landings in the Peninsula region this season was 32. IAATO emphasised that over 95% of all landed tourism activity in the Antarctic Peninsula continued to be focused on traditional commercial ship-borne tourism. IAATO highlighted that most visited sites were covered either by ATCM Site Guidelines for Visitors, IAATO operator landing site guidelines, or National Programme management guidelines. It further observed that all visits were conducted in accordance with landing limits established in applicable Site Guidelines for Visitors, and that the IAATO ship scheduler had been used effectively to ensure that no limits had been exceeded.

- (331) SCAR presented IP 75 *SCAR Tourism Action Group (Ant-TAG)*. This paper informed the meeting about the formation of the SCAR Tourism Action Group (Ant-TAG) in 2021, which provided an umbrella under which SCAR researchers and practitioners could make new connections, become aware of other existing projects, and call on existing expertise to facilitate research on important and relevant issues related to Antarctic tourism. SCAR highlighted the key aims of Ant-TAG including: to facilitate research collaboration among Ant-TAG members and other relevant SCAR groups in order to create policy-ready advice for the SCAR Standing Committee on the Antarctic Treaty System (SC-ATS) and the Antarctic Environments Portal; to establish a communication platform with IAATO and other stakeholders for translating research into management recommendations and addressing industry-relevant knowledge gaps; and to collate research-based, policy-ready information on the topic of Antarctic tourism for SC-ATS to present to the ATCM and CEP. SCAR noted that its paper highlighted key areas where further research was needed.
- (332) The Meeting thanked SCAR for its paper and noted that researchers may wish to engage in the important work of Ant-TAG. It further recognised that SCAR's paper served as a timely reminder of the value of interdisciplinary collaboration around tourism research in Antarctica.
- (333) ASOC thanked SCAR for its contribution, and noted that that a scientific study of tourism allowed for a detached examination of this activity that was relevant to the discussions of the ATCM.
- (334) The United Kingdom presented IP 80 rev. 1 *Data Collection and Reporting on Yachting Activity in Antarctica in 2021-22*, prepared jointly with Argentina, Chile, the United States and IAATO. The paper reported on consolidated information relating to yachts sighted in Antarctica, or indicating an intention to travel to Antarctica, during the 2021-22 season. Noting that many of the yachts considered in the paper had not been included in the EIES, the United Kingdom reminded Parties of the value of the EIES. The paper highlighted that, despite the decrease in tourism to Antarctica during the pandemic, there remained a disproportionate number of yachts visiting the region without authorisation, which required further attention from Parties. The co-authors invited other Parties in a position to provide information related to yachts in Antarctica to collaborate with the co-authors around these activities and to consider joining the group to report on yachting activity in the future.
- (335) The Meeting thanked the co-authors for their work and welcomed the information provided. The Meeting shared the co-authors' concerns about the persistent issues of unauthorised yachts or yachts that were unable to present permits in Antarctica. Parties noted the importance of following up on vessels that had been without or unable to present authorisation. Several Parties expressed an interest in future collaboration on the collection and reporting of information about yacht activities.
- (336) France stated that it would follow up with a vessel that had been authorised by its NCA

and which, according to IP 80 rev. 1, had been unable to present its authorisation.

- (337) IAATO thanked the co-authors for the collation of data and IP 80 rev. 1. IAATO expressed that it shared Parties' concerns about unauthorised yachts, including some that had been repeatedly identified over several years. Acknowledging the difficulties that competent authorities had in penalising such vessels, IAATO observed that some unauthorised yachts were becoming increasingly bold in their activities and were thereby undermining Antarctic Treaty processes and intent. Highlighting that such activities could have more than a minor or transitory impact on the Antarctic environment, IAATO cautioned that this set a poor example for responsible tour operators and passengers. IAATO reaffirmed that it remained committed to reporting yacht activity and to sharing pertinent information with both IAATO and non-IAATO yachts.
- (338) ASOC called attention to IP 92 *Developments to enhance the safety of pleasure yachts and fishing boats operating in the Antarctic Treaty area*, submitted under ATCM 13 Safety and Operations in Antarctica. The paper provided information on the latest developments at the International Maritime Organisation pertinent to the safety and operation of vessels, including pleasure yachts, in the Antarctic Treaty area. The paper noted that the initial adoption of the Polar Code did not include pleasure yachts and fishing vessels, which together make up a significant proportion of the vessels operating in the Antarctic. There has since been additional work at the IMO to extend the Code to these vessels in the form of voluntary Guidelines. The paper recommended that these *Guidelines for Safety Measures for Pleasure Yachts of 300 Gross Tonnage and above not engaged in trade Operating in Polar Waters* should be a requirement of any permits issued for pleasure yachts planning to operate in the Antarctic Treaty area.
- (339) Argentina presented IP 111 *Report on Antarctic tourist flows and cruise ships operating in Ushuaia during the 2021/2022 Austral summer season*. This paper reported on tourist flows and cruise ships operating in Ushuaia during the 2021-22 summer season, including information on the number of voyages that took place, passengers and their nationalities, average number of crew per vessel, and the registers of ships. Argentina recalled that it had shared these reports in the ATCM since 2008, thus providing a complete database of Antarctic tourist flows from Ushuaia. Argentina reported on data comparing the 2019-20 summer season to the 2021-22 summer season, which reflected the significant decrease in tourism activity since the COVID-19 pandemic. It also referred to the compliance of ships with the sanitary protocols implemented in Ushuaia and the situation of several scheduled voyage cancellations and vessels having to remain in isolation nearby the harbour of Ushuaia. Argentina highlighted that this paper demonstrated that a variety of information sources were available to Parties interested in data on tourism flows and cruise ships. It emphasised that such data could usefully inform Parties' future discussion of Antarctic tourism activities.
- (340) The Meeting thanked Argentina for its presentation and for its work taking note of the various sources of information including reports over many years on tourist's activities using the port of Ushuaia.

[Item 18: Preparation of the 45th Meeting

a. Date and place

- (341) The Meeting welcomed the kind invitation of the Government of Finland to host ATCM XLV in Helsinki, from 29 May to 8 June 2023.
- (342) For future planning, the Meeting took note of the following likely timetable of upcoming ATCMs:

- 2024 India
- 2025 Italy

[NEW PARA] The ATCM in India will be ATCM 46/CEP 26

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

- IP 82 *Preparation of the 45th Meeting Helsinki, 2023* (Finland).

b. Invitation of International and Non-governmental Organisations

(344) 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 XLIV: [the ACAP Secretariat, ASOC, IPCC, IAATO, the International Civil Aviation Organization (ICAO), IHO, IMO, IOC, IOPC Funds, the International Union for Conservation of Nature (IUCN), UNEP, UNFCCC, WMO and the World Tourism Organization (WTO).

c. Preparation of the Agenda for ATCM XLV

(345) The Meeting approved the Preliminary Agenda for ATCM XLV (see Appendix X).

d. Organisation of ATCM XLV

(346) According to the revised ad hoc Rules of Procedure adopted at this ATCM, Chairs for these groups should be appointed before the close of the Meeting and, in the absence of any nomination, Chairs would be appointed at the start of the next ATCM. The Meeting agreed to appoint Theodore Kill from the United States as Chair for Working Group 1 for 2020. It also agreed to appoint Sonia Ramos García from Spain and Dr Phillip Tracey from Australia as Co-chairs for Working Group 2 in 2023.

e. The SCAR Lecture

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

Item 19: Any Other Business

(348) Turkey presented IP 98 *Turkey's Membership to the COMNAP*. The paper reported Turkey had applied for membership to COMNAP in 2021 to enable its involvement in the development and best practice in managing the support of research in Antarctica. Turkey noted its request for membership was accepted in the 2021 COMNAP ATCM. Turkey considered its COMNAP membership would enhance and shape the future of its polar research, and expressed its gratitude to countries and representatives who supported it through the process.

[NEW PARA] Argentina made the following statement: “We are living through complex times and dealing with important challenges for the entire Antarctic Treaty System. It is in difficult times like these that our commitment, coherence and adherence to the principles that have been guiding us in the more than 60 years of the Antarctic Treaty must prevail, such as good faith, international cooperation and consensus. Unfortunately, yesterday, in another forum of the Antarctic Treaty System, one Party circulated a Note that surprises and worries us, since it could establish a dangerous precedent for our System. We do not agree with the considerations expressed in said Note and we will respond to it through the corresponding channels in that forum. Our position regarding the sovereignty dispute is widely known, so I am not going to repeat

it today. However, this issue goes beyond any bilateral dispute and concerns the fundamental commitments of the Antarctic Treaty System. Decisions like the one reflected in the Note we received yesterday do not contribute to the system. In this sense, today I would like to make a call for reflection to all Parties. The attitude or conduct of a Party can never be used as an excuse by another Party to fail to comply with its multilateral obligations by adopting unilateral decisions. I would like to reaffirm once again our commitment to the foundations and principles of the Antarctic Treaty System. We appeal to the commitment and responsibility of all Parties to support and strengthen our System.

[NEW PARA] The United Kingdom made the following statement: “The United Kingdom would also recall its position on sovereignty in the South Atlantic, which is well known to all delegates. It is unfortunate that this matter, which relates to a separate forum of the Antarctic Treaty System, has been raised here. But this situation relates to an egregious blocking of decision-making based on best available science by a third party. The UK is clear that the action we are taking, including to ensure continued high standards of marine conservation, and which is fully explained in the aforementioned Note, is entirely consistent with our obligations under the Convention for the Conservation of Antarctic Marine Living Resources - CCAMLR. The UK remains wholly committed to the principles and objectives of CCAMLR. The UK will continue to discharge its obligations under the Convention in good faith, including with respect to decision-making on the basis of the best scientific evidence available, and expects the same from all other Parties. The UK commits to working with Argentina and all other CCAMLR Members to seek to restore the framework under which the interests of all Parties had been protected for the past 40 years. We are ready to engage with all CCAMLR Members on this matter, including at this year’s annual meeting in October.”

[NEW PARA] Argentina rejects the United Kingdom’s statement and reaffirms its well-known legal position.

Item 20: Adoption of the Final Report

(349)

The Meeting adopted the Final Report of the 44th Antarctic Treaty Consultative Meeting in accordance with Rule 25 of the ATCM Rules of Procedure. Consensus was not reached on paragraphs 10 and 11 and paragraphs 34-39. The Chair of the Meeting, Mrs Tania von Uslar-Gleichen, made closing remarks.

Item 21: Close of the Meeting

(350) The Meeting was closed on Thursday, 2 June at 17:46.