

SUMMARY OF TEN YEARS OF SCAR – CEP INTERACTIONS

Non Paper for the SCAR AG-SATG Meeting

Before the establishment of the CEP, most of the ATCM requirements on scientific advice and management related to environmental protection were accomplished by the SCAR **Group of Specialists on Environmental Affairs and Conservation (GOSEAC)**. It was a standing group composed by about ten specialists in different scientific disciplines (biology, geology, ecology, glaciology, chemistry, etc) and specialists on environmental policy and management. GOSEAC had also, as observers, COMNAP, IUCN/ASOC representatives and some co-opted members when necessary. The group met once a year and, in the last years, with the use of the e-mail facilities, it worked also during the intersessional periods. With the establishment of the CEP in 1998, many of the issues discussed by GOSEAC (mainly those related to environmental management) were progressively taken by the CEP. GOSEAC eventually ended its activities in 2002.

According to the Protocol the CEP provides *advice and formulate recommendations to the Parties in connection with the implementation of this Protocol, including the operation of its Annexes, for consideration at Antarctic Treaty Consultative Meetings, and to perform such other functions as may be referred to it by the Antarctic Treaty Consultative Meetings*. But because of the meetings length and structure, and the unequal environmental background of delegations, many of the matters being discussed did not reach a solution as fast as expected. To improve its work, the Committee created *Contact Groups* which meet informally on the margins of the meetings and *Intersessional Contact Groups (ICGs)*, which discuss in a more structured way specific matters during the intersessional periods. The most substantive matters considered by CEP during the last ten years were discussed intersessionally by these ICGs.

Despite the creation of the Committee, the advice of SCAR is considered essential for the proper resolution of issues connected with environmental protection which require scientific background. Considering this need, after its reorganization, SCAR created the **Standing Committee on the Antarctic Treaty System**. The objective of this committee is not to replace the former GOSEAC, but “*to provide scientific representation at the meetings of the Committee for Environmental Protection and the Antarctic Treaty Consultative Meetings, organize and prepare the scientific advice requested by the ATS and briefs SCAR Officers and Committees on Treaty deliberations*”.

This paper provides a quick review of the most relevant issues related to the interaction between the SCAR and the CEP since its establishment, in 1998. The analysis was done taking into account the formal SCAR proposals to the Committee (through WPs and IPs) as well as the main discussions reflected in the CEP reports. The paper analyses the evolution of several main issues on which SCAR participated as advisor or proponent. The Annex reflects main issues connected with SCAR contributions to the CEP as reflected in the CEP Reports I to X.

The aim of this paper is to help the Action Group in analyzing which have been the main areas of interaction between CEP and the SCAR, and thus, to provide a basis for discussions so as to identify aspects that may deserve corrective measures in both forums to optimize the cooperation, therefore it does not provide any opinion or evaluation of the SCAR-CEP interaction.

Main Areas of interaction

SCAR has given its advice to the CEP in a high number of important topics. The list bellow intends to summarize how some of the most important ones evolved during the existence of the CEP. (the Annex contains more detailed information).

1. **Protected Areas**: before the establishment of the CEP, the analysis of new and revised PA management plans, the advice to the proponents and to the ATCM as well as the design of basic format (model) for the management plan was done by the GOSEAC. After that, the strategies applied by the Committee were diverse, and so were the results. Eventually in 2007 the CEP created a *Trial Informal Group -TIG* (a sort of informal standing WG) which deals with the analysis of any new proposal or review for ASPA or ASMA management plans.

During the last ten years SCAR has participated in discussions related to analysis of new and revised MPs as well as in the design of strategies, guidelines, procedures, etc. But SCAR did not participate in the TIG discussions during 2007, and neither did it in the general discussion forum on TIG conclusions.

2. *Specially Protected Species (SPS)*

- (1998) SCAR mentioned the possible declination in the population size of the southern giant petrel during CEP I.
- (1999) After a presentation by the UK, the CEP proposed, and the ATCM approved, a Resolution asking SCAR to undertake a review of the list of Specially Protected Species.
- (2000) In response, SCAR provided a review of the status of SPS, proposing the deletion of the fur seals from the list, while agreed with some delegations on the need to review Annex II to the Protocol in order to improve the criteria for designation and protection of SPS. The Committee created an ICG on SPS and decided to wait its conclusions before reviewing the criteria for designation of SPS.
- (2001) SCAR participated in the ICG discussions
- (2002) SCAR participated in the ICG discussions and, given the lack of criteria for SPS designation in Annex II identified by the ICG, SCAR offered to undertake, in conjunction with IUCN, an assessment of the status of well documented species using the IUCN criteria. The CEP accepted the proposal.
- (2003) SCAR presented a progress report about its consultation with IUCN. The CEP thanked SCAR for this work and noted that procedures and guidelines for designating Specially Protected Species needed to be completed by 2005.
- (2004) The conclusion of the assessment by Birdlife International, on behalf of IUCN, was that concern was limited to five species, but that most of the Antarctic species were not under immediate threat. SCAR offered to bring to CEP VIII (2005) a prototype process for the designation of SPS. The Committee noted that the issue of designating Specially Protected Species had become very urgent and should be a major item for consideration at CEP.
- (2005) SCAR recommended removing from the SPS list the two species of fur seals. The CEP asked SCAR to present a revision of that proposal in 2006.
SCAR also made a proposal on how the IUCN endangerment criteria could be applied to bird species breeding or foraging in the AT area. The CEP adopted the '*SPS guidelines...*' and asked SCAR to assess the status of those species that could be threatened.
- (2006) SCAR proposed to list the Southern Giant Petrel as SPS since, at regional level, the species could be still threatened. The Committee urged SCAR to prepare a draft Action Plan to facilitate development of an agreed template before CEP X. SCAR was also urged to prepare proposals for listing other species.
SCAR proposed again to remove the fur seals from the list, the CEP accepted and the ATCM agreed a Measure.
- (2007) SCAR had presented a WP for CEP X with a proposal to add the Southern Giant Petrel to the SPS list, but at the last moment the proposal was withdrawn because SCAR said that some new data appeared showing a different trend in some important regions. SCAR will make a new proposal in 2008, according to the results of the Southern Giant Petrel workshop to be held in May.
On the other hand, SCAR noted the potential utility of the regional criteria for designation of SPS.

3. *Annex II review*: (2002 – 2004) as consequence of discussions on SPS the CEP V, in 2002, decided to undertake a rolling review of the Annexes to the Protocol, starting with Annex II. SCAR actively participated in the discussion providing scientific advice, both during the intersessional periods and in the comprehensive discussions at the CEP VI and VII meetings.

4. *State of the Antarctic Environment Report (SAER)*

- (1998) SCAR noted that it had established an *ad hoc* group to maintain a watching brief on the State of SAER and remained prepared to provide advice and assistance, if required.
- (1999) SCAR formally proposed its willingness to assist in assessing the availability of data which might be required. The CEP accepted the offer and asked SCAR to report back the year after.

- (2000) SCAR updated the Committee on a scoping study for the SAER and announced to finish the study for 2001.
- (2001) SCAR apologized because it had been unable to finalize the analysis.
- (2002) SCAR presented information on existing available data for the SAER and reported about the positive environmental management results based on this sort of reports elsewhere in the world. The CEP welcomed the information and established an ICG to work intersessionally.
- (2003) SCAR recognized the value of focused environmental indicators and the proper selection of them to get a sound scientific basis for the SAER. The CEP established a new ICG and recommended to seek advice from SCAR.
- (2004) Coordinators of the ICG noted the population of the reporting system provided by SCAR and the importance to get SCAR involved in this process.
- (2005) The Committee decided to combine its work on environmental monitoring and SAER, and agreed to convene an ICG on environmental monitoring and reporting.
- (2006 - 2007) The SAER was not formally discussed at the CEP.

5. Meteorites:

- (2000) At the CEP III SCAR presented a Working Paper expressing serious concerns regarding the potential for unrestricted collection of Antarctic meteorites by private expeditions. The Committee supported these views and created an ICG to report back at CEP IV. SCAR actively participated in the ICG discussions.
- (2001) After the presentation of the ICG conclusions, the CEP drafted a resolution on Meteorites Protection, adopted by the XXIV ATCM as Resolution 3 (2001).

6. Lake Vostok: Scientific discussions on sub glacial lakes were undertaken formally at SCAR since the beginning of the 1990's.

- (1999) At CEP II, and taking into account future activities announced by Russia, SCAR informed that it will hold a workshop, in a continuing series, to develop science and logistic plans for Lake Vostok.
- (2001) SCAR confirmed the significant interest among the international scientific community on the Lake Vostok initiative. SCAR noted its intention to hold a workshop as part of the SCAR Biology Symposium and that the meeting of the SCAR Group of Specialists on Sub glacial Antarctic Lake Exploration in September 2001 would also address the Lake Vostok project.
- (2002) SCAR presented an IP expressing that there was as yet no international consensus among the scientific community on appropriate lake sampling or on drilling methods to penetrate into the lake. It expressed that additional studies should be carried out before further drilling. A SCAR group of experts was going to discuss the risks of deeper drilling at Lake Vostok, and SCAR was going to provide a report the year after.
- (2003) SCAR presented an IP suggesting that a more rigorous evaluation of the potential for chemical and biological contamination was required, as well as the risk connected with accidental penetration by drilling fluid.
- (2004 - 2005) There was no discussion on this issue at CEP VII and VIII.
- (2006) SCAR suggested that if one subglacial lake was contaminated, contamination may spread downstream to connected lakes. *SCAR's Subglacial Antarctic Lakes Exploration* group (SALE) had discussed this possibility over the years, but many aspects remained unclear - SCAR noted that the risks of continued drilling at Lake Vostok.
- (2007) SCAR presented an IP explaining that subglacial environments represents an important continental-scale interconnected phenomena, and that subglacial environments provided an opportunity to advance understanding of how life, the environment, climate, and planetary history combine to produce the world as we know it today.

7. Marine Acoustics:

- (2000) SCAR presented an IP on the impacts of acoustic techniques on the marine environment and proposing to hold a workshop on this issue in early 2001. The Committee welcomed these actions and asked SCAR to report back to the CEP IV meeting on the outcome of the workshop.
- (2001) CEP IV did not discuss the matter
- (2002) SCAR presented a WP and an IP concluding that there was not enough evidence of negative impacts on the Antarctic marine organisms from the appropriate use of acoustic technology

equipment. Germany did not agree with SCAR and the Committee asked Germany to provide its data to SCAR and asked SCAR to report back next year.

- (2003) SCAR presented an IP providing a database of existing marine seismic data and announced it was forming a new acoustics expert working group. It undertook to present further commentary on marine noise for next meeting.
- (2004) SCAR presented an IP reporting on a recent workshop and concluded that, with proper mitigation measures, existing scientific acoustic equipment could be used safely in the Antarctic. Some members expressed still concern on this issue. SCAR undertook to provide a further update on this field in 2006.
- (2005) The CEP agreed on that the topic needed to be on discussion and looked forward to receiving in 2006 a SCAR's paper reviewing available information on marine acoustics as agreed at CEP VII.
- (2006) SCAR presented a WP and an IP about its third workshop on this matter noting that further data was needed to ensure these procedures were as relevant and effective as possible. The Committee noted SCAR recommendations and looked forward to further SCAR updates as more information became available.
- (2007) Some members presented results from research and conferences on this issue and announced future activities. SCAR took note of some announcements.

8. Monitoring:

- (1998) SCAR and COMNAP were invited by the CEP to present a paper on Environmental Monitoring based on the Workshops held in Oslo and Texas in 1995 and 1996.
- (1999) SCAR and COMNAP presented a WP on monitoring of environmental impacts of scientific activities and operations in Antarctica. The committee endorsed the proposal and asked to report back on its development to CEP III.
- (2000) SCAR presented a WP with COMANP updating the CEP on the work done during the intersessional period. SCAR also presented an IP on the use of lichens to monitoring radioactivity in Antarctica.
- (2001) The CEP created an ICG on monitoring of cumulative impacts of human activities in Antarctica and asked it to report back in 2003. SCAR contributed to the discussions of that group.
- (2003) The meeting discussed the conclusions of the ICG on cumulative impacts.
- (2004) The ATME on Tourism agreed that CEP should address the issue of monitoring and provide the ATCM with recommendations for the coordinated monitoring of activities in Antarctica, including the establishment of a consistent methodology and central data collection process. The Committee established an ICG led by France to discuss the environmental monitoring in Antarctica with comprehensive ToRs.
- (2005) As ICG coordinator France presented a Progress Report noted that the group was going to use the report of the SCAR/COMNAP Texas workshop on biological monitoring. SCAR expressed that it was planning to present a paper on this for 2006.
- (2006) SCAR participated in the discussions of the ICG. SCAR presented also the results of the Texas workshop on biological monitoring. The Committee encouraged SCAR and COMNAP to report back to the CEP on further progress with environmental monitoring related work.
- (2007) SCAR presented an IP noting that, like the Arctic Council did, the ATCM should adopt a statement urging Treaty Parties to maintain and extend long-term monitoring of change in all parts of the Antarctic, and to request its subsidiary bodies to co-operate with SCAR in efforts to create a co-ordinated Antarctic observing network.

9. Climate Change:

- (2006) SCAR presented an IP noting that 3 of its 5 main programs relate to climate change matters. SCAR reported on work to be undertaken in conjunction with the World Climate Research Program to assess the impacts of climate change on the Antarctic environment. SCAR invited Parties to contribute to the assessment and consider joining the international steering committee to be formed July 2006.
- (2007) SCAR presented an IP on the Phase I of the review of Antarctic climate that it had introduced at CEP IX in 2006, and addressing what is known of the physics of the climate system of Antarctica and the Southern Ocean. SCAR urged Parties to work on this issue. Following a request from the CEP, SCAR agreed to provide available information on current long-term environmental and observational monitoring research programs.

Annex. Main SCAR contributions to the CEP I to X

Note: - Bullets refer to discussion reflected in the CEP reports not connected to SCAR papers
 - Numbers in brackets refer to the paragraph in the CEP Report

Document	Subject	Action
CEP I (1998) Tromsø		
Protected Areas : WP 47 <i>Developing the Protected Areas System in Antarctica</i>	Suggesting that the CEP should work towards developing a coherent overall protected areas strategy for Antarctica by convening a second international scientific workshop prior to the next meeting. (42)	The CEP acknowledged that Antarctic protected areas should be examined in the wider context of the protection given to Antarctica by the Environmental Protocol and Annexes I – IV and recommended a second Workshop. (49)
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • SCAR Advice to the CEP: The CEP agreed that information and advice provided by observers and experts will be essential to the ongoing work of the Committee. The Committee in this context expressed its appreciation for the work of CCAMLR, COMNAP and SCAR as well as other observers. (13) • Monitoring: SCAR and COMNAP were invited by the CEP to present a paper on Environmental Monitoring based on the Workshops held in Oslo and Texas in 1995 and 1996. (7) • SPS: SCAR noted a general decline in the southern giant petrel numbers, and was investigating the reasons for this (33) • SAER: SCAR noted that it had established an ad hoc group to maintain a watching brief on the State of Antarctic Environmental Report (SAER) and remained prepared to provide advice and assistance if required (58) 		
CEP II (1999) Lima		
SAER: WP 6 <i>Reporting on the State of the Antarctic Environment</i>	On SCAR's willingness to assist in assessing the availability of data which might be required if the CEP were to proceed with the production of a SAER (93)	The Committee gratefully accepted SCAR's offer to prepare a scoping study for presentation at CEP III (94)
Monitoring: WP 4 (with COMNAP) <i>The Monitoring of Environmental Impacts of Scientific Activities and Operations in Antarctica</i>	Same (88)	The Committee endorsed the work of COMNAP and SCAR on the comparability of environmental monitoring data. The Committee asked COMNAP and SCAR to submit a document to CEP III on the status of this work. (89)
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • SCAR Advice to the CEP: SCAR and COMNAP offered to continue lending advisory and other support to the CEP, as they had been doing in the past (para 15) • Lake Vostok: SCAR informed that it will hold a workshop, in a continuing series, to develop science and logistic plans for Lake Vostok (para 3) • SPS: The CEP proposed a draft resolution asking SCAR to undertake a review of the list of Specially Protected Species attached at Appendix A to Annex II. (49). The ATCM agreed Resolution 2 (1999) 		
CEP III (2000) The Hague		
SPS: WP 18 <i>Specially Protected Species</i>	In response to Resolution 2 (1999), the paper provided a review of the list of SPS in Appendix A of Annex II. <u>SCAR proposed deletion of the fur seal from the list and the addition of five bird species.</u> SCAR supported the view that Annex II needs clarification regarding the purpose of setting the criteria for designation, and the extra protection afforded to SPS (56)	The CEP <u>decided not to consider the revisions proposed in the SCAR WP until the criteria have been reviewed</u> , and to revisit the question of amendments to the list when the report of the ICG discussing the SPS issue review has been considered. (61)
Meteorites: WP 19 <i>Antarctic Meteorites</i>	Expressing serious concerns regarding the potential for unrestricted collection of Antarctic meteorites by private expeditions. (100)	The Committee supported the views expressed in the SCAR paper and noted that taking meteorites may constitute a violation of Article 3(2)(VI) of the Protocol in so far as it might lead to the degradation of, or substantial risk to areas of scientific significance. (101) The CEP accepted NZ offer to study further the issues connected with the collection of meteorites. SCAR offered to participate in this process, and gather further scientific information. (102)
Wildlife diseases: WP 20 (with COMNAP) <i>Wildlife diseases.</i>	Responding to the recommendations in the report from the 1988 Australian workshop on diseases of Antarctic wildlife. (49)	It was stressed that it would be advisable to increase awareness and scientific knowledge about diseases in Antarctic wildlife (51)
Monitoring: WP 22 (with COMNAP) <i>Recent Monitoring and EIA initiatives</i>	Updating the CEP on the work of COMNAP/SCAR on environmental monitoring and environmental impact assessment since CEP II (40)	The Committee welcomed the initiative and asked to report back in the CEP IV (41)
Monitoring: IP 13 <i>Environmental Radioactivity and Biomonitoring</i>	Dealing with radioactivity in the Antarctic and the use of lichens for biomonitoring and providing more information on this issues. (108)	-----
SAER: IP 14 <i>Scoping Study for the State of the Antarctic Environment Report</i>	Updating the Committee on the Scoping Study for a State of the Antarctic Environment Report that it had been tasked to produce. (109)	Sweden requested more information on progress in this respect. SCAR announced that the full Scoping Study would be available at the CEP IV. (109)
Marine Acoustics: IP 42 <i>Impacts of acoustic techniques in the marine environment</i>	On the impacts of acoustic techniques on the marine environment and proposing to hold a workshop on this issue in early 2001.(42)	The Committee welcomed these actions and asked SCAR to report back to the CEP IV meeting on the outcome of the workshop. (43)
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Protected Areas: The CEP agreed in creating individual contact groups to revise Protected Area MPs. SCAR, COMNAP and CCAMLR confirmed their willingness to take part in such intersessional work. (85) 		

CEP IV (2001) St. Petersburg		
Liability: WP 14 (with COMNAP) <i>Response to XXIII ATCM Resolution 5 (1999)</i>	On advice of COMNAP and SCAR on matters connected to Liability issues. (97)	The Committee thanked COMNAP/SCAR for their work. Several delegations raised specific points and advised they would be prepared to provide further input to this work. COMNAP and SCAR said they would be happy to receive comments on the paper.(98)
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Meteorites: After a presentation of a WP by NZ (based on the SCAR presentation at the CEP II) the CEP drafted a Resolution on meteorites protection, adopted by the ATCM as Resolution 3 (2001). (7) • Marine acoustics: The Committee noted that SCAR was planning a workshop in 2001 to consider the potential impacts on the marine environment of scientific acoustic techniques. (25) • Lake Vostok: SCAR confirmed the significant interest among the international scientific community on the Lake Vostok initiative. SCAR noted its intention to hold a workshop on the issue in August 2001 as part of the SCAR Biology Symposium in Amsterdam. The meeting of the SCAR Group of Specialists on Sub glacial Antarctic Lake Exploration in Bologna in September 2001 would also address the Lake Vostok project. (27) • Protected Areas: The issue of SCAR's participation in the review of draft MPs was also discussed. Several Members of the Committee considered that the need to forward draft Management Plans to SCAR in advance of the CEP meeting had now been overtaken by the new Guidelines. It was considered that SCAR's participation in the intersessional review process would satisfy the need for SCAR to have the possibility to comment on all draft Management Plans.(64) • SAER: SCAR apologized that it had been unable to provide the Scoping Study for a State of the Antarctic Environment Report (SAER). It will be provided by SCAR to CEP V. (94) 		
CEP V (2002) Warsaw		
Marine Acoustics: WP 23 <i>Marine Acoustic Technology and the Environment</i> IP 24 <i>Marine acoustic technology and the environment</i>	Reporting that, after surveying all relevant literature, it concluded that there is no evidence of negative impacts on the Antarctic marine organisms from the appropriate use of acoustic technology equipment. SCAR proposed a number of mitigation measures to be used to minimize potential impacts on marine species from the use of acoustic technologies in Antarctica. (25)	Germany said that the report of SCAR was unbalanced and misleading. Delegations welcomed SCAR's report and asked Germany to provide SCAR with comments for consideration by SCAR before final publication of the SCAR report. The meeting asked SCAR to bring forward a final report on the environmental impacts of acoustic technology at CEP VI. (26)
SAER: WP 31 <i>Scoping the data for a State of the Antarctic Environment Report</i>	Indicating that extensive and relevant data already existed for many of the key environmental variables but that there were some areas that were data deficient. It reported that state of the environment reporting elsewhere in the world had already proven its value for decision making in environmental management. (109)	The Committee welcomed the information contained in the papers presented on this issue. It was agreed that New Zealand and Australia jointly should lead informal intersessional work aimed at providing clear suggestions on how to move forward on developing a continent-wide state of the Antarctic environment report for consideration at CEP VI. (114)
Annex II review: WP 37 <i>Comments on the revision of Annex II</i>	Providing general and specific comment from the scientific point of view to improve the text of Annex II (the paper was presented at the same time than other WP presented by a Party on the same issue). (51)	The Committee expressed its gratitude for these two papers, and noted SCAR's scientific comments. The Committee agreed also that in its review of Annex II it would take into account the final report and recommendations in of the intersessional contact group on Specially Protected Species. (52)
SPS: WP 38 <i>Specially Protected Species</i>	Noting that Annex II currently does not provide adequate guidance on how special protection should be applied. SCAR offered to undertake, in conjunction with IUCN, an assessment of the status of well documented species using the IUCN criteria, beginning with birds and seals. (41)	The Committee thanked SCAR for their offer of assistance in assessing the conservation status of Antarctic species consistent with the approach submitted by the ICG. This includes considering the IUCN category of conservation status when recommending a species for special protection.
Lake Vostok: IP 55 <i>Exploring Subglacial Antarctic Lakes: A SCAR Report on Progress</i>	Expressing that there is as yet no international consensus among the scientific community on appropriate lake sampling or on drilling methods to penetrate into the lake. Additional studies should be carried out before further drilling towards Lake Vostok. A SCAR group of experts will discuss the risks of deeper drilling at Lake Vostok, and SCAR will provide a report to CEP VI. (15)	The Russian Federation advised that it would postpone drilling an additional 50 m of ice until the 2003/2004 season, and that it intends to produce an IEE for this drilling. (18)
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • SPS: Germany noted that the recent work of SCAR's Bird-biology Subcommittee and Bird Life International on the identification of important bird areas in Antarctica and trends in populations would be a useful source of information in assessing the status of all Antarctic bird species. (47) • Over flight guidelines: The Committee invited COMNAP, in consultation with SCAR, to review the proposed guidelines for the operation of aircraft near concentrations of birds in Antarctica, and to report back to the CEP. (56) • Incidents: COMNAP presented a WP reflecting on "worst case" and "less than worst case" scenarios of possible environmental incidents in Antarctica, taking into account comments received from SCAR and ASOC regarding introduction of non indigenous species. (115) 		
CEP VI (2003) Madrid		
Lake Vostok: IP 94 <i>Comment on the Draft Comprehensive Environmental Evaluation: Water Sampling of the Subglacial Lake Vostok</i>	Suggesting that a more rigorous evaluation is required of the potential for chemical and biological contamination, as well as the risk that the lake water is pressurized and could cause hydro-fracturing leading to accidental penetration by drilling fluid. (24)	The CEP produced an Advice containing, among others, the suggestions proposed by SCAR in its paper. (28)

Marine Acoustics: IP 77 <i>Acoustic technology and the marine ecosystem</i>	Providing a database of existing marine seismic data which may be used by researchers in order to avoid repeating seismic work. (56)	SCAR announced it was forming a new acoustics expert working group and that it undertook to present further commentary on marine noise to CEP VII. (58)
SPS: IP 100 <i>Antarctic Specially Protected Species</i>	Updating the CEP on the consultation SCAR was doing with IUCN on the global and regional threat status of Antarctic birds. Once SCAR has received the recommendations from IUCN at both the global and regional levels a formal and fully documented proposal will be prepared for each species that is deemed to be under threat at either the global or regional level. (109)	The CEP thanked SCAR for this work and noted that procedures and guidelines for designating Specially Protected Species need to be completed by 2005 in time for the first expected detailed proposals for SPS status. (110)
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Annex II Review: SCAR had an important participation during discussions of the ICG on Annex II review, both at the meeting and during the intersessional period. (63...) • SAER: SCAR noted that in previous discussions two approaches to state of the Antarctic environment reporting had been considered – <u>global and local</u>, and recognized the value of selected and <u>focused environmental indicators</u> as outlined by the ICG and SCAR considered careful selection of these could provide a sound scientific basis for future environmental management decisions. The CEP established a new ICG and, among other issues, asked it to seek advice from SCAR, COMANP and CCAMLR on indicators of human impact in Antarctica. (168) • Bioprospecting: SCAR noted that bioprospecting could raise important issues of freedom of scientific information if confidentiality required by commercial developments limited opportunities for scientific publication. SCAR also noted their concern that in the marine realm there could also be potential for harvesting of slow growing species containing compounds of pharmaceutical interest. (177) 		
CEP VII (2004) Cape Town		
Marine Acoustics: IP 78 <i>SCAR Report On Marine Acoustic Technology And The Antarctic Environment</i>	Reporting that a recent workshop had examined the latest research on acoustic equipment and marine mammals. SCAR concluded that, with proper mitigation measures, existing scientific acoustic equipment could be used safely in the Antarctic. The paper provided a risk evaluation of a range of equipment and outlined how this could be applied in estimating environmental impact before any cruise. SCAR undertook to provide a further update on this field in 2006, and invited Parties to comment on the present paper. (85)	Germany noted the report and indicated it would raise a number of technical questions about its contents. Spain welcomed the report but considered there was still considerable uncertainty about the mechanisms involved in these interactions and their possible impacts. The importance of this topic means further research is urgently required. (86)
SPS: IP 73 <i>Antarctic Specially Protected Species</i>	On the development of a scientific basis for assessing the conservation status of Antarctic species. The conclusion of the assessment by Birdlife international on behalf of IUCN was that concern was limited to five species, but that most of the Antarctic species are not under immediate threat. SCAR offered to bring to CEP VIII a prototype process for the designation of SPS. (114)	Several members welcomed the SCAR and UNEP papers noting that they greatly assisted the Committee's work on Annex II issues. And the Committee noted that the issue of designating Specially Protected Species has become very urgent and should be a major item for consideration at CEP VIII. (116)
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • SAER: When presented the joint WP by NZ and Australia <i>Towards a CEP State of the Antarctic Environment Reporting System: Report of the Intersessional Contact Group</i>, Australia noted the population of the reporting system with temperature data provided by SCAR, the contribution to the work of the ICG by Parties and organizations (including SCAR) and the essential continuing involvement by SCAR, CCAMLR in the future development of the system (195). • Annex II review: During the intersessional period and during discussions at the meeting, SCAR provided very useful scientific comments on Annex II review. 		
CEP VIII(2005) Stockholm		
SPS: WP 33 <i>De-listing Antarctic Specially Protected Species</i>	Recommending that <i>Arctocephalus tropicalis</i> (sub-Antarctic fur seal) and <i>gazella</i> (Antarctic fur seal) be removed from Appendix A on the basis of the current population estimates, the annual trend, the geographical area inhabited, and the lack of any threats to the species. (121)	The Committee asked SCAR to submit to CEP IX a revision of the proposal for delisting the two fur seal species in accordance with the new guidelines. SCAR noted that, by CEP IX, it could also provide information and data in relation to the Ross seal. (127)
SPS: WP 34 <i>Proposal to List a Species as a Specially Protected Species under Annex II</i>	On how the IUCN endangerment criteria could be applied to bird species breeding or foraging in the AT area, providing suggestions for a possible procedure, and including a model framework presenting data for the southern giant petrel. (119)	The Committee developed <i>Guidelines for CEP Consideration of Proposals for New and Revised Designations of Antarctic SPS</i> (122). The Committee asked SCAR to assess the species noted in WP 34 as candidates for listing (southern giant petrel and macaroni penguin) using the new guidelines. SCAR agreed to undertake this work and report back to CEP IX. (124)
Monitoring: IP 69 <i>Biological Monitoring of Human Impacts in the Antarctic</i>	SCAR stated that the results of the Texas workshop would be discussed at the COMNAP /SCAR Executive meeting in July. The report would be available to the CEP ICG for discussion. SCAR and COMNAP will provide a paper to the next CEP meeting on any issues arising. (202-218)	The CEP decided to continue with the work of the ICG. (206)
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Marine acoustics: the CEP recalled earlier discussions of this important issue, agreed that it warranted further consideration, and agreed that it should be a topic for substantive discussion at CEP IX. The Committee also looked forward to receiving at that meeting SCAR's paper reviewing available information on marine acoustics as foreshadowed at CEP VII. (114) • Ballast water: Many Members agreed that further detailed consideration of the Committee, based on expert scientific advice, such as from SCAR. SCAR indicated that it will bring a paper to the next meeting and offered to provide further expert advice on the issue. (140 & 144) • Hull fouling: SCAR indicated that it has programs studying the potential pathways for alien arrivals. SCAR also said that it had new 		

<p>information indicating that hull fouling is probably a bigger problem than ballast water in Antarctic waters and it will bring a paper to the next meeting. SCAR offered to provide further expert advice on the issue. (144)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • SEGF: NZ presented a proof of concept for the SEGF and requested SCAR review the “proof of concept” classification layer. SCAR indicated that it would be happy to review New Zealand’s work and may be able to provide other data being prepared in the SCAR system, such as improved geological information and remotely-sensed data. (182) 		
CEP IX (2006) Edinburgh		
<p>SPS WP 38 <i>Proposal to List Southern Giant Petrel as a Specially Protected Species</i></p>	<p>Noting that the proposal was prepared according with the guidelines adopted at CEP VIII. It said that a global level it was evident an increase in the population, but at regional level the species could be still threatened. (134)</p>	<p>The Committee urged SCAR to prepare a draft Action Plan to facilitate development of an agreed template before CEP X. SCAR was also urged to prepare proposals for listing other species. (138)</p>
<p>SPS WP 39 <i>Proposal to De-list Antarctic Fur Seals as Specially Protected Species</i></p>	<p>SCAR said that the fur seals were a conservation success-story, noting that the populations within the Antarctic Treaty Area were expected to continue to increase. (140)</p>	<p>The Committee considered that the scientific advice was comprehensive, consistent with the Guidelines adopted at CEP VIII, and sufficient to inform a decision to propose delisting. The ATCM adopted Measure 2 (2006) (143)</p>
<p>Marine acoustics WP 41 <i>SCAR Report on Marine Acoustics and the Southern Ocean</i> IP 98 <i>Broadband Calibration of Marine Seismic Sources – A Case Study</i></p>	<p>About the third SCAR workshop on the subject of marine acoustics in the Southern Ocean, noting that further data was needed to ensure these procedures were as relevant and effective as possible, in particular to establish the natural levels of background noise as well as that emanating from human activities. (145)</p>	<p>Several delegations thanked SCAR for its important work on this complex subject. The Committee noted the recommendations from the workshop and looked forward to further SCAR updates as more information became available. The Committee agreed to keep this subject on the agenda and discuss it again at CEP X (147)</p>
<p>Biodiversity WP 37 <i>Biodiversity in Antarctica</i></p>	<p>Commenting that biodiversity encompasses various levels of complexity, from the genetic level to the ecosystem level and highlighting the need of further survey. (151)</p>	<p>The Committee thanked SCAR for its excellent paper, and requested that it keep the CEP informed of its ongoing efforts to improve knowledge of Antarctic biodiversity. (153)</p>
<p>Monitoring IP 88 <i>Practical Biological Indicators of Human Impacts in Antarctica</i></p>	<p>On the outcomes of the meeting in Texas, which concluded that biological data alone would not provide a sound basis for decision-making; they should be used in tandem with chemical and physical indicators for a balanced picture and of long-term datasets. (166)</p>	<p>The Committee recognised the substantial challenges in progressing this important issue and encouraged SCAR and COMNAP to report back to the CEP on further progress with environmental monitoring related work. (167)</p>
<p>Climate Change IP 89 <i>Plans for an Antarctic Climate Assessment – Trends and Impacts</i></p>	<p>Noting that 3 of its 5 main programmes relate to climate change matters. SCAR reported on work to be undertaken in conjunction with the World Climate Research Programme to assess the impacts of climate change on the Antarctic environment. SCAR invited Parties to contribute to the assessment and consider joining the international steering committee to be formed July 2006. (168)</p>	<p>Many Members emphasised the importance of research into the effects of climate change on the Antarctic environment and welcomed SCAR’s proposal, and asked SCAR to keep the Committee updated on related research. In particular, these Members suggested that the Committee should consider the completed Assessment once it was published. (169)</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Lake Vostok: SCAR suggested that if one subglacial lake was contaminated, contamination may spread downstream to connected lakes. SCAR’s <i>Subglacial Antarctic Lakes Exploration</i> group (SALE) had discussed this possibility over the years, but many aspects remained unclear - SCAR noted that the risks of continued drilling at Lake Vostok. (42) • Site Guidelines: Members endorsed the recommendations of the ICG, noting that the CEP should: add Site Guideline issues to its wider consideration of area protection and management and work with SCAR to look at options for further studies on the potential impacts of Antarctic tourism (108) SCAR noted that it has been involved in work on cumulative impacts and would be happy to be involved in the scientific aspects of site monitoring. (110) • SEGF: When presented its paper, NZ noted that for the ‘proof of concept’ used, among other sources, the <i>SCAR’s Antarctic Digital Database</i> (122) • Non Native Species: the CEP should give consideration to sharing information with, and seeking advice from, other bodies, notably SCAR, and others. SCAR offered to review and update the <i>Code of Conduct for field work</i> and other related issues and come back for the Committee’s consideration at CEP X. (130) • CEP new Strategy: the CEP should give consideration to sharing information with, and seeking advice from, other bodies, notably SCAR, CCAMLR, COMNAP, IAATO, IUCN and other organizations as appropriate (e.g. IMO) (129) 		
CEP X (2007) New Delhi		
<p>SPS WP 1 <i>Document withdrawn</i> (originally proposing the Southern Giant Petrel as SPS)</p>	<p>Subsequent to the submission, unpublished data on the species at the South Orkney islands had been collected, and that these data suggested that the designation of the species as ‘critically endangered’ might require revision. SCAR noted that the uncertainties associated with unpublished data made it difficult to predict how quickly its advice could be available. However, SCAR undertook to consider changing the time of the workshop. SCAR also urged Parties to ensure that their respective experts provided all relevant data at the earliest opportunity. (235)</p>	<p>Recognizing importance of the issue, the Committee agreed to prepare a new resolution based on Resolution 4 (2006) for consideration by the ATCM (247)</p>
<p>SPS WP 26 <i>The Application of IUCN Endangerment Criteria at the Regional Level of the Antarctic Treaty Area</i></p>	<p>Noting the important differences between regional and global listing procedures, the potential utility of the regional criteria for designation of SPS, and the information required to undertake the regional listing. (252)</p>	<p>New Zealand suggested the Committee may, in due course, consider adding the guidelines contained in the paper to the CEP’s own guidelines for managing specially protected species. (253)</p>

<p>SPS WP 27 <i>Current Status of the Ross Seal (Ommatophoca rossii): A Specially Protected Species under Annex II</i></p>	<p>Noting that the species could be considered data deficient, and that therefore no change should be made to the species status, but that further information should be collected to improve knowledge... (250)</p>	<p>The Committee agreed that the status of the Ross Seal remain as a Specially Protected Species. (251)</p>
<p>Climate Change IP 5 <i>State of the Antarctic and Southern Ocean Climate System (SASOCS)</i></p>	<p>On phase I of the review of Antarctic climate that SCAR had introduced at XXIX ATCM, and addressing what is known of the physics of the climate system of Antarctica and the Southern Ocean. SCAR urged Parties to work on this issue. (276)</p>	<p>Following a request from the CEP, SCAR agreed to provide available information on current long-term environmental and observational monitoring research programmes. (286)</p>
<p>Vostok Lake IP 15 <i>Subglacial Antarctic Lake Environments (SALE) in the International Polar Year 2007-2008</i></p>	<p>explaining that subglacial environments are important continental-scale interconnected phenomena and that subglacial environments provided an opportunity to advance understanding of how life, the environment, climate, and planetary history combine to produce the world as we know it today. (267)</p>	<p>-----</p>
<p>CAML IP 32 <i>Census of Antarctic Marine Life (CAML) (with Australia)</i></p>	<p>Noting that the CAML was both a major IPY initiative and a key SCAR activity to develop a benchmark of the distribution and abundance of marine biodiversity in Antarctic waters. (265)</p>	<p>-----</p>
<p>Invasive Species IP 37 <i>Hull fouling as a source of marine invasion in the Antarctic</i></p>	<p>Indicating that it is an important route for the transport of marine non-native species to the Antarctic region. SCAR drew attention to the research required to fully understand the sources of and species contributing to hull fouling and the extent to which hull fouling could be reduced as a risk of introducing non-native species. (232)</p>	<p>The Committee looked forward to the product of this work at CEP XI. (233)</p>
<p>Invasive Species IP 49 <i>Aliens in Antarctica</i></p>	<p>Recalling that impacts produced by alien species on Antarctic ecosystems will be exacerbated with rapid climate change now being experienced in parts of Antarctica. SCAR also reported that their work on developing a code of conduct for minimizing the introduction of alien species would be the subject of a workshop in May 2007 (227)</p>	<p>-----</p>
<p>IPY IP 73 <i>IPY Report for ATCM XXX</i></p>	<p>Noting that, like the Arctic Council did, the ATCM should adopt a statement urging Treaty Parties to maintain and extend long-term monitoring of change in all parts of the Antarctic, and request its subsidiary bodies to co-operate with SCAR in efforts to create a co-ordinated Antarctic observing network. (37)</p>	<p>The Committee fully supported this proposal recognizing CEP interests in state of the environment monitoring and reporting and encouraged the ATCM to adopt such a statement, perhaps by means of a Resolution. (38)</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Site Guidelines: After a request from the CEP, SCAR agreed to provide a report on the current state of knowledge with respect to human disturbance of wildlife. (163) SCAR encouraged Members to provide any unpublished data and information on wildlife disturbance information to be supplied to the SCAR contact (Steve) to assist in its review (174) • SEGF: SCAR recalled that they had been requested by New Zealand to undertake an assessment of the EDA. Rather than undertaking a desktop review, SCAR proposed to assess the potential fit of existing biological data into the EDA, which would be a more beneficial exercise. SCAR anticipated reporting on this at CEP XI. The Committee welcomed this proposal. (185) 		