

Action Group on SCAR and the ATS in the 21st Century (AG-SATC)

Report on the AG -ATC Meeting

**0900 22 May – 1300 23 May, 2008
Scott Polar Research Institute, Cambridge**

Attendees:

AG Members:

Clive Howard-Williams (former SCAR Vice President and SCAR Delegate for NZ; Chairman);

Neil Gilbert (CEP Chair);

Tito Acero (Former GOSEAC Member and ATS Secretariat);

Anders Karlqvist (COMNAP & former member of the SCAR Review Team);

Steve Chown (Chair of SCAR's SC-ATS);

Colin Summerhayes (Executive Director, SCAR) (Secretary to the Meeting);

David Walton (in an advisory capacity as former Chair of GOSEAC and SC-ATS);

Chuck Kennicutt (by telephone)(in an advisory capacity as SCAR Vice President, former member of GOSEAC, and current member of SC-ATS);

John Shears (in an advisory capacity, providing the informal views of a Treaty Party)

CONTENTS

SUMMARY

- 1. Welcome and Introduction**
- 2. Background to SCAR's Interactions with the Treaty (SCAR Perspective)**
- 3. SCAR's Current Capabilities in Relation to ATCM/CEP**
- 4. Discussion of the Issues**
- 5. Recommendations**
- 6. Future of the AG-SATC, and Meeting Closure**

APPENDICES

APPENDIX 1. ATCM and CEP Requirements for Independent Scientific Advice

A1.1 The Treaty, and ATCM Documents on Links to SCAR

A1.2 The CEP Documents on Links to SCAR

A1.3 The CEP in Practice

A1.4 A Structured and Prioritised Work-Plan for CEP

A2. Perspectives from Treaty Parties

Report on the Meeting of the Action Group on SCAR and the ATS in the 21st Century (AG-SATC), 22-23 May 2008**SUMMARY:**

The creation of the “Action Group on SCAR and the ATS in the 21st Century (AG-SATC)” was proposed by the SCAR Executive Committee in October 2007 to review how SCAR manages its provision of advice to the Antarctic Treaty Consultative Parties (ATCPs), and to consider alternative approaches to managing this part of SCAR’s role. The AG had the following Terms of Reference: to-

1. Offer guidance on ways to efficiently manage SCAR’s ATS workload while being responsive to the ATS.
2. Suggest procedures/protocols that will ensure that SCAR’s advice is based on the best available knowledge.
3. Recommend procedures to manage SCAR’s consultations with other ATS entities.
4. Define ways for SCAR to manage the expectations of the CEP and set realistic time frames for response to ensure reasonable workloads.
5. Propose ways for SCAR to effectively meet its ATS mission in lieu of financial and human resource limitations and dependence on a voluntary workforce.

SCAR was designated an official Observer to the Antarctic Treaty (AT) on its development in 1959, and has remained a primary source of high quality scientific advice to the Antarctic Treaty System (ATS). SCAR advice has been incorporated into many Antarctic Treaty instruments, especially those dealing with environmental stewardship. The issues facing the ATCPs in the 21st century require access to the latest and highest quality scientific knowledge of Antarctica and how it works, in order to guarantee well-informed decision making on the preservation and protection of Antarctica.

The increasing demands of the growing ATCM, and the evolving CEP, have placed an increasing burden on SCAR, and the timescales for response have become compressed with yearly ATCM meetings, and deadlines for ATCM/CEP papers several weeks in advance. The advisory workload for SCAR has become a near continuous, year-long effort. Other than Secretariat personnel (a staff of 2.5), SCAR is reliant on a volunteer workforce to accomplish its mission. SCAR puts at least \$35000 annually into servicing the Treaty directly, a sum that excludes external voluntary costs that may be entailed by scientists attending SC-ATS meetings at the cost of their own organisations, and any contributions to SC-ATS meetings made by Parties.

Demands on SCAR have grown with the growth of the CEP, and SCAR remains the most logical and convenient source of high quality independent scientific advice. The SC-ATS, as originally configured, funded and staffed, is inadequate to meet the growing demand. The growing pressure has forced SCAR to stop providing detailed scientific advice on management plans for Antarctic Specially Managed Areas and Antarctic Specially Protected Areas.

These points prompted the following questions:

- How do we manage the workload?
- How do we create an appropriate internal balance in SCAR from Science to Advice?
- How do we improve the relationship with ATCM and CEP when there are so many demands (so as to avoid negative feedback relating to “non-performance”)?
- How do we better manage expectations? We need a mechanism for informing the ATS on SCAR’s limitations.

It was recognised that there are 5 categories for SCAR advice:

1. *Emerging issues* (eg subglacial lakes, meteorites, marine acoustics)
2. *State of knowledge reviews* (eg Southern Giant Petrel status)
3. *Technical advice* (eg management plans, monitoring methods, environmental standards, advice)
4. *Peer reviews* (eg environmental domains analysis etc)
5. *Communications*

These were addressed in turn to identify the barriers toward their resolution for CEP. In all cases the barriers of insufficient funding, insufficient time for SCAR scientists to report, and insufficient resources were identified as issues.

The expectation that SCAR will work for the ATS has grown with time, However SCAR science is not policy directed, though it may be policy related. To address policy driven science SCAR scientists will need to divert time and effort away from their ‘normal’ preoccupation with leading edge science. Compared with other sources of scientific advice to the ATS, SCAR remains the leading source of completely independent advice on the Antarctic. SCAR consults widely to derive its information. Its advisory products are developed to the highest possible quality. SCAR should strive to guarantee a high level quality control to maintain credibility.

The AG agreed that it would be useful to both SCAR and the CEP to clarify SCAR’s role and mandate. The clarification of roles should extend to the ATCM and CCAMLR. Clarity applies equally to data, for example defining what is SCAR data and what is not.

The AG agreed that as a new initiative, SCAR should explore capitalising on its established products and services to offer a range of data and information products and services to the parties, e.g. the Antarctic Digital Database (ADD) and hosting digital maps of protected areas. Having a SCAR data and information management strategy (post July 2008) will help promote services in this area for ATCM/CEP, and vice versa.

The AG considered that it would seem wise for SCAR to develop service-level-agreements with those agencies that run services for SCAR (e.g. with

BAS for running the ADD, and with AAD for running the SCAR terrestrial database).

SCAR should try to develop closer relations with national delegations, to ensure that they understood the scope, potential and limitations of SCAR's advice, and how that advice was provided by their own national scientists.

Recommendations of this report:

- 1 SCAR should continue to support the preparation and provision of advice to ATS bodies;
- 2 The organisation and terms of reference of SC-ATS do not need to be changed;
- 3 Additional funding of \$10,000 per year is required to increase the effectiveness with which SC-ATS can respond to requests from ATCM/CEP. This will enhance SC-ATS's ability to deal with ATS issues e.g. by funding more workshops, or contracting more reports, or participating in ICGs, or hiring temporary staff (students) to carry out support tasks as needed.
- 4 SCAR should assist ATCM & CEP to develop a clear understanding as to the nature and extent of SCAR's input to key issues on the basis of ATCM and CEP plans. This process will involve the Chief Officer of SC-ATS and the SCAR Executive Director, in consultation with SCAR's EXCOM, the ATS Secretariat and the CEP Chair (e.g. through telephone conferences).
- 5 To assist in developing this understanding Colin Summerhayes and Steve Chown will write a paper for the ATCM/CEP meeting explaining what SCAR is, does, and can provide, and the mechanisms by which it does so, as the basis for cementing the relationship between SCAR and the ATS bodies.
- 6 Once SCAR has received an approved CEP Plan of future issues and priorities, SC-ATS should interact with SSG-LS to plan how SCAR should respond to upcoming issues. This should be made feasible intersessionally.
- 7 Chief Officers of Standing Scientific Groups and leaders of their subsidiary bodies and of the Scientific Research Programmes should liaise annually and formally with the Chief Officer of SC-ATS, at least six months before each ATCM, to ensure that pressing issues of scientific interest and concern, and/or of relevance to environmental management of Antarctica be brought to the attention of the Parties via the ATCM and/or the CEP meeting.
- 8 SCAR should regularly inform Parties on availability of its information products and services (e.g. the Antarctic Digital Database – which could host information products, such as digital maps of protected areas).
- 9 Following completion of the Antarctic Climate Change and Environment (ACCE) Review, SCAR should consider development of a regular Antarctic Environmental Report Card (based on the Arctic example).

- 10 Prior to each CEP meeting, SC-ATS and CEP chairs should hold discussions (e.g. via telephone conference) to ensure effective communication about upcoming issues, as an aid to better decision-making.
- 11 SCAR should provide scientific input to the management plan review and development process, specifically advice concerning the scientific value of sites, the characteristics of those sites in terms of scientific information available, and the likely influence of designated areas on scientific work that might be undertaken at such sites. Such advice should be developed via a small group of scientists, where possible experienced with the area. Time commitment will mostly fall on the coordinators of such work and would amount to 1-5 days per plan depending on the scope of the plan proposal. This is a significant rationale for the proposed budget increase.
- 12 The production of SCAR reports to ATCM/CEP should be timed in such a way as to allow an appropriate review of quality.
- 13 SCAR should request SCAR national committees to keep their national delegations to the ATS bodies well informed about SCAR activities and the national scientific contributions to those activities.
- 14 The various meetings of ATCM/CEP, CCAMLR, COMNAP and SCAR should be scheduled in a coordinated way wherever practicable, to enable inputs to be fully effective, and advertised together in a timely fashion.
- 15 The SCAR ATS web site should be linked to the ATS Secretariat web site to facilitate access to the database of Recommendations from past Treaty meetings.
- 16 There should be a URL Link to the EBA web site on the CEP web page to alert CEP members to evolving SCAR biology activities.
- 17 SCAR should undertake a review of its information products and services, and should consider developing service-level-agreements with those who agree to run those services and products (e.g. databases), to ensure there is no conflict over intellectual property.
- 18 SCAR should routinely review the recommendations of this report.

Report on the Meeting of the Action Group on SCAR and the ATS in the 21st Century (AG-SATC), 22-23 May 2008

1. Welcome and Introduction

The Chairman welcomed the participants, explaining how each of them had been selected to bring a particular organisational perspective to the review.

He reminded attendees that the creation of the “Action Group on SCAR and the ATS in the 21st Century (AG-SATC)” had been proposed by the SCAR Executive Committee in October 2007. A group of experts familiar with the ATS, SCAR history, and other entities in the ATS and having a view of future trends, was needed to review how SCAR manages its provision of advice to the Antarctic Treaty Consultative Parties (ATCPs), and to consider alternative approaches to managing this part of SCAR’s role. The AG is tasked with addressing the following Terms of Reference (ToR): to-

1. Offer guidance on ways to efficiently manage SCAR’s ATS workload while being responsive to the ATS.
2. Suggest procedures/protocols that will ensure that SCAR’s advice is based on the best available knowledge.
3. Recommend procedures to manage SCAR’s consultations with other ATS entities.
4. Define ways for SCAR to manage the expectations of the CEP and set realistic time frames for response to ensure reasonable workloads.
5. Propose ways for SCAR to effectively meet its ATS mission in lieu of financial and human resource limitations and dependence on a voluntary workforce.

The AG is expected to develop recommendations to be considered by the SCAR Executive Committee and the SCAR Delegates at their next meetings, in July 2008. The recommendations of the SCAR Delegates on this topic will be communicated to all participating organisations in due course. Treaty Parties and CEP members are already aware of the AG-SATC meeting. SCAR will inform the June meetings of the ATCM and CEP about the process, and Anders Karlqvist agreed to tell COMNAP about it at their meeting in St Petersburg in June/July.

The Chairman thanked Tito Acero and Neil Gilbert for the background material and papers from the ATS and the CEP respectively on different topics relevant to the discussions, and John Shears for providing the (informal) views of a Treaty Party (UK). Views of other Treaty Parties (Australia, Russia, Norway, were tabled in Neil Gilbert’s paper.

2. Background to SCAR’s Interactions with the Treaty (SCAR Perspective)

Between them, Steve Chown, Chuck Kennicutt and Colin Summerhayes set out the background to the review, which can be considered as one of a series of ‘external’ reviews of different parts of SCAR (others including the reviews of

JCADM and the 5 SCAR Scientific Research Programmes). The following text draws these various threads together rather than reflecting the dynamics of the free-flowing discussion.

2.1 SCARs mission with respect to the Treaty

SCAR's primary mission, established in 1958 is to initiate, promote and co-ordinate Antarctic scientific research. Because of its leading role in Antarctic science, SCAR was designated an official Observer to the Antarctic Treaty (AT) on its development in 1959, and since then has been a primary source of high quality scientific advice to the Antarctic Treaty System (ATS). This advice is independent of government, SCAR being an international network of non-governmental National Committees, Delegates, subsidiary bodies and programmes, and Antarctic scientists, researchers and educators. SCAR has been the premier provider of scientific guidance to the Antarctic Treaty Consultative Meetings (ATCMs) for more than 30 years. SCAR recommendations have been the basis for, and have been incorporated into, many Antarctic Treaty instruments, especially those dealing with environmental stewardship. The issues facing the ATCMs in the 21st century require access to the latest and highest quality scientific knowledge of Antarctica and how it works, in order to guarantee well-informed decision making on the preservation and protection of Antarctica.

2.2 Evolution of SCAR's activities with the Treaty

Over the past 30 years the context within which SCAR acts as a scientific advisor to the ATS has evolved. The ATS has grown in membership from 12 to 46 countries. Its business has evolved and expanded through the adoption of conventions, protocols, annexes, and resolutions. In recent years the ATCM agenda has become focused on environmental issues, culminating in establishment of the Environmental Protocol and the creation of the Committee on Environmental Protection (CEP). In parallel, some other organizations have been created to meet various needs (e.g., COMNAP, CCAS, CCAMLR, and ACAP). They may also provide advice on scientific and technical matters in the areas of their competence, as may other bodies of Experts (such as WMO or ASOC). As a consequence, SCAR is no longer the only source of scientific advice, though it is likely to be the only source of such advice in areas where it has special competence.

The increasing demands of the growing ATCM, and the evolving CEP, have placed an increasing burden on SCAR, and the timescales for response have become compressed with yearly ATCM meetings, and deadlines for ATCM/CEP papers several weeks in advance. The advisory workload for SCAR has become a near continuous, year-long effort. Other than Secretariat personnel (a staff of 2.5), SCAR is entirely reliant on a volunteer workforce to accomplish its ATS advisory mission.

Until the year 2000, SCAR's interactions with the ATS were managed by the Group of Specialists on Environmental Affairs and Conservation (GOSEAC). GOSEAC included 10 to 12 members and convened at least once a year for a

week. To inform the discussion, Tito Acero provided a list of all SCAR papers to ATCM and/or CEP since 1998, and a paper summarizing GOSEAC's main outputs and the effects of its papers on the ATCM and CEP (see SCAR web site – <http://www.scar.org/about/standingcommittees/antarctictreatysystem/meetingpapers/index.html>). Advice came not only through GOSEAC papers but also through the interventions of the GOSEAC chair during ATCM/CEP discussions (which is now one of the roles of the SC-ATS chairman).

2.3 The formation and development of SCAR's Standing Committee on the Antarctic Treaty System

During the restructuring of SCAR, GOSEAC was replaced by the Standing Committee on the Antarctic Treaty System (SC-ATS). Originally SC-ATS had just 3 members (each representing a different discipline area)(now expanded to 5) and was expected to conduct much of its business electronically. At that time, some in both SCAR and the ATS felt that the CEP would replace GOSEAC, which would diminish SCAR's advisory role on environmental issues. However, GOSEAC did an excellent job and provided much independent advice to the ATS, and it was the view of some that GOSEAC or something like it was still needed to provide independent scientific advice. In principle, SC-ATS could be doing much of what GOSEAC did. However, SC-ATS has the same budget as GOSEAC (\$10,000/year) which, given its wider mandate, the steady decline in the value of the dollar, compounded by annual inflation, means that SCAR is now putting into its interface with the ATS a smaller effort in manpower (5 versus 12) and money.

GOSEAC was well known as a body of experts. SC-ATS is not yet known in the same way. Enabling it to be seen in the same way is important for the external perception of SCAR (making it obvious that we still have a body of experts attending to ATS issues).

On the finance side, SCAR puts at least \$35000 annually into servicing the Treaty directly. This is made up of \$10,000 for SC-ATS, around \$10K in Life Sciences for the Birds and Seals Groups, and \$15000 for SCAR's attendance at ATCM and CEP meetings, including the costs of the SCAR Lecturer. These sums exclude external voluntary costs that may be entailed by scientists attending SC-ATS meetings at the cost of their own organisations, and any contributions to SC-ATS meetings made by Parties.

In practice, SC-ATS can call upon the services of experts from within SCAR's three Standing Scientific Groups, and can ask national committees for advice. Where there is time between the production of an advisory paper and its submission to ATCM/CEP the paper is circulated to national committees for comment – usually with a nil response.

SCAR is invited to participate in CEP's Intersessional Contact Groups. SC-ATS has so far declined to be so engaged. Our perception was that they are the CEP's business. Others suggested that SCAR should be involved in the ICGs because SCAR has an ongoing Observer relationship with the CEP. Given limited time among SC-ATS personnel, SCAR felt this was not the best

use of its time (with present manning and financial limitations). This could be discussed again if the Recommendations (below) are approved by the SCAR Delegates in July 2008.

SCAR also stopped the detailed examination of management plans for Antarctic Specially Managed Areas (ASMAs) and Antarctic Specially Protected Areas (ASPAs), which used to be done by GOSEAC in association with SCAR's Life Sciences group, partly because it was felt that the CEP needed to be doing this job, not farming it out to SCAR, but also because of limited manpower. SCAR used to provide advice on every aspect of these plans (e.g. maps, permitting, and so on), which is really CEP business, not SCAR business. Nevertheless, it was agreed that there might be some scientific details or implications of the plans that need SCAR's attention. Should SCAR be proactive in offering such advice where relevant?

SCAR is currently providing CEP with scientific advice on specially protected species. Should SCAR continue to provide such advice, or leave it to the CEP?

2.4 Demands on SCAR and its SC-ATS

Demands on SCAR have grown rather than diminished with the growth of the CEP. This is not least because the CEP has no budget and no permanent working groups, though it can convene Intersessional Contact Groups (ICGs) to address key issues. SCAR remains the most logical and convenient source of high quality independent scientific advice. Under the circumstances, it is clear that SC-ATS, as originally configured, funded and staffed, is inadequate to meet the growing demand. Indeed, as discussed in 2.3 above, the growing pressure has forced SCAR to stop providing detailed scientific advice on management plans for Antarctic Specially Managed Areas (ASMAs) and Antarctic Specially Protected Areas (ASPAs). While SC-ATS is doing an admirable job, it is unable to meet the full range of expectations. Partly as a result of pressure to produce papers to a (perhaps artificially accelerated) CEP schedule, two SCAR CEP papers were withdrawn in recent years for reassessment and revision. In one case a Party had failed to supply its data, the eventual submission of which made no difference to the outcome; in the second case the SCAR paper was based on a paper submitted to a journal and containing data that had subsequently become out of date – an error that could have been corrected when the SCAR paper was circulated to those national committees that held the missing data. Events like these damage SCAR's otherwise high credibility.

The following key points emerged for later discussion:

1. Ever increasing workload in SCAR to service the ATCM/CEP;
2. SCAR attempts to cover too many topics and needs to have a system of prioritisation;
3. CEP is attempting to layout an organised work-plan for the CEP This will greatly assist in guiding and setting SCAR's priorities;
4. There are a limited number of volunteers in SCAR;

5. We are overloading our system, which sometimes affects the quality of the product;
6. The relationship with ATCM/CEP should be a comfortable partnership;
7. SCAR needs to say NO if and when appropriate
8. Environmental questions are becoming more and more complex and increasing certainty is being required. This, in turn, requires more detailed analysis if the issue and the scientific information.

Questions for AG-SATC:

1. How do we manage the workload?
2. How do we create an appropriate internal balance in SCAR from Science to Advice?
3. How do we improve the relationship with ATCM and CEP when there are so many demands (so as to avoid negative feedback relating to “non-performance”)?
4. How do we better manage expectations? We need a mechanism for informing the ATS on SCAR’s limitations.

These various observations suggest that all aspects of SCAR's mission to advise the ATS should be reconsidered and a new strategy developed to enable SCAR to continue its long and distinguished history of service to the international community of Antarctic nations. Any such strategy must consider what the optimal balance might be between SCAR’s dual missions, and the appropriate level of resources for SC-ATS activities.

3. SCAR’s Current Capabilities in Relation to ATCM/CEP

How do SCAR’s capabilities match CEP expectations, and what barriers exist to improved service to the CEP and ATCM? This part of the meeting was informed by presentations from Neil Gilbert (ATCM and CEP Requirements for Independent Scientific Advice – see notes in Appendix 1, item 1), and from John Shears (Perspectives from a Treaty Party - see notes in Appendix 1, item 2).

Neil Gilbert suggested that there are 5 categories for SCAR advice:

6. *Emerging issues* (eg subglacial lakes, meteorites, marine acoustics etc)
7. *State of knowledge reviews* (eg Southern Giant Petrel status and trends.
8. *Technical advice* (eg management plans, monitoring methods, environmental standards, advice)
9. *Peer reviews* (eg environmental domains analysis etc)
10. *Communications*

These were addressed in turn to identify the barriers toward their resolution for CEP. In all cases below, the barriers of insufficient funding, insufficient

time for SCAR scientists to report, and insufficient resources were identified as issues.

1. *Emerging issues*. Potential barriers are:
 - Obtaining advice on policy-relevant science. The SSGs continually need to be updated on the need for Policy Relevant Science and to be asked for suggestions about topics for ATCM/CEP. This process needs to be reviewed again (it used to be done at SSG meetings by David Walton).
 - Recognition of ATCM/CEP as a stakeholder or even as a user/customer of research findings. SCAR needs to improve this internally.
 - Recognition that the possibility exists that at some time some Treaty initiatives introduced for political reasons could provide barriers to the advancement of Antarctic science (for instance if a ruling on acoustics was made that prevented the collection of seismic data).
 - SCAR-COMNAP relations. SCAR and COMNAP need to work even better together to address CEP issues. It was noted that tourism potentially provides a good lever for improving SCAR-COMNAP interactions.
 - Work and resource planning. Given production of a CEP work plan, SCAR would have more time to plan its CEP contributions, and opportunities would be improved for developing joint workshops with COMNAP, where needed.

2. *State of knowledge reviews*. Potential barriers are:
 - Lateness - SCAR has generally delivered on time but has been late on occasions. This can be strengthened by better planning on the part of CEP and advance warning to SCAR, thus enabling improvements in SCAR plans.
 - Internal process for assembling reports - SCAR needs a better process for assembling reports and other services in a timely manner. Because CEP meets annually and SCAR meets biennially, a 1-year request to SCAR may result in a 2-year response. If SCAR received a 5-year rolling plan from CEP a phased response plan could be developed (with COMNAP).
 - Delays in defining the problem from the CEP (or ATS). (e.g. Treaty Parties took a decade to define the Southern Giant Petrel problem).

3. *Technical advice*. Potential barriers are:
 - Management of expectations. Expectations are unrealistic on one side (CEP) and not properly managed on the other (SCAR).
 - Management Plan preparation and review. CEP does not know that since the demise of GOSEAC, SCAR has become (so far anyway) reluctant to engage in Management Plan preparation and review. This reluctance needs to be re-evaluated.

- Internal disagreements. There is the possibility of internal barriers related to disagreement between scientists. So far this has been well managed by SCAR.
- Response to new issues. How will SCAR respond if CEP requests advice on standards? SCAR would initially want to work with CEP to define the issue.
- SCAR-COMNAP interaction. Need for a better definition of the boundary between SCAR (scientific review and advice) and COMNAP (monitoring).

4. *Peer reviews*. Potential barriers are:

- SCAR clarity on the services it can provide. SCAR's current review, through AG-SATC, of what it can provide is critical and the CEP needs to be informed on the results.
- Timely reviews of CEP documents. These can be managed by SCAR if expectations are agreed and clarified

5. *Communications*

Communication of SCAR's capabilities to CEP and ATCM/CEP could be improved. The first step will be with the publication of the CEP work plan, and with other steps such as:

- (i) inviting CEP to send a representative to attend SCAR Delegates meetings (as this year);
- (ii) having a 'heads up' from the ATS Secretariat when meeting papers are submitted that contain items relevant to SCAR;
- (iii) holding a dialogue with CEP Officers ahead of time about how we might respond to what is coming up in the papers;
- (iv) internally communicating between SC-ATS and SCAR's SSG-LS one year before CEP meetings, to explain what is coming up and identify who should or could be acting on it;
- (v) putting all SCAR, COMNAP, ASSW and ATCM meetings on one events page on the web.

In the context of communication, it seems surprising that the CEP does not have a good idea of SCAR's Scientific Research Programmes and what they can do, even though these are reported in some detail in the SCAR Annual Report to the ATCM. This suggests that SCAR must improve ways of marketing its science to CEP. There would seem to be potential for proposing integration of work by CEP and SCAR's EBA programme on the Peninsula, for example.

Not all SCAR's emerging issues will be picked up by the ATCM/CEP. SCAR's paper about bioprospecting was not adequately recognised at the time it was produced, but was later picked up by the UK. The use and application of bioprospecting results in biotechnology is a legal issue, not SCAR's.

Finally, examining SCAR's strengths and weaknesses (Appendix 1, item 2) pointed to the following weaknesses that needed addressing:

- Lack of resources for ATS work;
- Poor communication with Treaty Parties (e.g. our scientists need to tell their own national delegations to the ATCM what they're doing);
- Poor or late response to CEP/ATCM (we take on too much; CEP asks for too fast a turn around);
- Demise of GOSEAC (it seems to others outside SCAR that we now put less effort in through SC-ATS than we did through GOSEAC, which damages our credibility)

In conclusion, there is no real divergence between CEP and SCAR overall objectives for improving the way in which each organisation works with the other. We need to build on this. The situation ought to be much improved if and when the CEP implements its forward plan (see Appendix 1, item 1), which will enable both organisations to better manage their workloads.

4. Discussion of the Issues

In the ensuing discussion the following points emerged:

4.1 SCAR's advice - Proactive versus Responsive

SCAR provided extensive and valuable advice to the Treaty in the first few decades, helping to inform a whole series of environmental decisions that shaped the formation of the Antarctic Treaty System and helped to lead to the formation of both the CEP and CCAMLR.

The AG agreed that SCAR continues to provide high quality, independent advice, usually in a timely manner, plus ready access to pools of expertise, and databases. The key issue to be addressed is what needs to be done to ensure that the advice is both timely and of high quality, given the constraints of slim resources, and the availability of scientists on a voluntary basis to provide the necessary advice to the appropriate degree of quality in the time required?

Over the years SCAR has acted in both proactive and responsive mode to the ATCM and CEP. In proactive mode, SCAR considers what new topics should be brought to the attention of the Parties (examples include, for instance, subglacial lakes, meteorites, alien species, and climate change). The SCAR Lecture to the ATCM (a recent innovation, starting in 2003) is one means to introduce new topics (in 2008 it will be on solar-terrestrial interactions).

The AG noted that SCAR is proposing to review its several products and services – it would be good to ensure that this is done among other things in the context of meeting the needs of the ATS bodies.

In reactive mode SCAR responds to requests made, mainly by the CEP, that arise as a consequence of ongoing business, and that are not easy to anticipate. If the CEP had a long-term plan, SCAR would have more time to prepare for upcoming issues.

For the most part, SCAR has accepted the responsibility (in responsive or reactive mode) for a wide range of tasks, which has generated a substantial workload and cost not directly related to SCAR's ongoing work programmes. It is not always easy to say "no", although SCAR has done so at times in the past, especially where a topic was clearly "outside our area of competence". Having said "yes", the common SCAR practice is to hold a meeting to generate a report containing advice and recommendations. However, meetings can turn out to be expensive, requiring us either to spend our own funds or to trawl through the Parties for willing donors – never an easy task, especially for volunteers busy with their own day jobs. An alternative is for SCAR to pay a consultant to do the work (as we did with this year's paper on bird approach distances). Is it appropriate for SCAR to pay consultants to do CEP work? Some of the things we do for CEP perhaps would be done by CEP if it had a budget. They represent policy-driven science, not leading edge research.

The expectation that SCAR will do work for the ATS seems to have grown with time, and neglects the fact that SCAR science is not policy directed, though it may be policy related. To address policy driven science we have to persuade SCAR scientists to divert time and effort away from their 'normal' preoccupation with leading edge science. They cooperate because they want to see soundly based conservation and environmental protection policies in place in the Antarctic. Nevertheless, given the increasing demand on scientists in recent years to meet national targets for scientific output and quality, many have less time than they had in the past to devote in a voluntary manner to SCAR activities in support of ATCM/CEP.

Compared with other sources of scientific advice to the ATS, SCAR still has the advantage of being the leading source of completely independent advice on the Antarctic. SCAR consults widely to derive its information. Its advisory products are rigorously developed to the highest possible quality. SCAR should strive to guarantee a high level quality control to maintain credibility. To be above criticism, SCAR prefers now, where feasible, only to work with published peer-reviewed data.

The AG noted that often the demands on SCAR seem to be for 'instant' results, when in fact the Treaty process is quite slow. Speed may not be of the essence, and should not be where high quality matters. However, clear expectations on dates and times of delivery of the results need to be defined and agreed upon.

4.2 SCAR's involvement in assessing management plans

The AG noted that from time to time in the past there had been a tendency for SCAR's advice to stray from the science advice into policy advice. The AG accepted that under certain circumstances it may be difficult to know where to place that line as much of SCAR's science advice leads to the development of policies. Crafting of such policies requires input from the scientific community to ensure that they achieve the desired objective and do not inadvertently

damage the science. SCAR can also provide useful information on the effectiveness of policies – e.g. if Parties collect data on visits to protected areas, SCAR could then analyse it for cumulative impacts.

SCAR cannot ignore management issues if they are important for long-term science. But the driver should be what SCAR can afford to do in terms of manpower and money to be most effective. The AG agreed that SCAR should always focus on providing science-based advice, not policy-based advice.

The AG agreed that an improvement in CEP's long term planning will, in turn, help SCAR to plan better how to service CEP requirements and will help to refine SCAR's role in the provision of advice.

Examination of the Environmental Protocol makes it clear that SCAR has a role to play in assessing management plans for ASMAs and ASPAs, but this should be understood by both SCAR and CEP as only being from a strictly scientific standpoint (i.e. advice that is less all-embracing than that provided formerly by GOSEAC). In any case, additional resources would be required to enable SC-ATS to undertake those tasks.

The AG agreed that although SCAR is permitted by the Environmental Protocol to designate protected areas, SCAR instead should draw attention to the NEED for special protection (e.g. on the basis of analyses of particular species). After designation there would be a need for a management plan and responsibility for it by a Party.

The AG agreed that SCAR should participate in CEP Intersessional Contact Groups (ICGs) where high quality scientific advice was needed, but recognised that this is another big task and beyond the capacity of SC-ATS as presently constituted. Participation in ICGs, and scientific evaluation of ASMAs and ASPAs, will require additional resourcing from SCAR Delegates.

The AG considered that it was SCAR's role to nominate species for consideration for protected status, because many SCAR scientists spend much time observing flora and fauna.

Under a different, possibly future, scenario (in which CEP had its own scientific groups, much as CCAMLR now does) SCAR might not be expected to provide so much written advice, but would instead be expected to provide informed independent comment on the scientific advice provided by CEP groups.

4.3 Clarifying SCAR's Role

The AG agreed that it would be useful to both SCAR and the CEP to clarify SCAR's role and mandate for the benefit of both bodies, though it may not be necessary to formalise the relationship any more than it is already in the ATCM and CEP articles and annexes. The clarification of roles should extend to the ATCM and CCAMLR. Clarity concerning roles applies equally to data, for example defining what is SCAR data and what is not.

The AG requested Colin Summerhayes and Steve Chown to write out for the benefit of the Treaty Parties a paper explaining what SCAR is, does, and can provide, and the mechanisms by which it does so, as the basis for cementing the relationship between SCAR and the ATS bodies, paying attention to our links with other observers and experts, including for example COMNAP, WMO, WCRP, IHO etc, and noting the small size of the SCAR and SC-ATS budgets. Consideration should be given to providing a list of topic areas to define our area of competence, recognising that such a list would be a moveable feast.

Such a paper would facilitate a direct exchange between CEP and SCAR, with the object of ensuring a better understanding of the relationship. i.e. ensuring that the expectations on the part of both parties were realistic and understood. Such an exchange could happen at a CEP meeting, to which we might submit this paper. The key elements of an “understanding” could then be captured in the CEP report.

4.4 Provision of SCAR Products and Services

The AG agreed that as a new initiative, SCAR should explore the possibility of capitalising on its established products and services to offer a range of data and information products and services to the parties, e.g. the Antarctic Digital Database (ADD). As one prospective service, SCAR could offer to host digital maps of protected areas anticipating that the ATS Secretariat might pay for it.

The AG noted that SCAR is proposing to review its several products and services – it would be good to ensure that this is done among other things in the context of meeting the needs of the ATS bodies.

Having the SCAR data and information management strategy (post July 2008) will help promote services in this area for ATCM/CEP, and vice versa.

As far as SCAR’s own databases are concerned, the AG considered that it would seem wise for SCAR to develop service-level-agreements with those agencies that agree to run services (e.g. databases) for SCAR (e.g. with BAS for running the ADD, and with AAD for running the SCAR terrestrial database). The same applies to all SCAR products and services.

4.5 Communication with National Delegations

SCAR should try to develop closer relations with national delegations, to ensure that they understood the scope, the potential and the limitations of SCAR’s advice, and the extent to which that advice was provided by their own national scientists operating through organisations linked to the national academies of science.

This raised the question of the extent to which SCAR could use the ATS mailing list to attract national attention and stimulate national dialogues in the context of the role of science in policy-making. Such dialogues would help to

dispel the notion shared by some Parties that SCAR is somehow failing because it does not carry out monitoring and survey activities.

The AG noted that although SCAR needed to improve yet further its communication with ATS bodies, there did not seem to be any justification for employing a communications person to take on that responsibility. Better and more focused targeting, working to a designed communications plan was required. It should not be difficult for SCAR to promote itself more in the ATCM arena; currently we put news about SCAR science into the ATS newsletter. Erecting posters on a range of SCAR science at Treaty meetings might be one way forward.

The AG agreed that holding a telephone conference or meeting between the CEP and SC-ATS Chairs prior to a CEP meeting will improve the decision-making process – not least by alerting SCAR to what issues might be arising, and by alerting the CEP Chair to the scientific implications.

The discussion touched on what kind of person is needed to act as chair of SC-ATS. It has to be someone with high scientific credibility. Does it also have to be someone who a national organisation is prepared to 'lose' to SCAR activities for a significant amount of time – e.g. to participate in ICGs? Senior academic scientists tend not to have time or that kind of activity.

The AG recognised that SCAR was likely to have to take on a larger management task in managing the IPY legacy (e.g. oversight of observing systems and data and information management systems), though it is difficult at this point in time to know precisely what that means. When it is clear what the legacy will comprise, and what SCAR's role in managing it should be, perhaps SCAR should consider requesting support (investment) from Treaty Parties, since they will benefit if the task is done well. As a first step along that path the AG recommends that SCAR plans to have a high profile at the ATCM 50th celebration in the USA in 2009.

5. Recommendations

5.1 SCAR should continue to support the preparation and provision of advice to ATS bodies;

5.2 The organisation and terms of reference of SC-ATS do not need to be changed;

5.3 Additional funding of \$10,000 per year is required to increase the effectiveness with which SC-ATS can respond to requests from ATCM/CEP. This will enhance SC-ATS's ability to deal with ATS issues e.g. by funding more workshops, or contracting more reports, or participating in ICGs, or hiring temporary staff (students) to carry out administrative support tasks as needed.

5.4 SCAR should assist ATCM & CEP to develop a clear understanding as to the nature and extent of SCAR's input to key issues on the basis of ATCM

and CEP plans. This process will involve the Chief Officer of SC-ATS and the SCAR Executive Director, in consultation with SCAR's EXCOM, the ATS Secretariat and the CEP Chair (e.g. through appropriate telephone conferences).

5.5 To assist in developing this understanding Colin Summerhayes and Steve Chown will write a paper for the ATCM/CEP meeting explaining what SCAR is, does, and can provide, and the mechanisms by which it does so, as the basis for cementing the relationship between SCAR and the ATS bodies. The note will recall that SCAR has provided vital scientific advice since the inception of the Treaty, with examples, and point to the role of SCAR, as an Observer, in providing a "hot-link" to advise parties on important emerging scientific issues, and on the scientific implications of items under debate at Treaty meetings.

5.6 Once SCAR has received an approved CEP Plan of future issues and priorities, SC-ATS should interact with SSG-LS to plan how SCAR should respond to likely upcoming issues. This should be made feasible intersessionally, not just at biennial SSG-LS meetings.

5.7 Chief Officers of Standing Scientific Groups and leaders of their subsidiary bodies and of the Scientific Research Programmes should liaise annually and formally with the Chief Officer of SC-ATS, at least six months before each ATCM, to ensure that pressing issues of scientific interest and concern, and/or of relevance to environmental management of Antarctica be brought to the attention of the Parties via the ATCM and/or the CEP meeting. This should be done in papers, lectures and other formats (as in the past with topics such as subglacial lakes, meteorites, alien species, and climate change).

5.8 SCAR should regularly inform Parties about the availability of its information products and services (e.g. the Antarctic Digital Database - ADD –which could host information products, such as digital maps of protected areas).

5.9 Following completion of the Antarctic Climate Change and Environment (ACCE) Review, SCAR should consider development of a regular Antarctic Environmental Report Card (based on the Arctic example).

5.10 Prior to each CEP meeting, SC-ATS and CEP chairs should hold discussions (e.g. via telephone conference) to ensure effective communication about upcoming issues, as an aid to better decision-making.

5.11 SCAR should provide scientific input to the management plan review and development process, specifically advice concerning the scientific value of sites, the characteristics of those sites in terms of scientific information available, and the likely influence of designated areas on scientific work that might be undertaken at such sites. Such advice should be developed via a small group of scientists, where possible experienced with the area. Time commitment will mostly fall on the coordinators of such work and would

amount to 1-5 days per plan depending on the scope of the plan proposal. This is a significant rationale for the proposed budget increase.

5.12 The production of SCAR reports to ATCM/CEP should be timed in such a way as to allow an appropriate review of quality.

5.13 SCAR should request SCAR national committees to keep their national delegations to the ATS bodies well informed about SCAR activities and the national scientific contributions to those activities.

5.14 The various meetings of ATCM/CEP, CCAMLR, COMNAP and SCAR should be scheduled in a coordinated way wherever practicable, to enable inputs to be fully effective, and advertised together in a timely fashion.

5.15 The SCAR ATS web site should be linked to the ATS Secretariat web site to facilitate access to the database of Recommendations from past Treaty meetings.

5.16 There should be a URL Link to the EBA web site on the CEP web page to alert CEP members to evolving SCAR biology activities.

5.17 SCAR should undertake a review of its information products and services, and should consider developing service-level-agreements with those who agree to run those services and products (e.g. databases), to ensure there is no conflict over intellectual property.

5.18 SCAR should routinely review the recommendations of this report.

6. Future of the AG-SATC, and Meeting Closure

Following circulation amongst the AG-SATC members for comment, the final report of the AG-SATC meeting will be posted on the password protected web page for the SCAR Delegates Meeting, where the Chairman will present the report.

At that point the AG-SATC will have completed its Terms of Reference and will be terminated unless the Delegates wish it to undertake further analyses.

The Chairman thanked all participants for their constructive contributions, and closed the meeting at 1300 on Friday May 23.

APPENDIX 1. ATCM and CEP Requirements for Independent Scientific Advice

Neil Gilbert reminded the AG of SCAR's formal relationship to the ATCM and the CEP, as well as enlarging on what the CEP is and does and what its requirements are for independent scientific advice.

A1.1 The Treaty, and ATCM Documents on Links to SCAR

The Treaty itself says nothing about SCAR. However, the Rules of Procedure of the Antarctic Treaty Consultative Meetings (ATCM XXI: Decision 1 (1997) Revised Rules of Procedure (1997)) make the following statements:

Rule 2: "The Representatives of the Commission for the Conservation of Antarctic Marine Living Resources, the **Scientific Committee on Antarctic Research** and the Council of Managers of National Antarctic Programs, invited to attend those meetings in accordance with Rule 30, shall be referred to as "observers"."

Rule 3 "The Commission for the Conservation of Antarctic Marine Living Resources, the **Scientific Committee on Antarctic Research** and the Council of Managers of National Antarctic Programs shall be represented by their respective Chairman or President, or other persons appointed to this end. The names of members of delegations and of the observers shall be communicated to the Host Government prior to the opening of the meeting."

Rule 30: The observers referred to in Rule 2 shall attend the Meetings for the specific purpose of reporting on:

- b) in the case of the **Scientific Committee on Antarctic Research**:
 - (i) the general proceedings of SCAR;
 - (ii) matters within the competence of SCAR under the Convention for the Conservation of Antarctic Seals;
 - (iii) such publications and reports as may have been published or prepared in accordance with Recommendations IX-19 and VI-9 respectively.

Rule 31: Observers may be present at:

- (a) the plenary sessions of the Meeting at which the respective Report is considered;
- (b) formal committees or working groups, comprising all Contracting Parties at which the respective Report is considered, unless a Representative of a Consultative Party requests otherwise in any particular case.

Rule 32: Following the presentation of the pertinent Report, the relevant Chairman may invite the observer to address the Meeting at which it is being considered once again, unless a Representative of a Consultative Party requests otherwise. The Chairman may allot a time limit for such interventions.

Rule 33: Observers are not entitled to participate in the taking of decisions.

Rule 34. Observers may submit their Report and/or documents relevant to matters contained therein to the Secretariat, for distribution to the Meeting as working papers.

Note that these rules differentiate SCAR, CCAMLR and COMNAP (the “official” observers) from other scientific and technical bodies, which are invited to attend ATCMs on an *ad hoc* basis, and which can only present information papers and not working papers, whereas SCAR can present both.

A1.2 The CEP Documents on Links to SCAR

Article 10 (2) of the Treaty’s Protocol on Environmental Protection notes that in reviewing the work of the CEP the Antarctic Treaty Consultative Meetings shall draw on the advice of **SCAR**.

Article 11 of the Protocol established the CEP, and required the CEP to invite the **President of SCAR**, along with the Chair of the Scientific Committee of CCAMLR, to participate as an observer at its sessions. COMNAP also has the status of observer through the Rules of Procedure. Under Article 11 the CEP may also invite other scientific and technical organisations that can contribute to its work to be observers at its sessions.

The CEP was set up to provide advice, formulate recommendations, and perform other functions as needed. Under Article 12, the CEP shall provide advice (in consultation with **SCAR**, the Scientific Committee for CCAMLR and other relevant scientific, environmental and technical organizations) on:

- (a) the effectiveness of measures taken pursuant to this Protocol;
- (b) the need to update, strengthen or otherwise improve such measures;
- (c) the need for additional measures, including the need for additional Annexes, where appropriate;
- (d) the application and implementation of the environmental impact assessment procedures set out in Article 8 and Annex I;
- (e) means of minimising or mitigating environmental impacts of activities in the Antarctic Treaty area;
- (f) procedures for situations requiring urgent action, including response action in environmental emergencies;
- (g) the operation and further elaboration of the Antarctic Protected Area system;
- (h) inspection procedures, including formats for inspection reports and checklists for the conduct of inspections;
- (i) the collection, archiving, exchange and evaluation of information related to environmental protection;
- (j) the state of the Antarctic environment; and
- (k) the need for scientific research, including environmental monitoring, related to the implementation of this Protocol.

SCAR would be expected to provide high quality advice to the CEP on (i), (j), and (k), but in the interests of the application of good science should also be prepared to comment on (a), where appropriate.

Article 3 (1) of Annex II to the Protocol notes that “Any emission standards and equipment guidelines which may be recommended by, inter alia, the Committee and the **Scientific Committee on Antarctic Research** shall be taken into account”, which implies that SCAR may be expected to make such recommendations.

Article 5 (1) of Annex V to the Protocol notes that “the **Scientific Committee for Antarctic Research** or the Commission for the Conservation of Antarctic Marine Living Resources may propose an area for designation as an Antarctic Specially Protected Area or an Antarctic Specially Managed Area by submitting a proposed Management Plan to the Antarctic Treaty Consultative Meeting”.

Article 6 (1) of Annex V to the Protocol notes that “Proposed Management Plans shall be forwarded to the Committee, the **Scientific Committee on Antarctic Research** and, as appropriate, to the Commission for the Conservation of Antarctic Marine Living Resources. In formulating its advice to the Antarctic Treaty Consultative Meeting, the Committee shall take into account any comments provided by the **Scientific Committee on Antarctic Research** and, as appropriate, by the Commission for the Conservation of Antarctic Marine Living Resources”, which implies that SCAR is expected to examine the scientific implications of management plans – something GOSEAC did, but SC-ATS has not done.

The Rules of Procedure for the Committee for Environmental Protection (Decision 2 (1998)) state:

Rule 1: “Where not otherwise specified the Rules of Procedure for the Antarctic Treaty Consultative Meeting shall be applicable.”

Rule 4: Observer status in the Committee shall be open to:

- (e) the President of the **Scientific Committee on Antarctic Research**, the Chairman of the Scientific Committee for the Conservation of Antarctic Marine Living Resources, and the Chairman of the Council of Managers of National Antarctic Programmes, or their nominated Representatives.
- (f) subject to the specific approval of the Antarctic Treaty Consultative Meeting, other relevant scientific, environmental and technical organisations which can contribute to the work of the Committee.

Rule 6: Observers may submit documents to the Host Government of the meeting for distribution to members of the Committee. Observers may participate in the discussions, but shall not participate in the taking of decisions.

Rule 7: In carrying out its functions the Committee shall, as appropriate, consult with the **Scientific Committee on Antarctic Research**, the Chairman

of the Scientific Committee for the Conservation of Antarctic Marine Living Resources, and the Chairman of the Council of Managers of National Antarctic Programmes and other relevant scientific, environmental and technical organisations.

Rule 8: The Committee may seek the advice of experts as required on an ad hoc basis.

The Rules of Procedure for the CEP (above) echo the wording of the Article 11 of the Protocol on Environmental protection to the Antarctic Treaty, which says:

The Rules of Procedure of the CEP do not change the Rule of Procedure of the Treaty that allows only the “official” observers (**SCAR**, CCAMLR and COMNAP) to submit working papers, whereas all other ‘experts’ may only submit information papers.

The implication of these various articles and rules is that CAR need a mechanism to respond to these requirements. Thus far SCAR has not designated any specially managed areas, though it is entitled to do so.

A1.3 The CEP in Practice

The CEP has certain handicaps in carrying out its mission.

- CEP is not solely a group of specialists; attendees comprise a mix of policy makers, environmental managers, and environmental scientists.
- There is no dedicated environmental manager within the ATS Secretariat to assist CEP.
- CEP has only limited data collection or management capability
- There is no dedicated budget, for instance to support the activity of subsidiary groups.
- There is commonly a fairly high turnover of people annually within delegations.

Hence the encouragement in Article 12 to consult with SCAR, the SC-CCAMLR and other relevant scientific, environmental and technical organisations. The CEP relies on others (e.g. SCAR and SC-CCAMLR) who are collecting relevant data.

Neil suggested that the CEP requirements of SCAR embraced the following:

- Alerts to emerging issues, concerns, and environmental pressures (e.g. changing biodiversity; changing climate); in the past good advice of this kind has been delivered for instance on meteorites and acoustics);
- State of knowledge reviews (e.g. on human interference with wildlife; on the status and trends of the southern giant petrel, and fur seals);
- Technical advice (e.g. on management plans; emission standards; monitoring methods; methods for assessing specially protected species; technical standards for scientific activities; codes of conduct);

- Peer review of proposals to the CEP (e.g. of environmental domains analysis).

SCAR can produce and provide advice to CEP and ATCM through:-

- Working and Information papers,
- Presentations and lectures,
- Contributions to the intersessional process,
- Joint workshops,
- Partnership projects,
- Access to databases,
- Assistance in framing the questions,

while saying “no” where necessary.

SCAR can play an important role in Antarctic-wide initiatives such as regional assessments (e.g. of seals, birds, and climate). SCAR can assist with tackling major challenges for the CEP, such as the need for an integrated management approach to dealing with changes on the Peninsula, including a wide range of topics such as:

- Temperature rise
- Ice sheet Collapse
- Growth in ice free ground
- Affected species
- Biosecurity concerns
- Rising tourism
- More fishing, and
- Variations in sea ice.

The AG noted that the mechanisms for addressing these kinds of problems seem to be better developed in the Arctic, where the Arctic Council (AC) seems able to fund subsidiary bodies like AMAP (the Arctic Monitoring and Assessment Programme) and the body dealing with the Conservation of Flora and Fauna (CAFF). These have published valuable guidance documents on environmental management. The AC also led the impressive Arctic Climate Impact Assessment (ACIA), in partnership with the International Arctic Science Committee (IASC) which is SCAR’s counterpart in the north. CEP appears less efficient or effective because it has no budget, and because of the constraint that subsidiary groups are supposed to work in all 4 Treaty languages (a serious cost constraint). In some respects Neil thought it may be easier to do these things in the Arctic, where doing science is cheaper by an order of magnitude, and where there are more scientists involved, and governments are more engaged.

This impression of how the AC works with subsidiary bodies appears to contain a misconception. After the meeting Colin Summerhayes was informed by a representative of the AC that the way in which AMAP and other groups work is that a Party may propose a project to the AC, and, if the Party finds a co-sponsor from among the Members, is likely to get approval to run the project, which others may then join (including as appropriate NGOs and IASC). The AC does NOT fund these activities; funds have to be found by the

co-sponsors, from a variety of sources. Nevertheless they are regarded as AC projects.

A1.4 A Structured and Prioritised Work-Plan for CEP

The CEP is in the process of developing a 5-year structured and prioritised work-plan to assist in managing its growing and somewhat *ad hoc* workload. The plan has been provisionally adopted. The final version should contain a table of issues with a schedule for tackling them over a 5-year period, and with an indication of likely SCAR involvement. The current draft Plan is a Working Paper for the Kiev CEP (June 2008). When it is accepted, SCAR can use it as a guide to what may be required from us.

CEP is thinking about having technical (not necessarily scientific) intersessional groups that may be issue-specific, to assist in handling its work programme (e.g. to handle environmental impact papers). Some of SCAR's advice could come in through such subsidiary bodies. The problem at the moment is the requirement for CEP groups to have simultaneous translation, which makes such meetings too costly to hold.

A2. Perspectives from Treaty Parties

A.2.1 Presentation by UK

John Shears, a member of the UK delegation to the ATCM, gave an informal presentation on the SCAR-ATCM-CEP relationship as seen from the perspective of a Treaty Party. The AG welcomed the presentation because the UK is a 'benchmark' Party, and a major player in both SCAR and ATCM/CEP.

Science is a pillar of how Parties work in the Antarctic. The Treaty relies on freedom of scientific investigation, and free exchange of scientific data and personnel. SCAR is one of the primary sources of vital scientific advice, which it has provided since the Treaty was signed. The UK has long-established policy of working closely with SCAR, and sees SCAR as an important source of advice or Treaty Parties. SCAR's position as 'Observer' provides "hot-link" to advise parties proactively on important emerging scientific issues (such as climate change and its effects).

At the recent (October 2007) polar meeting sponsored by the UK Foreign and Commonwealth Office at Wilton Park (attended by John Shears and the SCAR Executive Director) it was clear that many around the table (including prominent representatives of Treaty Parties) misunderstood SCAR's role, not realising its independence. That misunderstanding had coloured the views of some who thought that SCAR should be much more responsive to the needs of the Parties, for example for monitoring. There is a need for SCAR to produce a briefing note for ATCM/CEP delegations to explain its nature and role in the context of the Treaty.

It may help the work of the AG-SATC to consider an analysis of the strengths and weaknesses of SCAR in the context of the Treaty. This may help the AG to take a systematic approach to seeing how SCAR might better engage with Parties and the ATS?

SCAR Strengths –

- High quality scientific advice
- Long established track record
- Skills and experience
- Responds well to ATS needs
- Highlights emerging science issues
- SCAR lecture

SCAR Weaknesses

- Lack of resources for ATS work
- Poor communication with Treaty Parties (e.g. our scientists need to tell their national delegations what they're doing)
- Occasional poor or late response to CEP/ATCM (we take on too much; CEP asks for too fast a turn around)
- Demise of GOSEAC gives impression we now put less effort in than we did then.

Improvements Needed

- Need better communication with individual Parties delegations (e.g. like the recent BAS-SCAR meeting). Links with Parties offer opportunities for SCAR to influence national strategy and vice versa.
- More investment (return of GOSEAC in some form).
- Updates on SCAR web site of progress with CEP/ATCM issues (currently all that is reported are end results in the form of working and information papers).
- Delivering data and advice (e.g. via SCAR's services and products like the Antarctic Digital Database - ADD).
- An Antarctic Report Card (like the new Arctic one to assess change against climate indicators).

SCAR is seen by many as a scientific “honest broker”. SCAR's credibility will suffer if there are poor communications and/or poor delivery (promising to much).

SCAR has a major role to play in providing advice on climate change and its impacts, especially in the Peninsula. SCAR can operate as a sort of IPCC for the Treaty System, recognising that the IPCC does not deal in detail with Antarctic climate change.

SCAR should provide an introductory slide for each SCAR lecture, setting it in the context of the breadth of scientific advice to ATCM. SCAR should also ask ATCM and CEP to advise us on what they would like as lecture topics (currently the topics are picked by SCAR with no consultation with ATCM or CEP).

John wondered about SCAR's links with CCAMLR as another part of the Treaty system. SCAR has observer status with CCAMLR. Article 23 of the CCAMLR Convention requires that "the Commission and the Scientific Committee shall seek to develop co-operative working relationships, as appropriate, with inter-governmental and nongovernmental organisations which could contribute to their work, including the Scientific Committee on Antarctic Research, the Scientific Committee on Oceanic Research and the International Whaling Commission". In that context, the Scientific Committee of CCAMLR, under its Rule of Procedure 19(c) "may invite, as appropriate, organisations named in Article 23 of the Convention to attend..... as Observers in the meetings of the Scientific Committee". Under its Rule of Procedure 24 (a), "observers may submit documents to the Secretariat for distribution to Members of the Committee as information documents".

Over the past three years SCAR has been steadily building up its links with CCAMLR, through the activities of the SCAR representative, Graham Hosie, a member of SC-ATS. Reports of these interactions are posted on the SCAR web site at <http://www.scar.org/researchgroups/lifescience/#LS-Partnerships>. There is an especially strong interest of CCAMLR in SCAR's Census of Antarctic Marine Life (CAML) project, in SCAR's Marine Biodiversity Network (MarBIN), in SCAR's Environment and Biodiversity in the Antarctic (EBA) programme, and in the Action Group on the Continuous Plankton Recorder. CCAMLR was not able to develop an IPY programme, so has become a participant in SCAR's CAML IPY programme.

John concluded that SCAR needs to invest more effort and resources in doing what it does for the ATS, in delivering it, and in communicating it.

A.2.2 Written Comments from Australia, Russia and Norway, via CEP

Note that these comments relate to the CEP not to the ATCM. The following is a summary.

Australia

It is difficult to be specific about the scientific information and advice CEP will need into the future, particularly because its current planning horizon stretches only to five years – examples of science needs during that period are given in response to the following question. CEP's interests and focus will change over time as high priority issues are dealt with and new issues are tackled. Given CEP's considerable workload, it is important that time and effort is not spent by the CEP developing or considering information and advice that is not directly relevant to the tasks at hand. The CEP needs scientific information and advice that meets the following criteria:

Information and advice provided should be: 1) consistent with what was specifically sought by the CEP; or 2) directly useful for matters under consideration by the CEP. Scientific information and advice should preferably assist consideration of matters identified by the CEP as high priority.

Due to the annual nature of CEP meetings (and ATCMs), and the associated risk of discussion and resolution of issues being delayed by a year at a time, it is important that CEP has available to it in a timely manner the scientific information and advice needed to inform its work. It will be increasingly important that such information and advice is available to coincide with scheduled discussions. Requested information and advice should be available well in advance of annual meetings to allow sufficient opportunity for Members' consideration.

Expert information and advice should come from the most appropriate and reliable source for the matter in question. Because there is a broad range of issues on the CEP agenda, the range of scientific advice to inform discussions of those issues is likely to be similarly broad. By necessity, any body will have only a finite breadth of skills and expertise, so there are problems inherent in relying on a single source for all expert scientific advice. Australia raised similar points during discussions to develop the CEP's five-year work plan and suggested the CEP, in addition to calling on SCAR, SC-CAMLR and COMNAP for expert advice, might also consider the establishment of CEP sub-groups.

CEP needs from SCAR information that is relevant to its work, able to be provided in a timely manner, and for which SCAR is the most relevant source.

The following list contains examples of higher priority items on the CEP's five-year work plan for which the CEP might need scientific input. SCAR is already identified as contributing to some of these matters, and CEP should look to SCAR to provide timely and relevant submissions.

- **Quarantine and non-native species:** information about the nature and scale of risks associated with particular species, activities and regions. The IPY project Aliens in Antarctica aims to assist with quantifying risks, and will report to CEP in 2009. SCAR is yet to respond to the Committee's request at CEP IX for an updated version of its guidelines to prevent the introduction and transfer of alien species. [*Editorial note – SCAR Delegates will be expected to approve these guidelines at their July 2008 meeting*]
- **Tourism and NGO activities:** advice on scientific findings regarding the environmental effects of tourism.
- **Global pressures (climate change/pollution) and biodiversity loss:** syntheses of available information, including trends and thresholds, with a focus on matters requiring changes in the management of human activities in Antarctica. SCAR has undertaken to provide a report on Antarctic Climate and Environment to a future meeting. [*Editorial note – IP62 at 2008 ATCM*]
- **Marine protected areas:** advice on the nature of the Antarctic marine environment, including vulnerable, important, and representative areas. CEP has already acknowledged the need to work closely with SC-CAMLR, as the body with expertise most relevant to this issue.

- **Monitoring and reporting:** despite considerable discussion of this matter over the years by ATCM and CEP, including several workshops and reports by SCAR and COMNAP, there remains a need to identify key indicators of human impacts, to synthesise existing data and to coordinate scientific/monitoring activities. SCAR has already undertaken to report to CEP XI on current long-term monitoring activities.
- **Specially Protected Species:** advice on the status and trends of Antarctic species, sufficient to inform decisions to list or de-list and, where relevant, sufficient to assess the effectiveness of management actions. SCAR's role in this process has been identified through the "Guidelines for CEP Consideration of Proposals for New and Revised Designations of Antarctic Specially Protected Species under Annex II of the Protocol", although the Guidelines also state that the CEP should consult with other authorities or organisations as appropriate. CEP is currently awaiting further advice from SCAR on the status of the southern giant petrel [*Editorial note – WP 12 at 2008 ATCM*] and the Ross seal [*Editorial note – completed at 2007 ATCM*]. As the activities and capabilities of SCAR are not necessarily well understood by the CEP, it might be useful to hear from SCAR what it believes it can contribute to those matters identified on the CEP's five-year work plan. Further, CEP should be willing to receive information about important emerging issues – outside those on the current work plan – from all relevant sources, SCAR included.

The Committee is generally comprised of national representatives with considerable environmental management/policy experience, but it is not possible for those representatives to be expert in all aspects of the Committee's extensive agenda. As a result, scientific advice provided to the CEP need not be provided in complete layman's terms, but neither is the committee of itself an expert scientific body. In most cases it is unlikely the CEP will directly consider raw data, and some form of summary or analysis would be more helpful. It is, however, important that sufficient data or references are provided to allow scientific experts associated with Member Parties the opportunity to scrutinise and validate such analyses. If submissions are provided in a timely manner, Members can ensure that scrutiny is given prior to consideration by the Committee. It is very important that scientific information and advice from any source carries with it descriptions of assumptions, gaps in knowledge and other uncertainties including, wherever practicable, a measure of the scale of such uncertainties. An accurate understanding of the strengths and limitations of scientific advice is crucial to the Committee when taking decisions and providing advice to the ATCM. Acknowledging that many experts in relevant fields of environmental science have a thorough understanding of the management and policy implications and applications of scientific information, it will often be useful, where appropriate, for submissions to contain not only conclusions drawn from the science but recommendations for the Committee's consideration.

CEP representation at the XXX SCAR Delegates' Meeting has the potential to highlight ways to improve the working relationship, and Australia supports attendance by the CEP Chair (or a Vice-chair). In a similar fashion, Australia

considers there might be merit in assigning a CEP representative as the “SCAR liaison”. That person could be SCAR’s first point of contact on queries, and could also be responsible for maintaining regular contact with SCAR to ensure CEP’s needs and requests are being addressed handled in a manner that meets the criteria mentioned above. While this function likely currently rests with the CEP Chair, consideration could also be given to whether it would be a suitable role for a Vice-chair.

On a specific issue, there may be merit in convening a joint meeting or workshop of all relevant Antarctic Treaty system bodies to identify cooperative approaches to implementing a systematic Antarctic-wide environmental monitoring and reporting system. In the same way that such a workshop could involve participation by relevant persons, irrespective of their affiliation to one or more Treaty bodies, to achieve outcomes for the Antarctic Treaty system as a whole, similar opportunities could be sought to bring together relevant persons on other issues. That is, an issue-based approach rather than an organisation-based approach. In that sense, the involvement of “SCAR” expert representatives together with relevant others in CEP expert groups, standing groups, workshops or ICGs would no doubt be of benefit to those discussions.

Russia

An interest of some SCAR members in the problem of the Antarctic environment is clear. Practically any activity in the Antarctic can be considered both in terms of science and practical activity, and the environmental issues are no exception. The SCAR recommendations on many directions of activity in the Antarctic are very useful for different decisions made in the Antarctic Treaty System.

Adoption in 1991 of the Protocol on Environmental Protection to the Antarctic Treaty was a significant milestone in the development of the Antarctic Treaty System. Establishment in 1998 of the Committee for Environmental Protection (CEP) determined a new body in the Antarctic Treaty System, responsible for the issues of environmental protection. The CEP has become part of the Antarctic Treaty System, which as is known, consists of the Antarctic Treaty Consultative Meeting, Antarctic Treaty Secretariat, Commission for the Conservation of Antarctic Marine Living Resources (CCAMLR), CEP, SCAR and COMNAP. Each of these bodies has its own authorities and measures of responsibility. At the same time we observe for the last few years the attempts of revisions of the established authorities. It was proposed to pass to CEP some CCAMLR functions (marine protected areas), which are legislated in the text of the Convention on the Conservation of Antarctic Marine Living Resources. SCAR in turn, made attempts to discuss the CEE projects, not touching upon the scientific aspects of these assessments, but directly the nature protection issues. The new direction of SCAR activity should be confined to the framework of the adopted Provision on this international organization, and not duplicate the activity of CEP; SCAR should be concerned only with scientific advice.

Norway

We welcome SCAR's initiative to consider its interaction with the ATCM/CEP and its internal handling of ATCM/CEP matters.

CEP needs from SCAR new and updated knowledge/understanding related to identified topics (ie. climate change, climate impacts, etc.), assessments on specifically identified overarching topics (cf. eg. topics identified in the CEP's 5-year plan).

CEP needs input from SCAR in the coming years in topics such as pollution assessment, climate - new and updated knowledge, assessments re. introduced species, human presence and impacts on fauna, and biodiversity loss.

The information should be in the form of summaries of data/written papers and oral presentations at meetings.

There is an opportunity for joint workshops.