

SCAR Standing Committee on the Antarctic Treaty System
REPORT TO SCAR EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE ON XXVI ATCM
Madrid, Spain, 9–20 June 2003

1. The agenda for the CEP was larger than in previous years and the Committee worked longer hours to achieve a final agreed report.
2. All the planned SCAR papers were submitted in advance of the meeting. A further extra Information Paper on the International Polar Year was submitted during the meeting once it was learnt that ICSU had approved the establishment of the international steering committee for the IPY.
3. SCAR Report to Plenary (IP 103) – this went well with an initial emphasis on the Prince of Asturias Prize and its disbursement to follow up on the Prince’s mention of SCAR earlier in the day. Several delegations commented very positively in private on the establishment of the Fellowships.
4. SCAR IP 94 “Comments on the draft CEE for water sampling from Vostok Lake”. This paper was drafted by SALEGOS and drew attention to details about possible contamination, hydrostatic fracturing and dissolved gases that were not well represented in the ICG report. SCAR did not contribute to the ICG discussions, preferring to wait until SALEGOS met to develop its independent advice on the proposal. Comment from the two Russian members of SALEGOS were included in the paper. There was a good discussion on the draft CEE and it was concluded that it failed to meet the requirements of Annex I. SCAR’s points were originally included specifically in the advice to the ATCM but were lost in a generic re-write on the final evening.
5. SCAR’s comments on the ANDRILL draft CEE were welcomed by New Zealand and included in a detailed response in WP 35.
6. SCAR IP 77 “Acoustic technology and the Marine Ecosystem” was one of three papers on hydroacoustics. The, ASOC IP 73 provided considerable new information both on incidents elsewhere in the world and numerous grey literature citations. WP 34 from Spain on marine noise provided considerable support to ASOC and Germany was able to claim that increasing numbers of Parties were taking these impacts seriously. SCAR’s announcement of an Expert Group to look after this area was welcomed by all and we promised to refer the ASOC and Spanish papers, as well as the Berlin Workshop report, to the Group for comment. Both ASOC and Germany have already asked if they can nominate members for the Expert Group. The choice of membership for this Group needs especial care, given the high political interest in this field, and must involve several leading scientists from outside the Antarctic if the SCAR advice coming from it is to carry international credibility. The Group may need to meet initially to establish its Terms of Reference and working practices. Agreeing the composition needs to be a priority if we are to have its conclusions on the various papers on this subject.
7. SCAR IP 100 “Antarctic Specially Protected Species” was well received and the CEP decided that since the first proposals for an SPS might arrive in 2005 they needed to progress the revision of Annex II quickly.
8. WP 25 was the progress report on the ICG for the revision of Annex II. This was by far the most contentious subject at the meeting and consumed a great deal of time. Plenary discussion of this by the ATCM was badly chaired and there was a large number of

lengthy interventions on some of the ideas proposed. The CEP ICG on this is to continue and it is important that SCAR participates as before. This Annex is of particular significance to science and it would seem that the lawyers are likely to agree to a very limited revision which is unlikely to address some of the major areas of our concern.

9. SCAR IP 101 and 102 were the two science papers in support of the SCAR lecture. There were no interventions after their brief introduction but again, privately, several delegations sought me out to express enthusiasm for the style of the papers and the nature of the explanations provided.
10. The SCAR lecture was very well attended with most delegations being present. Jerónimo López-Martínez gave an excellent introduction which left open the possibility of a lecture in Cape Town if the delegates wished. All the comments afterwards from lawyers and diplomats were extremely positive and great enthusiasm was expressed for this being an annual Plenary event. South Africa has already told us that they would be happy to include this in the programme if there was sufficient interest expressed in it. This was agreed on the final day when the agenda for XXVII ATCM was discussed. ??? The choice of the speaker was good (female and young) and the level of information was just right for the non-scientists in the audience. Several people remarked that this was the first time they had actually understood how the ozone hole formed! Putting the lecture on the SCAR website is certain to result in its more widespread use by many countries.
11. SCAR IP XXX on the International Polar Year attracted great support. Ten countries and COMNAP intervened to provide verbal support and the UK and SCAR provided a draft Resolution for the Plenary. Russia seemed less enthusiastic since the resolution reduced the role of WMO to one of several international bodies providing partial support and ICSU as the international coordinating body.
12. It is clear from the tenor of the discussion in CEP that SCAR is expected to provide detailed comments on all management plans and that many delegations expect us to comment on the scientific components of draft CEEs.
13. The Chairman of the CEP suggested that it might be necessary for the CEP to have more time at future meetings. Heads of Delegations would appear not to support this.
14. Our conclusions are that this has been an especially successful ATCM for SCAR with a high profile, wide scale support for our papers and interventions, and an underlining of the importance of science.
15. This is the first report of the new ATS Standing Committee and in organizing our work this last year and in developing our work for the next year a number of questions have become apparent. These are attached as an Annex for discussion by the Executive.

D W H Walton
M C Kennicutt II
D M Stoddart

SCAR ATS STANDING COMMITTEE WORK PLAN 2003–04 FOR XXVII ATCM

1. Intersessional Contact Groups

1.1 draft Management Plans for revised ASPAs

- Litchfield Island
- Arrival Heights
- Biscoe Point
- Pointe Géologie
- Cape Denison

1.2 draft Management Plan for a new ASMA

- Dry Valleys ASMA

1.3 Annex II (including information on captive animal facilities, rules for exchange and acquisition)

2. Papers for XXVII ATCM

- International Polar Year
- Report on progress with Specially Protected Species
- Report on progress with hydroacoustics
- SCAR Report
- Biological Monitoring Workshop
- Antarctic Conservation in the 21st Century (if ready)
- Supporting papers for SCAR lecture

3. Other matters

3.1 Refer report on Vostok to SALEGOS

3.2 Agree subject and responsibility for next SCAR lecture.