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This document is presented in support of the Working Paper 13 “Dedicated process for the development of a comprehensive and consistent framework for Antarctic tourism and other non-governmental activities”

Workshop “The future of Antarctic tourism: towards a strategic vision and policy program”, 8-10 March 2023, Paris

Chair’s report

Summary

France and the Netherlands present the Chair’s Report from the informal workshop on the management of Antarctic Tourism (the future of Antarctic tourism: « towards a strategic vision and policy program ») held in Paris (8 to 10 March 2023). This report supports the Working Paper 13 “Dedicated process for the development of a comprehensive and consistent framework for Antarctic tourism and other non-governmental activities”.

Background

France and the Netherlands co-chaired an informal workshop on a strategic vision and policy program for Antarctic tourism, hosted by France in Paris (8 to 10 March 2023). This workshop was prepared by the hosts of the ATCMs XLIII, XLIV, XV and 46 and the delegations of the Netherlands and the United Kingdom, with the objective to accelerate and support an ATCM-wide, transparent and inclusive debate and subsequent decision-making on the future of Antarctic tourism. The workshop agenda is provided in Appendix 1.

38 participants attended, as follows: 28 delegates representing 17 Consultative Parties, 2 delegates from 2 Non-Consultative Parties, 6 delegates representing Experts and Observers (COMNAP, ASOC, IAATO, IUCN and SCAR), and 1 external French expert in polar law. The list of participants is provided in Appendix 2.

The key recommendations supported by many who participated in this workshop, presented in the present Information Paper, support the Working Paper 13 for the ATCM to consider.

Day I – Morning session (Sessions 1 & 2) - Workshop introduction

1. Caroline Krajka (Co-Chair, FR), opening Session 1 (Workshop introduction - plenary opening), welcomed attendees for this informal workshop in Paris. She noted with regret that several delegations were not able to attend as initially planned (Ukraine, Austria, Ecuador, South Africa and India).
2. Olivier Poivre d'Arvor, French Ambassador for the Poles and Maritime Issues, formally opened the workshop with a keynote speech. Welcoming the 38 attendees to Paris, all Parties to the Madrid Protocol and particularly involved in the framing of tourism, the Ambassador reminded that the pandemic did not allow for participants to be greeted in person during the 43rd Antarctic Treaty Consultative Meeting, organized by France in June 2021, in Paris.
3. The Ambassador recalled the context in which this informal workshop was taking place: the Rotterdam workshop, co-organized in 2019 by the Netherlands and the United Kingdom, provided a great opportunity for the Antarctic Treaty Consultative Parties (ATCPs) and Observers to define international priorities for tourism management in the Antarctic Treaty area. The subsequent ATCM XLII in Prague was thus able to make concrete progress on these issues, and ATCM XLIIV saw the success of the proposals put forward by France in this area (establishment of a voluntary common system for the boarding of government observers on cruise ships; adoption of a “Tourism Rules Manual” compiling all the rules of the Antarctic Treaty system (ATS) relating to tourism).
4. He also noted that the objective of the work conducted within the ATCM is to better monitor the tourism phenomenon, and that the ATCM Multi-year Strategic Work Plan, adopted by Decision 3 (2022), contains two priorities relating to tourism, namely: Priority 11, on the development of a strategic approach to the management of Antarctic tourism, and Priority 12, on compliance. He finally mentioned that in the margins of the ATCM, the Chairs of ATCMs XLIII, XLIV, XLV and XLVI and the delegations of the Netherlands and the United Kingdom discussed ways to accelerate a more robust discussion on the future of Antarctic tourism.
5. He stressed that the rapidly increasing number of tourists visiting Antarctica every year - over 100,000 visitors are expected to do so during the 2022-23 season- and the diversification of touristic activities in Antarctica, urge us to develop a new vision for Antarctic tourism. He added that these developments call for a robust and coherent policy approach to ensure that activities comply with the values, principles and rules adopted within the framework of the ATS. He also insisted that it was time to adopt stronger regulations on tourism in the Antarctic, to avoid the exponential rise of tourism.
6. He hoped that this workshop, by bringing together the most involved ATCPs and Observers, would provide an opportunity for the elaboration of a strategic policy on Antarctic tourism. Such an objective is in line with France’s first Polar Strategy, published in March 2022, titled “France’s 2030 polar strategy - equilibrium in extremes”.
7. The Ambassador emphasised the critical importance of protecting the polar environment in Antarctica - a continent where humans must remain visitors and whose stay needs to be responsible and mindful of nature. It therefore requires preservation of areas that have not been impacted by humans, so they may be declared as reserves and used as benchmarks. He highlighted the fact that the Antarctic Treaty, which was signed in Washington on 1 December 1959, can be seen as a model of success in multilateralism, for facilitates overcoming divisions to reach a joint solution, respecting everyone State’s interests.
8. Finally, he pointed out that France was one of the first signatories of the Antarctic Treaty and the initiator, together with Australia, of the Protocol on Environmental Protection to the Antarctic Treaty (EP) signed in Madrid, on 4 October 1991, which established the principle that activities in this region should be undertaken “so as to limit adverse impacts on the Antarctic environment and its dependent and associated ecosystems”. He added that France intended to increase its efforts to see the ATCPs adopt the most ambitious and protective legislation possible in the field of Antarctic tourism. He finally underlined the key role of this workshop to set out the future of Antarctica, as it is time to adopt more robust and international regulation on tourism in the Antarctic.
9. After this introductory speech, Caroline Krajka (Co-chair, FR) explained the workshop goals and structure, with the objective of drafting a Working Paper to be submitted in ATCM XLV in Helsinki aiming at proposing a clear and concrete vision for Antarctic tourism.
10. Jane Rumble (UK) introduced, as a “Thought Starter”, the second session related to “General remarks and expectations”. She suggested that arguably the ATCM was not taking a strategic or comprehensive approach to the management and regulation of tourism in Antarctica, and as such, ATCPs were not taking a consistent approach. In her view, Parties had yet to articulate a clear and shared vision of what tourism in Antarctica should be, develop goal in terms of tourism management, or have reached a consensus on what actions to take. She noted that in her experience, the ATCM had been focused on address existing problems in a piecemeal way, rather than being proactive and visionary. Whilst there was limited evidence of environmental impact from tourism activities, Antarctica was preserved for peace and science, and Jane asked whether Antarctica was already a mass market tourism destination, or whether it might soon become one without proactive action, and whether Parties would consider that such a scenario was consistent with the objectives of the Environmental Protocol. She concluded by advocating that the ATCM look at tourism as a whole activity, and to look at the bigger picture.  By taking a more comprehensive approach, rather than looking at specific issues in isolation, ATCPs may be able to better clarify common values, and be prepared to accept that compromises had to be found.  It was a clear responsibility of ATCPs to define what kind of tourism activities and experience would be consistent with the Protocol and to be better able to meet new and emerging challenges. Jane proposed that a new, dedicated, coherent and comprehensive tourism framework could be considered under the Treaty or Protocol, with a view to steering away from a piecemeal, reactive approach towards a pro-active and more dynamic approach.
11. The workshop participants were split into four small groups, and invited to express their expectations. They reported back to the plenary. The wide-ranging discussion made it possible to identify some common ingredients about a vision of what Antarctic tourism may look like in the future.
12. One participant stated that, as ATCM already proposes such a vision based on Resolution 7 (2009) and on the Environment Protocol, hence the work should focus on clarifying the existing vision rather than establishing a new one. However, some participants stressed that it is not so clear, as values in the Environmental Protocol, the General Guidelines do exist, but it is unclear what this means in terms of the kind of tourism Parties want for the future. It thus justifies that this workshop should define what kind of tourism participants really want and set it out in a concrete proposal.
13. Some participants recalled that the interests of the tourism industry should be taken into account, along with the protection of Antarctica. In this sense, there is a need for a level playing field for the industry, as well as a shared understanding of the actions that both ATCM as well as the industry should take in terms of tourism management/regulation.
14. Some participants highlighted that common standards and procedures at the international level, between the ATCPs, would help tackle “permit shopping”, prevent freeriding, and provide clarity and support to the National Competent Authorities (NCAs) as well as visibility to the operators. So far, each NCA deals with its respective applications and requests based on ATS provisions. An objective could be to find methods to ensure that each NCA will deal with its applications according to a common set of criteria, and will follow the same kind of procedures, along common standards. This requires a far more coordinated and pro-active international approach than the current, reactive, situation. Communication between Parties is important in that regard, to avoid significant differences in terms of standards and decision-making.
15. One participant stated that each Party must require its nationals to comply with applicable regulations. Monitoring and enforcement should first be implemented by national authorities and not international bodies, as each Party is responsible for its own citizens.
16. The need for a clear and concrete vision of what Antarctica tourism will look like in the future, based on scientific data, was underlined.
17. Some highlighted the need for stronger domestic regulations, based upon international policies, was underlined as it may constitute a legal basis upon which NCAs could better handle the challenges posed by tourism.. It was recalled that NCA’s lack of decisions could be considered a decision, and that the absence of any prohibition of some activities means that they are in fact allowed. The question of banning some activities was raised, and there was an interest among many participants to determine those activities that would be regarded by all Parties as environmentally sound. Many concluded that addressing the question of what Antarctica tourism may look like in the future, requires international policies and regulations, so that NCAs may implement them at the national level. Beyond that, the ATCM should make its regulations and framework clearer, as well as more visible, so it will become the main reference for operators.
18. Better collaboration and communication between Parties was mentioned as important to be able to monitor cumulative impacts and to let operators and the public know how NCAs process tourism applications.
19. Finally, attention was drawn to defining what tourists should experience in Antarctica and the possibility of focusing on the educational value of tourism. Examples from around the world could be an inspiration. One of the mottos proposed resonated throughout the workshop: ‘snow tourism should be slow tourism.’

Day I – Afternoon session (Sessions 3) - Stocktaking and vision

1. IAATO provided the participants with some details about tourism in Antarctica, with focus on the 2022-2023 season. The operators opined that their activities are compliant with the ATS and that their objectives are to promote safe and environmentally responsible tourism in Antarctica. Thus, IAATO stated it does not promote tourism, nor advocate for the development of tourism, rather advocates for responsible tourism. To achieve this goal, IAATO requires its operators to comply with ATCM instruments, resolutions and measures, even if they have not entered into force. IAATO also develops its own bylaws to ensure that the activities of its members meet this goal of safe and responsible tourism.
2. IAATO presented its 5-year vision for Antarctic tourism, which it summarized as "the implementation of safe and environmentally friendly tourism" and which contains the following key elements: Operators should be "stewards", able to report on what they see in the field, provide data and information on the environment; tourism could support scientific research, e.g. passengers could be involved in citizen science operations ; based on scientific data or emergency situations, IAATO is able to close a site to its members if it appears that visits are causing environmental changes or it is unsafe; IAATO develops guidelines for site visits and activities as needed ; the association is also developing mechanisms for operators to share information, capturing field data that is useful for tourism management ; finally, IAATO recalled that it can not set numerical limits.
3. IAATO presented its needs and opportunities. Regarding its needs, IAATO noted that it cannot prohibit activities that ATCPs allow, unless proved unsafe or could potentially damage the environment. Therefore, harmonization of the NCAs authorization process would be helpful, to allow for greater consistency in the type of activities its operators can conduct. IAATO expressed interest in knowing what activities Parties do not want to see in Antarctica. IAATO advocated that Measures 4 (2004) and 15 (2009) should come into force, and that governments should take actions in this regard. In terms of opportunities, IAATO can help identify “bad actors”, by reporting instances of bad behaviour to NCAs. However, the Association has noted that such reports rarely lead to concrete action by NCAs. In conclusion, IAATO called on the Parties to keep on working together with the operators that fall under their jurisdiction.
4. The discussion that followed the presentation was an opportunity to raise the following key points. Tourist vessels are expected to carry close to their maximum capacity next season, but the number of vessels is not expected to increase significantly. One participant asked how operators would react if the ATCM set limits on the number of activities allowed. IAATO stated that its members are committed to complying with the regulations adopted by ATCM. However, sudden changes in regulations can be a challenge for operators. ATCPs should give operators time to adapt. IAATO was then asked the type of tourism, number of operators, etc it would like to have in the future. IAATO recalled its remit to promote safe and environmentally responsible tourism. Future tourism should meet these criteria.
5. With respect to “bad actors”, IAATO does not maintain a "blacklist", but may provide information on the activities of such operators to ATCM.
6. One participant pointed out that IAATO is brilliant at dealing with what is happening now, quickly and reactively, but cannot restrict trade and therefore can only try to manage what is authorised. Thus, it is the Parties that need to undertake action in this direction.
7. The discussion then turned to the educational aspects of Antarctic tourism, and to the experience that tourists should have in Antarctica. It appeared clearly that visiting Antarctica should lead tourists to realise how unique this environment is, and that such an impact on tourists’ understanding should be one of the goals pursued by IAATO members.
8. Finally, IAATO was asked what would be the worst decision ATCM could take in their views. IAATO responded that it is necessary to be able to continue to explain to operators where decisions come from and their supporting rationales. To do otherwise could lead to frustration.
9. Then Kees Bastmeijer (NL) introduced, as thought starter, the third session, dedicated to answering the following questions: “Where are we, where are we going and where do we want to go? - ingredients for the vision on the future of Antarctic tourism”. He noted that, for some years now, the Multi-year Strategic Work Plan (MYSWP) has included on the ATCM agenda the adoption of a strategic vision for Antarctic tourism, meaning that Parties do not start from scratch. He pointed out that elements for a strategic vision were presented in the UK's Working Paper n° 10 submitted in 2009. He furthermore recalled that the general principles (Resolution 7 2009) and the work done by the Parties in the framework of some Intersessional Contact Groups (ICGs) also provide some ingredients.
10. He added that a vision is not about rules, but rather about what Parties want Antarctica to look like in the future, what they do not want, and what that means for tourism. ATCM needs policies to give substance to this vision. A proposed vision was presented in the concept note supporting the workshop. It builds on already accepted language, but does not talk about what the future should look like, although that should ultimately be its purpose. He noted that keeping Antarctica unchanged as far as possible, to ensure that also future generations have the options to enjoy the special values of Antarctica, could be considered as part of the vision.
11. One participant pointed out that if the vision clearly expressed the type of activities that could be implemented in Antarctica, it could help prevent the development of new and undesirable activities, which NCAs currently cannot prohibit due to their national regulations.
12. One participant noted that one should talk about goals, not just vision, because a vision is not measurable, while goals are.
13. Participants then divided into breakout groups, tasked with identifying elements of a vision, as well as possible goals, to support the establishment of a policy program by the ATCPs. Each group reported back to the plenary session. Of all the "ingredients" proposed by the participants, the following stand out as supported by many participants :

* The vision should reflect the fact that Antarctica is a nature reserve. Therefore, tourism should not have more than a minor or transitory impact on the environment. The concept of "slow tourism", i.e. slow, calm, quiet and simple tourism, was put forward.
* Tourism in Antarctica must be subject to adequate environmental and scientific monitoring, management and control, with dedicated and consistent instruments.
* The vision must be based on indicators that are measurable.
* Science on board tourist vessels should not be used as a promotional tool for tourist operators.
* Antarctic tourism management should be based on the instruments of the Antarctic Treaty system. The ATCM has competency to establish a coherent framework and provide guidance and regulations that ATCPs and IAATO could use. These guidelines and regulations could build on what currently exist to address the difficult issues raised by Antarctic tourism, such as what type of activities are acceptable and how to decide if an activity can be conducted, how to ensure that visiting new sites will not cause more than a minor or transitory impact, how to use site-specific guidelines in this regard.
* The vision must take into account the positive impact of tourism. In this sense, the vision could consider that only activities with educational value can be implemented in the Antarctic treaty area.
* Tourism regulations must be predictable for operators, and ATCM must provide a level playing field for them.
* The current piecemeal approach has proven to be unsatisfactory to many participants. A comprehensive vision is therefore desirable. However, beyond designing a vision, which may be too general, ATCPs need to be more specific and take concrete, coherent and robust action on the relevant issues within the vision.

1. The Chair tasked the Netherlands to include proposals for development of a vision, based on the elements of the discussion, as well as building blocks and no regret measures in the working document to be submitted to the ATCM.

Day II – Morning session (Session 4) – Policy program and Building Block 1 (Managing growth)

1. Rita Fabris (Germany) introduced the building blocks for a policy program and specifically building block 1 (managing growth) by giving a presentation drawing attention to the risk that mass tourism represents for Antarctica. She noted that the number of trips is increasing and that it will be difficult to restrict what has already been authorized – but not impossible. Furthermore, she mentioned that there are several options for management but that each of them will have implications and consequences. Adjusting one aspect might put additional pressure on others so there needs to be a holistic approach. Following this introduction, a participant noted that continued expansion of tourism may not comply with the Antarctic Treaty objectives and principles to protect Antarctica. Some behaviour, or activities carried out by some operators, such as noisy or visible ones (helicopter flights), can disturb other operators, conducting more contemplative activities.
2. The Policy program (list of Building Blocks) proposed in the workshop’s concept note was considered to be comprehensive by participants. The discussion continued as follows:

Building block 1: Managing growth

1. Participants concurred that the ATCM should tackle the issue of the growth of tourism activities, preferably using existing tools. Different approaches were proposed in that regard. While some participants emphasized the need to limit tourism expansion in some ways, others stated that the ATCM should better manage growth, rather than limit the activity.
2. Some avenues were expressed in both directions, to be further considered:

* Limiting landings:
  + Limiting the number of landings per vessel to only one per vessel and per day.
  + Only sites covered by specific site guidelines could be visited.
  + Designing and implementing a quota system, defining a maximum number of visitors, either by area or in general.
* Limiting the length of the season:
  + Setting a fixed start and end date for the Antarctic tourism season, bearing in mind potential negative effects this could have.
* Developing spatial management:
  + Developing dedicated Antarctic Specially Managed Areas (ASMAs) for tourism management, in order to properly manage tourism activities in a given area, under a consistent management plan. Such ASMAs should be large enough to encompass several popular tourist sites. A pilot ASMA could be considered.
* Setting a clear framework for the visit of new sites:
  + Identifying what should be considered as a "new site" (e.g., site without guidelines or any other management tool).
  + Not permitting any off-ship activities in Antarctica from vessels carrying more than 500 passengers (additionally to the landing prohibition of Measure 15 (2009), to ensure these activities are real ‘cruise only’ activities
  + not allow overnight stays in the top-20 visited sites
  + Requiring that a prior environmental impact assessment under existing procedures be conducted before any new site visit. Who should conduct this assessment, and how, should be further discussed.

Day II – Afternoon session (Session 5) – Policy program and Building Block 2 (Managing diversification) and 3 (Monitoring)

1. Jenny Haukka (Finland) introduced the afternoon session, related to building blocks 2 & 3 (managing diversification & monitoring). Regarding diversification, she recalled that by “diversity” is meant the variety of forms of travel to Antarctica, as well as the variety of activities and experiences that are undertaken by tourists and non-governmental expeditions in Antarctica. As highlighted in previous ATCM discussions, including the "Ad Hoc Working Group on Competent Authority Issues" that brought up this issue at ATCM 2015, diversity presents some challenges for ATCPs and their NCAs, such as (among others) the lack of guidelines or information on how NCAs may deal with new activities and the lack of a harmonized position across Parties especially in relation to potentially risky activities for the environment and the safety of the environment beyond what is provided in the Environmental Protocol, and the difficulty in regulating and anticipating the types of interactions with the environment in relation to new activities etc.
2. Regarding monitoring, she recalled that it may refer to either the monitoring of tourism activities or the monitoring of the environmental impact of these activities, but that this building block was dedicated to the latter (as monitoring of the activities will be addressed in building block 4 on compliance). The aim was therefore to discuss ways and tools to monitor the environmental consequences of touristic activities in Antarctica.
3. The discussion continued as follows:

Building block 2: Managing diversification

1. Outcomes of previous discussions on the need to improve consistency between NCAs on how they deal with new activities, in terms of environmental impact assessment, as well as how they deal with new, unexpected and possibly undesirable activities were recalled. Diversification was generally considered to be an issue that ATCPs should address since it causes challenges in terms of environmental protection, safety, and consistency with the Antarctic values. It was generally observed that the ATCM is competent to provide Parties and NCAs with tools and guidance to address these challenges.
2. Many agreed following avenues could be further considered:

* Limiting the type of activities that can be carried out by tourist operators:
  + Establishing a positive list of tourism activities that can be conducted in the Antarctic Treaty Area, alongside a list of activities that can only be allowed in certain places, and activities that are banned. An alternative option would be to design a process rather than a list. Such a process could be based upon the existing Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA) process, under which the ATCM could identify such activities. The distinction between activities that can and cannot be conducted and must be based on sensible, clear and objective criteria. A value-based approach should be followed if we were to develop such a list. This would involve redefining the values we want to protect.
* Setting up a framework for the implementation of new activities:
  + Requiring that an environmental impact assessment must be conducted before the implementation of new and/or novel activities. The CEP could be encouraged to develop a standardized process in that regard. A precautionary approach should be followed.
* Fostering an increased collaboration and information exchange between NCAs, with the objective to move towards more coherency and homogeneity in terms of domestic authorisation processes. Greater consistency should also contribute to addressing the “permit-shopping” issue.

Building block 3: Monitoring

1. Participants noted that monitoring could refer to several concepts, such as monitoring trends in tourism activities, environmental impacts, and compliance. While there was a general consensus that Parties need to strengthen long-term environmental monitoring of tourism activities, the necessity to clarify which aspects of activities should be monitored, and how, was pointed out. Monitoring the social aspects of tourism, i.e., how Antarctica affects visitors, was also brought up.
2. In this sense, among all the ideas put forward by participants, the following seem to be the most promising to most participants:

* How to conduct environmental impacts of tourism activities:
  + Technologies offer opportunities in this regard (dedicated apps, satellite images). Potential uses of such technologies should be further explored.
  + Vessel expedition teams could contribute, by implementing basic environmental monitoring at selected sites according to a checklist established by the ATCM. The question of who this report should be sent to and who should process and analyse the data collected needs to be further discussed, keeping in mind that this should not cause an additional burden on NCAs.
  + Clear indicators should be developed.
* Where such monitoring should be implemented:
  + There is a need to focus on certain areas or sites, as individual Parties will not be able to monitor all visited sites.
* How to finance environmental monitoring:
  + A tourist fee paid by the operators could be considered to allow for long-term monitoring.
  + Establishing a subsidiary group tasked with the actual monitoring, under the ATCM, could be considered. This work could be financed through the tourist fee, and work should be guided by the ATCPs, on the basis of CEP advice.

Day III – Morning session (Session 6) – Policy program Building Block 4 (compliance and enforcement) and 5 (overall governance)

1. Kees Bastmeijer (NL) introduced the morning session, related to building blocks 4 & 5 (compliance and enforcement & overall governance). To prevent repetition of earlier debates in the workshop and to try to inspire the discussions in the sessions, he provided a brief introduction on the concept of Rights of Nature. The essence of this is that nature or components of nature are no longer seen only as an object (current situation) but as a subject (legal person), to which rights can also be attributed. There are now hundreds of initiatives worldwide to anchor such rights of, for example, ecosystems, rivers or animals in domestic legal systems. This thinking can help us not only to look at Antarctica from the perspective of our own human interests, but to put Antarctica itself at the center of our discussions.

Building block 4: Compliance and enforcement

1. Participants noted that compliance issues are currently mainly dealt with under domestic regulatory systems based on the ATS. However, a more consistent approach at the international level seems desirable. In that sense, promoting homogeneity between NCAs, and fostering dialogue between them on this issue turns out to be a key point. A more robust dialogue would help to learn from each other and facilitate information sharing, on cases of non-compliance for instance. Participants recognized the different observation, inspection and monitoring systems in place (Article VII of the Antarctic Treaty, IAATO's mandatory scheme, Resolution 9 2021). Increased use of the mechanisms available to ATCPs to monitor the activities they authorize was encouraged, while difficulties, technical or financial, were pointed out. The ICG currently led by the UK on EIA practices should constitute a valuable contribution.
2. Many supported the following proposals:

* Harmonizing national policies in terms of authorization processes, monitoring and implementation:
  + An enhanced dialogue between NCAs could help them identify and address common concerns and challenges, better share information, and work together towards a more harmonized approach in terms of compliance and enforcement. This dialogue could be strengthened by a specific NCA meeting in the margins of the ATCM, and/or a virtual meeting before each Antarctic season. A dedicated and up to date mailing list for NCAs could also be valuable in that regard.
  + Better use of the EIES could also be considered, for example to highlight and share information on the main activities they permit in the Antarctic treaty area.
* Improving the consistency of national systems with regard to gathering evidence and criminal proceedings:
  + Enhanced dialogue between NCAs could be useful in this regard.
  + Training, presentations, etc., could be considered to strengthen NCAs' compliance and enforcement capabilities.
* Encouraging and developing the conduct of on-board monitoring by the Parties:
  + Strengthening the dialogue among interested Parties to address the financial and technical challenges associated with the implementation of these observations.
  + Considering the extent to which the proposed fee for environmental monitoring, and the subsidiary committees that could be created in this regard, could also be used to support an international on-board observer framework.
  + An international pool of accredited observers, as a complement to current observation practices (IAATO’s mandatory scheme, national frameworks), could be considered. The CCAMLR framework could provide a valuable example to build on.

Building block 5: Overall governance

1. The attention of the participants was drawn to the opportunity of engaging in a more robust discussion in order to consider and design a comprehensive instrument dedicated to Antarctic tourism. Participants stated that the current approach is piecemeal, often not resulting in decision-making, which many believe is proving unsatisfactory.
2. The following points were made:

* Many participants recognized the value of such a comprehensive and coherent instrument and expressed interest in exploring this option within the ATCM process.
* Pros and cons of such a global instrument were discussed. A level playing field, providing more certainty for operators, political profile and support, shifting from a piecemeal approach to a comprehensive and consistent approach, enabling package deals, ensuring a future for the industry, and moving forward with regards to the Measures or annex of the Protocol that are yet to enter into force, were identified as pros, among others. Cons were mainly related to the challenging character of this approach, and subsequent questions that will arise (nature of the document, etc.).

1. The five Building Blocks put forward in the concept note circulated prior to the workshop are relevant in terms of the framework components that should be discussed. Safety should also be considered as an issue to be addressed in this context.

Day III – Afternoon session (Session 7) – Discussions on next steps, key elements for Working Papers and closure of the workshop

1. The Chairs presented a first overview of the discussions, as well as the next steps, underlining the general understanding in the workshop for the need of a dedicated approach and the need for the development of a dedicated coherent framework under the ATS They thanked participants for their active contributions to advance the development of a pro-active, precautionary approach and robust policy building blocks.
2. An Information Paper (the co-Chairs’ report), and a Working Paper, containing the specific proposals arising from the workshop, will be drafted by France and the Netherlands. Participants will be given the opportunity to cosponsor the WP.
3. The workshop is closed by the Chairs.
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