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Background

At CEP XXIV in Berlin the Committee discussed WP 27 Revisiting CEP strategic priorities and the CEP Five-Year Work Plan.

The Committee, while emphasizing that the CEP had functioned very well within the current Five-year Work Plan and had been successfully delivering on its mandate as outlined in Article 12 of the Environmental Protocol, nevertheless recognised the timeliness of reviewing its strategic priorities. The Committee considered this particularly relevant in light of changing circumstances and emerging issues.

The Committee agreed that it would revisit its priorities, the functioning of the Committee, and its Five-year Work Plan at CEP XXV.

The Committee agreed that this should be taken forward in the following manner:

* The Chair/CEP Bureau would be tasked with facilitating intersessional discussions to prepare for a workshop in Helsinki prior to CEP XXV, in collaboration with the host country, Finland.
* Discussions before and during the workshop would be open and inclusive of all Members and Observers.
* Members and Observers would be encouraged to facilitate participation in the intersessional discussions and workshop by early career researchers and policy makers/managers, as appropriate, and ensure diversity and inclusivity; and
* At CEP XXV in Helsinki, the Committee would consider the outcomes of the workshop and earlier intersessional discussions.

The Committee noted that during these considerations of CEP strategic priorities, efforts would be made to identify existing and new challenges. The Committee further noted that participants should be guided by the principles of the Environmental Protocol, drawing on best available science.

The timeliness of revisiting priorities

A revisit of the priorities and strategies was considered timely considering the amount of time that has passed since the original Five-Year Work Plan was adopted, and in light of new available knowledge and understanding of the Antarctic environment and challenges facing Antarctica.

In the fifteen years having passed since the adoption of the Five-Year Work Plan, the plan has guided the CEP well, and has been instrumental in further maturing the work of the Committee.

The current five-year work plan is based on the environmental challenges that in 2006 were considered to be the challenges most likely to face Antarctica over the next 15 years and beyond, and through this be a basis for devising policies, recommendations, and strategies to meet those challenges.

Many of the challenges faced in managing the Antarctic environment have remained the same as they were 15 years ago, such as climate change and non-native species. Nevertheless, there are new aspects and nuances to the challenges (rate of change, areas of risk, etc.) that were considered relevant to consider in context of future prioritisation of efforts. Furthermore, new challenges are emerging, such as use of and impacts caused by new technologies, plastic pollution, etc. Consequently, there was good cause to pause and consider whether these changes should and could impact the way the Committee prioritises its work.

In addition, the Committee itself has evolved over these 15 years, both in membership, approach to its work, interaction with ATCM, etc. This also provided cause for the Committee to consider whether it is and how it can most efficiently utilise the 5YWP as a tool to support its extensive and continuously expanding workload in a systematic and strategic manner.

A fuller historic review of the development of the first CEP 5YWP and its function over the last 15 years is held in CEP XXIV WP 27.

Intersessional discussions

Through three rounds of discussions on the CEP Discussion Forum Members and Observers provided input on the following issues that contributed to shape the background material for the informal CEP Workshop on CEP strategic priorities and 5-year work plan:

1. **Theme 1:** Identifying the main environmental challenges that should frame the CEP strategic priorities in the next 15-year period, and consider strategies/actions relevant/necessary for meeting these challenges (relevant for the CEP in fulfilling its mandate in accordance with Article 12 of the Protocol)
2. **Theme 2:** Consider and identify pathways for tackling the priority issues in an efficient, structured and goal-oriented manner.
3. **Theme 3:** Consider and suggest any required actions related to the format of the 5YWP and/or updating procedures.

Eleven Members and one Observer contributed to the informal intersessional discussions on the CEP Discussion Forum. During the discussions participants also provided valuable input to the framing of the CEP workshop itself.

The informal CEP Workshop on strategic priorities and the 5-year work plan

1. *Where, when and who*

The informal CEP Workshop on strategic priorities and the 5-year work plan took place in Little Finlandia, Helsinki on 25 and 26 May. 32 participants attended the workshop: from 16 Member countries, from 4 Observer organisations and the Antarctic Treaty Secretariat. The list of participants is provided in **Appendix 1**.

The workshop was generously supported by the Finnish Ministry of Foreign Affairs and the Finnish Ministry of the Environment.

1. *Workshop aim*

The aim of the workshop was threefold:

1. Using the outcomes of the intersessional informal discussions that had taken place since CEP XXIV – discuss, identify, and agree to those elements that could be the core in a revisited and revised 5-year work plan - specifically:
2. issues and topics that the Committee should focus efforts on in the coming period;
3. objectives for the Committee’s work on identified priority topics; and
4. priority actions with concrete outcomes to pursue under each of the priority topics.
5. Discuss and identify mechanisms and procedures that can assist the Committee in moving priority action items forward and monitor progress on these actions.
6. Initiate discussions aiming to assist the Committee in formulating its information and knowledge needs in an efficient and functional manner.

The workshop program was developed to reflect these overarching aims. The program is found in **Appendix 2**.

At the beginning of the workshop former CEP Chair Dr. Neil Gilbert set the scene for the discussions by giving a reflection presentation over the topic *Fulfilling Environmental Protection Objectives in Antarctica*, highlighting the crucial role of the CEP work plan is in ensuring Protocol objectives continue to be met.

1. *Draft revised 5-year workplan*

Through pre-workshop informal intersessional exchange on the CEP Discussion Forum and through two dedicated sessions at the workshop the following key elements for a draft revised 5-year workplan have been identified and developed.

1. **Priority Topics**: The discussions indicated that the current environmental challenges identified as priority areas in the CEP 5-year work plan (5YWP) were mostly still valid for the next 15-year period, although noting that there could be some room for restructuring and tidying up the plan (including merging of topics, etc.). There was also a clear call for adding Pollution as a new priority topic, noting the growing evidence that Antarctica is increasingly exposed to chemical stressors, and the many recent studies indicating that plastic pollution also is also found throughout the Antarctic environment. On basis of these discussions, one of the key outcomes of the workshop was an agreed set of 12 draft Priority Topics which could frame the Committee’s strategic work in the coming years.
2. **Priority**: The workshop participants briefly considered the level of priority for each of the Priority Topics, in line with the set-up in the current 5YWP. The initial consideration showed that while there is general agreement on priority level for some of the priority topics, there is a larger spread in views for many of them. During the workshop the question was raised whether the priority level has a practical function, noting that all items on the priority list have a high priority simply by being listed. It was suggested that further consideration is given to the issue of whether priority level is a necessary attribute to the priority topics before conducting any further discussion on specific priorities.
3. **Objectives**: Through discussions it became clear that it would be useful – for each Priority Topics - to set clear objectives against which planned CEP actions respond directly to and can be measured against. The workshop, through discussions, has developed proposed objectives for each of the Priority Topics, focusing on the content of the objectives thus far, rather than on their wording.
4. **Contextualizing the priority topics**: The pre-workshop discussions on the CEP Discussion Forum indicated that it may be useful to frame/contextualize the Priority Topics somewhat, to provide a clearer understanding of why the area is of importance (description of the issue) – assisting CEP Members (particularly new delegates) in pursuing the objectives associated with each Priority Topics. Through the informal discussions such context text has been proposed for all Priority Topics.
5. **Interlinkages between Priority Topics**: The pre-workshop discussions indicated that there is complexity in the interlinkages between most of the Priority Topics and that it would be useful to visualize these interlinkages in the 5-year work plan. A manner to visualise these interlinkages has been proposed as an outcome of the intersessional discussions.
6. **Priority actions**: Priority actions: The workshop revisited the actions currently listed in the 5-year work plan and discussed these in context of the proposed new Priority Topics and associated objectives. For each proposed Priority Topic, the workshop aimed to identify 3-5 priority actions that: were **relevant** to the objectives for that Priority Topic and to the CEP’s roles; made it **clear** what the CEP should do; were **achievable** with the resources and time available; and **measurable** with regard to progress. The workshop also considered the value of identifying ‘regular actions’, for visibility of the Committee’s must-do tasks (e.g. arising from the Protocol, CEP procedures or ATCM Decisions / Resolutions). Through the discussion proposed themes for priority actions were developed and included in the draft revised work plan. Further work will be required to develop these themes into specific priority actions that are **relevant**, **clear**, **achievable** and **measurable**.

An at-a-glance overview of proposed Priority Topics, Objectives is provided in **Appendix 3**.

A draft revised 5-year workplan including all elements described in the above is found in **Appendix 4**.

1. *How to action the actions*

The CEP has an agreed procedure for keeping its 5-year work plan updated with new actions, through ensuring that actions that are identified and agreed to during the discussions of the Committee at its meeting are recorded in the plan. The CEP does not, however, have many procedures or mechanisms that ensure that actions are set in motion. Most actions are set in motion by Members (one or a group) who have specific interest or feel a specific responsibility to move a specific action forward. This approach makes progress unpredictable, both as to whether the action is being taken forward at all and by who and as to the timeline of progress. However, the CEP does have a few mechanisms at its disposal that provide a clearer path for progressing actions, such as the establishment of intersessional contact groups to pursue an action or the holding of a workshop on specific issues.

Pre-meeting discussions on the CEP Discussion forum indicated that:

* there is room and need for more clarity around and focus on the actual implementation of action points;
* there is a need to have a better overview of which Members are working on which actions;
* that CEP delegates have numerous ideas and suggestions as to how to have a more robust approach to the implementation of actions; and
* that we need mechanisms that engage and include more Members in implementing the actions.

On this basis a full session at the informal CEP workshop was dedicated to pursuing these discussions, focusing in particular on 5 specific questions. The discussions during the workshop were wide and engaged. Some key components of the discussions are captured in the below. Fuller notes from the discussions will be made available on the CEP Discussion Forum for reference.

1. **What practical mechanisms are available to the Committee to actively address actions?**

The following mechanisms are actively being used today:

* The meeting itself
* Formal ICGs and Informal ICG, noting that it is not always clear what the difference is between this, and that further clarity could be needed.
* Workshops.
* Papers presented by one Members, or a group of Members working in collaboration.
* Setting up Subsidiary Groups to deliver longer-term issues.
* Secretariat Summary Papers of previous discussions on individual topics
* Requests to SCAR/COMNAP/etc.
* Bringing in external experts to talk about some topics (e.g. SCAR/CEP Protected Area workshop 2019).

The following mechanisms could be considered for future use:

* Virtual workshops
* Virtual meetings as part of ICG process and/or stimulate discussions on other action items.
* During CEP meetings: Seminar to discuss particular topic, longer sessions or creating time on the margins to have short workshops or meetings. This has not been done in the CEP before but has happened in the ATCM, e.g. climate day.
* Ask for volunteers to lead on topics/issues/actions, but need to consider how to get broader participation
* Mechanisms to create broader participation:
  + Create a CEP 101 guide (live, video, or other options) – to help new representatives find decisions and agreements appended to meeting reports; how things work, what we have, how an ICG functions, etc.
  + Mentor – encourage a less-active member to join the leader of an action to improve collaboration and provide learning and engagement.
* Produce a state of knowledge summary when starting work on a new topic.
* Engage experts outside of the CEP to increase communication with technical experts/scientist to share understanding of needs and interest – note that this is difficult as the meeting is relatively closed.
* Allow remote access via zoom for community to experience the meeting to understand how it works
* Have champions for priority topics or priority actions. Champion does not necessarily need to do the work but can contribute to drawing connections and linking people together to progress a particular action. Champion could encourage and connect with new CEP Members.
* Consider how we can carve out more time in the meeting – current approach to pre-meeting management plan reviews provide a useful example. However, note that it might not be realistic to do this in between meetings as there is not always enough time for people to participate.

1. **What types of actions require what type of approach?**

* Consider for each action, what is the nature of the work required to take forward an action? A small niche group might be appropriate for some actions whereas a broader policy stage of an action would need a more inclusive mechanism, like a workshop format or an ICG. Actions that are requests may require a unique approach.
* The table below provides an indication of what type of approach might be appropriate for what type of action, but flexibility must be maintained to consider on case-by-case basis.

Table of types of action and mechanisms for working.

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | | Actions | | | |
| Provision of information | Development of guidelines | Progress in a major topic | Major long-term issue, climate change, protected area |
| Mechanism | Paper by single Party | X |  |  |  |
| Paper by Group of Parties | X | X |  |  |
| Informal ICG |  | X |  |  |
| Formal ICG |  | X | X | X |
| In person Workshop |  | X | X | X |
| Subsidiary Group |  |  |  | X |

1. **How/when do we make decisions about approach?**

* Most decisions are made in the meetings themselves, often on the basis of a Member or group bringing forward a suggested path forward.
* However, it could be useful to adopt a more strategic approach at the meeting and consider the full range of mechanisms available before making a decision, ie.  consider the advantages and disadvantages of each mechanism available, to help us pick the most appropriate one. In this context, important to also understand what else is going on in the CEP. Are there already 3 ICGs going on?  Do we have the capacity to do a new one? What alternative approaches do we have?
* Informal/formal and the stage of development: If it is a new topic then more informal mechanism, if well-developed then formal.
* Could be useful to list how an action should be addressed in the work plan.
* Review the workplan during the meeting and/or consider and decide the approach during a specific agenda session.
* Need to maintain flexibility.

1. **How should the Committee:**
   1. *monitor and ensure progress against the work plan?*
      * Papers are identified by agenda item but don’t address the work plan item. It is mentioned in the text but this is hard to locate. So there could be merit in considering if the template of the paper could be changed to ask authors to identify what work plan item they address if relevant.
      * Review where we are at in the implementation of the work plan. Consider the burden of doing this administrative work and how it can be done in an efficient manner. One option would be that the Chair with the support of the Secretariat could log progress after each meeting. This could be done in combination with the listing of actions arising from the meeting, which is normally circulated after the meeting. Consider opportunities that build on the existing process to monitor progress. Another option would be that the Chair, with the support of the Secretariat does this in advance of meetings.
      * Regularly – eg. every (three) years -  allocate time to monitor progress in the work plan and discuss under agenda item 3 on the CEP agenda. Then identify next steps of an action and put them into the plan.
      * To what degree could Members report on where they are in the plan without this becoming a burden? If a Champion system is developed, there could be a role for the Champion to provide regular updates. Another option would be that Vice-chairs supervise topics and report on progress.
      * Consider a dashboard system to visualize progress or other ways of adding information (in a new column) about progress status.
   2. *adjust its agenda consistent with the work plan?*
      * Change agenda to have ‘focus topics’ to promote progress.  Members would be encouraged to provide papers on these topics. Pollution is an example where a new agenda item is to be created. However, important that the work plan should not dictate the agenda as flexibility is required for items of discussion.
   3. *engage the ATCM in its work plan?*
      * May be utility to look at solving mismatch in timing of getting request for action from ATCM which is then delayed by a year before the CEP can receive that request and start to respond.
      * Consider whether there is a way to ensure that the CEP is ‘in the room’ to respond to requests of the ATCM. CEP may say something is not possible, or may take X years to deliver, etc.
      * Consider connect between 5YWP and ATCM multi-year strategic plan.
      * Consider whether there would be utility in having the ATCM consider the CEP 5YWP and provide feedback. In particular maybe the importance of highlighting changes to the 5YWP when the CEP report is presented to the ATCM.
2. **How should the work plan be reviewed and updated?**

* Potential approach: annual revisions to reflect CEP meeting outcomes, three yearly time allocation to evaluate process and five (to ten) yearly review. Maintain sight on and reflect on progress throughout.
* Do a review of what has been achieved during the previous period as a starting point for large-scale reviews.
* Five yearly review could take place through workshop or ICG. Workshop attached to meeting helps with participation, or consider longer sessions during the annual meeting (e.g. go on later into the evening).

1. *How to formulate information and knowledge needs*

Session 4 concerned (i) the communication by the Committee of knowledge needs to relevant bodies and (ii) the mechanisms for receipt of knowledge from those bodies. The aims of the session were to:

* Consider current knowledge needs in light of identified priority actions and how we might formulate these needs so they are fit for purpose.
* Consider whether there are other science, knowledge and information needs needed to move actions forward.
* Note the difference between (i) wider knowledge needs and (ii) specific knowledge needs for identified actions.

Workshop participants were provided with a copy of the CEP’s ‘*List of science, knowledge and information needs identified in the CEP 5-Year Work Plan, CEP Climate Change Response Work Programme, CEP Final Reports and other CEP Manuals (2021)*’ (available at: <https://documents.ats.aq/cephandbook/ATCM43_att054_e%20(1).docx>)

As way of an introduction and to help inform the thinking of the workshop participants on this issue, a presentation was delivered by Dr. Susie Grant (Chief Officer of the SCAR Standing Committee on the Antarctic Treaty System; SC-ATS) entitled ‘*What does the science community/SCAR need from the CEP to enable action?*’.

The workshop participants were presented with the following set of questions. The collated responses are provided below.

**How can the CEP articulate its information needs? Who is the CEP articulating them to? How best do they receive information?**

* Communication of information needs is complex, with many different researchers and science bodies needing to be informed at both an international and national level. This makes two-way communication between policymakers and scientists regarding policy-relevant science needs a challenge.
* CEP could be more strategic and highlight which knowledge needs are most important. Not all information needs are equally urgent and we have to distinguish between (i) information coming from knowledge that already exists or (ii) the need for new research.
* The SCAR Standing Committee on the Antarctic Treaty System (SC-ATS) makes best efforts to understand CEP science needs and communicate them to researchers within SCAR. However, there may be opportunities for SC-ATS to improve communication and provide more guidance to researchers.
* It might be useful to have a regular specific session at the SCAR conference to discuss CEP science needs. The session would facilitate the communication of new and existing science needs, as well as allowing some feedback on how provision of earlier science progressed the work of the Committee.
* In general, scientists work on issues for which they have received funding. CEP’s policy needs have to be articulated to national science funding bodies so that appropriate resources can be allocated to relevant researchers.

**Is there a case for developing a structured approach to how the CEP articulates its information needs? If so, what would it look like?**

* Currently it is not always clear where existing knowledge requests came from or what action the CEP is meant to take once the information is received. Also, existing knowledge needs articulated by the CEP often lack context and are unclear about what is specifically required and when the information is needed by. Consequently, a revision of the list of science needs to remove duplication and tie the knowledge needs to a specific Action (or set or Actions) would greatly help in the communication of more focused science needs to relevant individuals and organizations, thereby ultimately helping the delivery of the Committee’s work.
* It might be useful to make a clear link between: Priority Topics → Actions → associated knowledge need. It may also be useful to note when knowledge needs are relevant to more than one Action.
* For each or a sub-set of Priority Topics, the Committee could identify a Priority Topic ‘champion’ to keep track of progress on the relevant Actions and the delivery of associated science needs. The role of the ‘champions’ would need to be defined clearly, in order to balance the need for someone to lead but yet not overload them with work.
* Careful consideration should be given to the best mechanisms for defining/stating the knowledge needs in a manner that is useful to researchers and other knowledge holders. The CEP may not be well-placed to undertake this step, but might require input from researchers or individuals with expertise in both science and policy within a given topic area. The CEP Chair, or Priority Topic champions could work with SCAR SC-ATS to develop relevant questions. To help explain the science needs, would it be useful for a CEP representative to be a standing member on SCATS? It may be possible for a nominated CEP representative to work with SCAR to discuss science questions and help with their formulation in a manner appropriate for researchers.
* Relationships need to be developed between CEP and other relevant knowledge bodies that can provide information relevant to the Topic Priorities. We note that this is already encouraged through Rule 7: *CEP shall consult with SCAR, COMNAP, CCAMLR, and other relevant scientific, environmental, and technical organizations*. CEP should consult with other bodies to ask how best it can communicate its information needs in the most appropriate manner. As a basis for continuous improvement, the Committee should seek feedback from SC-ATS/SCAR, or other bodies, on whether, or not, its existing science requests have had enough information or were formulated effectively.
* Some Priority Topics may require provision of information from bodies that operate outside of the Antarctic and work on global issues, e.g., long-range contaminants/pollution, or in regions facing similar, if not necessarily identical, issues, e.g., the Arctic. There may be opportunities for communication with these bodies by the CEP or, alternatively, by the Parties, who could then report back to CEP.
* The regular updating of the CEP Five-Year Work Plan and list of science needs, plus their effective communication to knowledge providers would be a good starting point.

**How does the CEP (i) keep track of and (ii) review progress against its information requirements? How could this be improved?**

* Consideration could be given to how information relating to science needs is communicated and received, e.g., the Committee could use a checklist, timeline or milestones to keep track of the status of a request and record amongst other things:
  + What did the Committee ask for?
  + To whom was the request made?
  + When was the request made?
  + Did the Committee/knowledge provider specify a deadline/target for provision of information?
  + Has the information been received?
  + Has the Committee considered the information and made any recommendations as a result of the provided information?
* The provision of an extra column on the Five-Year Work Plan or ‘List of science, knowledge and information needs’ might help track the status of information provision relevant to the topic in question.
* Keeping track of progress would be partly administrative and could be delivered through the Antarctic Treaty Secretariat. Securing funding for this would need further consideration, although use of assigned CEP funds might be a possibility. Alternatively, Priority Topic ‘champions’ may be well-placed to keep track of the receipt of information (see earlier).
* Should a paper be submitted to the CEP that contains information relevant to a Priority Topic, it would be useful if the paper noted which Priority Topic and Action it is relevant to, and this could be used to track progress on information delivery.
* For some questions, it may be hard to define progress regarding the provision of information if they are very general in nature. It may be useful to rephrase the questions or divide them into sub-questions.

**Are there new working mechanisms that could be established to help facilitate information flow back to the CEP?**

* The most appropriate mechanism for provision of information to the Committee may depend upon the nature of the question and the quantity, complexity and specificity of the associated information. Also, Parties may vary in how they communicate the knowledge needs of the CEP to their researchers and further thought on this issue at a national level my improve information flow.
* Several information bodies report regularly to the CEP (SCAR, COMNAP, WMO, IAATO, etc.). It would be useful to understand which information requests these bodies can respond to and potentially ask that information relevant to specific Actions be provided in their annual reports to CEP. It might be useful to map out which organizations can potentially provide information on different Priority Topics and target them specifically with information requests.
* The SCAR Antarctic Environments Portal provides useful information summaries on many topics but does not provide detailed information. Can the Portal be expanded in scope to help manage or act as repository for knowledge across both the specific and more general knowledge needs of the Committee? Also, could SCAR provide WP and IPs that relate to specific Actions within the CEP Five-Year Work Plan? Could SCAR run seminars on topics of direct relevance to the CEP Priority Topics?
* It is emphasized that decision-making should not be delayed until ‘all’ the relevant information becomes available. Rather, management practices should be based upon best available science and practices could change should better science become available.
* Knowledge should be provided to the Committee in a policy-ready format and be effective in informing subsequent policy responses. Use of maps, graphs, GIS systems, etc., may help to convey information to the Committee in a digestible way.

**If time permits: Look at current knowledge needs (i.e., in the Table ‘*List of science, knowledge and information needs identified in the CEP 5-Year Work Plan, CEP Climate Change Response Work Programme, CEP Final Reports and other CEP Manuals (2021)’*) and consider how they could be reframing to fit new action points (clear, relevant, etc…). Can you provide examples of how science questions could be better formulated?**

* The Table should indicate where information needs are relevant to multiple work plan priorities.
* The list could be colour coded to indicate priorities and/or progress in delivery.
* Many of the current science needs are very broad and lack context, making them difficult (impossible?) to answer.
* Some of the ‘needs’ are not actually information requests, but statements.
* There should be a clear linkage to the context so that it is obvious why an information request has been made.
* There could be more detailed information on short-term vs. long-term needs, where possible.
* Scientists and relevant experts should review the information needs in order to translate the CEP need into actionable requests.
* An additional column could be added to track progress on delivery of the requested science.
* Note that ideally the Table should not become too complicated, so as to stay user-friendly.

**Appendix 1: List of participants**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Argentina | Ortuzar, Patricia |
| ASOC | Roura, Ricardo |
| ATS | Wainschenker, Pablo |
| Australia | McIvor, Ewan |
| Belgium | Langerock, Stephanie |
|  | Vanstappen, Nils |
| Canada | Keast, Stephanie |
| China | Chen, Yitong |
|  | Yang, Lei |
|  | Zheng, Yingqin |
| COMNAP | Colombo, Andrea |
| Ecuador | Suárez Miño, Francisco José |
| Finland | Mähönen, Outi |
| France | Jolly, Maude |
|  | Ritz, Catherine |
| Germany | Duennwald, Sonja |
|  | Herata, Heike |
|  | Lindemann, Christian |
| India | Tiwari, Anoop Kumar |
| IAATO | Lynnes, Amanda |
| Monaco | Le Bohec, Celine |
| New Zealand | Poirot, Ceisha |
|  | White, Sophia |
| Norway | Høgestøl, Astrid Charlotte |
|  | Njåstad, Birgit |
|  | Storvik, Kristin |
| SCAR | Grant, Susie |
| Spain | Quesada Del Corral, Antonio |
| United Kingdom | Clarke, Rachel |
|  | Hughes, Kevin |
| United States | Penhale, Polly A. |
|  | Titmus, Andrew |

**Appendix 2: Workshop program**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **THURSDAY 25 May 2023** | |
| **Time** | **Topic** |
| 09:00 | * Opening Session (Chair: Birgit Njåstad) * Setting the Scene * Key note reflections: Neil Gilbert * Workshop Session 1: Priority Areas and their objectives (Chair: Birgit Njåstad) |
| 10:30 | COFFEE BREAK |
| 10:50 | * Workshop Session 1: Cont. |
| 12:30 | LUNCH |
| 13:30 | * Workshop Session 2: Priority Actions for the Priority Areas (Chair: Ewan McIvor) |
| 15:00 | COFFEE BREAK |
| 15:20 | * Workshop Session 2: Cont. |
| ~17:00/17:30 | End Day 1 & Departure to WORKSHOP GET-TOGETHER DINNER hosted by the Ministry of the Environment, Finland. Bus transportation and guided tour on the way. |
| ~20:30/21:00 | Return to hotels |
| **FRIDAY 26 May 2023** | |
| **Time** | **Topic** |
| 9:00 | * Workshop Session 3: How to action the actions (Chair: Polly Penhale) |
| 10:30 | COFFEE BREAK |
| 10:50 | * Workshop Session 3: Cont. |
| 12:30 | LUNCH |
| 13.30 | * Workshop Session 4: Knowledge needed to underpin actions (Chair: Kevin Hughes) |
| 15:00 | COFFEE BREAK |
| 15:20 | * Workshop Session 4: Cont. * Summarizing workshop outcomes and preparing for CEP XXV reporting * Concluding Session |
| ~17:00 | End Day 2 |

**Appendix 3:** **Priority Topics and objectives[[1]](#footnote-1)**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **1.** | **Environmental Pressure Priorities** |
| 1a. | **Management of non-native species & wildlife disease** |
| ***Draft Objective***: Facilitate monitoring of and surveillance for NNS and wildlife disease, particularly in high risk areas, and ensure that operators have enough tools to prevent and mitigate NNS and wildlife disease. |
| 1b. | **Impacts of Tourism and NGO activities** |
| ***Draft Objective***: Ensure a robust knowledge base, including monitoring, to understand the impacts of tourism and non-governmental activities, seen also in light of other environmental impacts and ongoing activities. Through CEP actions provide tools and guidance that limit environmental impacts. |
| 1c. | **Climate Change Implications for the Environment** |
| ***Draft Objective***: To support efforts within the Antarctic Treaty system to prepare for, and build resilience to, the environmental impacts of a changing climate and the associated implications for the governance and management of Antarctica through the implementation of the CCRWP. |
| 1d. | **Repair or Remediation of Environmental Damage** |
| ***Draft Objective:*** Through CEP actions facilitate actions to identify, respond to, repair and remediate environmental damage in Antarctica. Furthermore assess whether all actions that should have been taken with respect to repair and remediation have been taken and promote actions where it still may be required. |
| 1e. | **Response to Long-range and local Pollution** |
| ***Draft Objective***: Through CEP actions facilitate initiatives to track long-range pollution and enable Parties to respond appropriately, including communication to/with relevant global organizations. Furthermore, provide guidance and tools to monitor, reduce and respond to local pollution (primarely chemical and plastic pollution). |
| **2.** | **Management Response Priorities** |
| 2a. | **Facilitating monitoring and state of the environment reporting** |
| ***Draft Objective***: Encourage coordinated and systematic monitoring efforts. Enable reporting on state and trends for key environmental values in Antarctica. |
| 2b. | **Contributing to marine spatial protection and management** |
| ***Draft Objective***: Support monitoring, protection and management of [key] marine species and processes and areas within the framework of the provisions of the Environmental Protocol. |
| 2c. | **Systematic approach to the protected areas system** |
| ***Draft Objective***: Assess the effectiveness of the current series of ASPAs with regard to the provisions of Article 3.2 of Annex V and provide a framework for a systematic further development of the protected area system. |
| 2d. | **Implementing and improving the EIA provisions of Annex I** |
| ***Draft Objective***: Ensure clear guidance to all those responsible for activities in Antarctica on conducting appropriate assessments of the activities. Assist through guidance material Parties in assessing, authorizing and permitting activities on basis of EIAs. Allow for a continuous improvement of EIA process, including EIA follow-up. |
| 2e. | **Understanding and protecting Antarctic Biodiversity** |
| ***Draft Objective***: Keep up to date and take into account trends in biodiversity and threats and implement relevant management actions with respect to [unique] Antarctic Biodiversity [and/or biodiversity at risk]. |
| 2f. | **Designating and managing Historic Sites and Monuments** |
| ***Draft Objective***: Provide Parties with guidance and support in assessing and managing heritage. |
| **3.** | **Operational Priorities** |
| 3a. | **Effective Operation of the CEP and Strategic Planning** |
| ***Draft Objective***: Ensure that the CEP systematically, works to provide advice in implementing the objectives of the Protocol to the ATCM prioritized, strategic and efficient manner. Facilitate for a broader participation by Members in the work of the Committee. |

**Appendix 4: *Draft* Revised Five-Year Work Plan[[2]](#footnote-2)**

|  |
| --- |
| **1. Environmental Pressure Priorities** |

|  |
| --- |
| **1a. Management of non-native species & wildlife disease** |
| **Priority:** |
| **Context:** Antarctica’s biodiversity and its intrinsic values are potentially at risk from the introduction of non-native species, derived from a range of sources including human activities. Whilst controls on introducing plants and invertebrates are now in place, limited attention has so far been given to microorganisms that comprise the majority of the Antarctic terrestrial biomass and are highly dispersive. Because of steadily growing human activities on the continent and climate change trends, the risk of non-native organisms arriving and establishing is likely to increase. Regionality: This issue is particularly important in the Antarctic Peninsula region, ie. those areas of Antarctica where human activity is high and climate is changing rapidly. |
| **Interlinks with:** Climate change implications, Tourism and NGO activities, Monitoring and state of the environment reporting, Biodiversity knowledge |
| **Objectives:** Facilitate monitoring of and surveillance for NNS and wildlife disease, particularly in high risk areas, and ensure that operators have enough tools to prevent and mitigate NNS and wildlife disease. |
| **THEMES FOR POTENTIAL Priority Actions**   1. Reporting on implementation of biosecurity measures and the NNS manual 2. Development of a rapid response mechanism for use in the instance of a wildlife disease outbreak 3. Development of surveillance strategy for areas at high risk of wildlife disease   **REGULAR ACTIONS**:   * Review the progress and contents of the CEP Non-native Species Manual |
| ***WORKPLAN TO BE DEVELOPED*** |
| **Science knowledge and information needs:** |

|  |
| --- |
| **1b. Impacts of Tourism and NGO activities** |
| **Priority:** |
| **Context:** Tourism and non-governmental activities in the Antarctic have grown steadily since they began in the 1950s. The numbers of tourists and tour operators have increased as has the number and geographic spread of sites being visited. The range of activities being undertaken has also diversified. It is recognised that tourism has the potential to result in impacts on the environmental, intrinsic, wilderness, aesthetic, and scientific values of Antarctica. Unforeseen cumulative impacts may also arise. Future development of Antarctic tourism and the associated environmental implications and potential management responses need to be considered, also in the context of other pressures being faced in the region, such as climate change. Regionality: This issue is particularly important in the Antarctic Peninsula region, ie. that area of Antarctica where tourism is most intense and growing/expanding. It is nevertheless also important to keep an eye on land-based tourism, which seems to be increasing. |
| **Interlinks with: N**on-native species & wildlife disease, Climate change implications, Environmental Damage, Pollution, Monitoring and state of the environment reporting, EIA provisions, Biodiversity knowledge |
| **Objectives:** Ensure a robust knowledge base, including monitoring, to understand the impacts of tourism and non-governmental activities, seen also in light of other environmental impacts and ongoing activities. Through CEP actions provide tools and guidance that limit environmental impacts. |
| **THEMES FOR POTENTIAL Priority Actions:**   1. Develop mechanism for rapid considerations of changes to existing Visitor Site Guidelines 2. Discuss, and prepare as appropriate a framework for an environmental monitoring programme to assess the impacts of tourism (with a future aim of looking at sensitivity and carrying capacity) 3. Develop framework for pre-assessment relating to new, novel or particularly concerning activities *[NOTE – could be an action under EIA]*   **REGULAR ACTIONS**:   * Regular review of all existing Visitor Site Guidelines to ensure that they are accurate and up to date, including precautionary updates where appropriate. |
| ***WORKPLAN TO BE DEVELOPED*** |
| **Science knowledge and information needs:** |

|  |
| --- |
| **1c. Climate Change Implications for the Environment** |
| **Priority:** |
| **Context:** Observations, modelling and global assessments describe significant changes in Antarctic physical and living systems, both marine and terrestrial. Changes in Antarctic and Southern Ocean environments are linked to and influence climate impact drivers globally. While climate change has global impacts and will contribute to ecosystem disruption and loss of biodiversity beyond the Antarctic region, the impacts on the Antarctic environment itself are also of immeasurable concern. Although climate change may benefit some Antarctic species in the short-term, by expanding the size of ice-free areas available for breeding, or with warmer waters increasing biological productivity in the ocean, the loss of habitat for some species, the threat of non-native species establishing and outcompeting native species, and the loss of natural heritage values are some of the potential negative implications of climate change. Regionality: This issue is of continent-wide importance, although there are substantial variations in the degree of change and therefore implications as a consequence of change. |
| **Interlinks with:** Non-native species & wildlife disease; Monitoring and state of the environment reporting; Biodiversity knowledge |
| **Objectives:** To support efforts within the Antarctic Treaty system to prepare for, and build resilience to, the environmental impacts of a changing climate and the associated implications for the governance and management of Antarctica through the implementation of the CCRWP. |
| **THEMES FOR POTENTIAL Priority Actions:**   1. Implement the Climate Change Response Work Programme and keep it updated.   **REGULAR ACTIONS:**   * Consider subsidiary group report, including CCRWP updates |
| ***WORKPLAN TO BE DEVELOPED*** |
| **Science knowledge and information needs:** |

|  |
| --- |
| **1d. Repair or Remediation of Environmental Damage** |
| **Priority:** |
| **Context:** Environmental damage in Antarctica might occur as the result of chemical, physical or biological processes resulting from human activities in the region and might occur as a result of one-off or irregular activities, emergency situations as well as situations in which the environment has been impacted or degraded over longer periods of time. For example, chemical impacts might arise from pollution events, such as the critical failure of a fuel tank; a coastal shipping disaster, or the slow degradation of abandoned bases; leaking fuel tanks, or waste dumps. Physical impacts might arise from regular foot and vehicle traffic causing tracking, or damage to vegetation, as well as from the establishment and ongoing operation of Antarctic stations and bases. Biological impacts might arise through the introduction and establishment of non-native species. The environmental and geographic characteristics of Antarctica means that response actions and approaches used elsewhere may need to be adapted, while taking into account the high standards of environmental protection in Antarctica relative to many other parts of the world. Regionality: This issue is of continent-wide importance, wherever there has been or is human activities ongoing. |
| **Interlinks with: P**ollution; Climate change implications |
| **Objectives:** Through CEP actions facilitate actions to identify, respond to, repair and remediate environmental damage in Antarctica. Furthermore assess whether all actions that should have been taken with respect to repair and remediation have been taken and promote actions where it still may be required. |
| **THEMES FOR POTENTIAL Priority Actions:**   1. Develop guidance for the establishment of an Antarctic wide inventory of sites of past activity. 2. Develop guidance for remediation of past sites of activity. 3. Implement a process for assessments of and reporting on sites relevant for remediation. 4. Develop framework for reporting on actions taken and experiences gained with respect to remediation activity.   **REGULAR ACTIONS:**   * Continuous review of the Manual. Parties to work on the development of new techniques or guidelines |
| ***WORKPLAN TO BE DEVELOPED*** |
| **Science knowledge and information needs:** |

|  |
| --- |
| **1e. Response to Long-range and Local Pollution** |
| **Priority:** |
| **Context:** Antarctica is one of the cleanest, least polluted places on Earth. However, there is growing evidence that Antarctica is increasingly exposed to chemical stressors, both long-range transport of chemical contaminants and pollutants and local discharges. Some of these chemicals can become concentrated in the Antarctic biota. Microplastic pollution has also been found in Antarctica, but the presence and effects of microplastics within food webs are still little understood. Regionality: This issue is of continent-wide importance, |
| **Interlinks with:** Climate change implications; Environmental damage |
| **Objectives:** Through CEP actions facilitate initiatives to track long-range pollution and enable Parties to respond appropriately, including communication to/with relevant global organizations. Furthermore, provide guidance and tools to monitor, reduce and respond to local pollution (primarily chemical and plastic pollution). |
| **THEMES FOR POTENTIAL Priority Actions:**   1. Framework for systematic sampling and data collection of chemical contamination in the Antarctic 2. Develop mechanism for updates on status and trends of pollutants in Antarctica. 3. Assess the need for guidance /regional plan on avoiding pollution. |
| ***WORKPLAN TO BE DEVELOPED*** |
| **Science knowledge and information needs:** |

|  |
| --- |
| **2. Management Response Priorities** |

|  |
| --- |
| **2a. Facilitating monitoring and state of the environment reporting** |
| **Priority:** |
| **Context:** In order to develop relevant management actions to meet the overarching objectives of the Environmental Protocol to protect the Antarctic environment it is helpful and necessary to understandand report onif and how the Antarctic environment, on continental, regional and local scale is changing, including understanding how human activities contribute to those changes. Environmental monitoring is fundamental to assessing and understanding change on all scales. Regionality: This issue is of continent-wide importance. |
| **Interlinks with:** Climate change implications; Biodiversity knowledge; Tourism and NGO activities; Environmental Damage; Pollution |
| **Objectives:** Encourage coordinated and systematic monitoring efforts. Enable reporting on state and trends for key environmental values in Antarctica. |
| **THEMES FOR POTENTIAL Actions**   1. Develop objectives for enviro monitoring; operational (i.e. human activities) vs environmental indicators of change vs. success of implementation of measures, etc. 2. Undertake a gap-analysis on what monitoring is already being conducted. 3. Consider and facilitate the development of possible mechanisms to facilitate access to monitoring data |
| ***WORKPLAN TO BE DEVELOPED*** |
| **Science knowledge and information needs:** |

|  |
| --- |
| **2b. Contributing to marine spatial protection and management** |
| **Priority:** |
| **Context:** The marine environment and the terrestrial environment in Antarctica are closely intertwined, where numerous biological and physical processes are connected to both realms in one way or the other. Protection and management activities in the one realm, therefore need to be seen in the context of the other. The Environmental Protocol aims to protect the Antarctic environment and associated and dependent ecosystems, which clearly links the continent and the surrounding ocean. While CCAMLR is the key engine for marine spatial protection and management in Antarctica, the ATCM can make complementary decisions within its competence to support robust marine spatial management.Regionality: This issue is of continent-wide importance. |
| **Interlinks with:** The protected areas system; Climate change implications; Biodiversity knowledge; Monitoring and state of the environment reporting |
| **Objectives:** Support monitoring, protection and management of [key] marine species and processes and areas within the framework of the provisions of the Environmental Protocol. |
| **THEMES FOR POTENTIAL Priority Actions:**   1. Identify needs for additional measures for spatial marine protection and management measures. 2. Use tools to work with SC-CAMLR to progress spatial protection and management.. 3. Consider connectivity between land and ocean 4. Advice on complementary actions that could be taken by Parties with respect to MPAs, incl. advice relating to Resolution 5 (2017). 5. Initiate action on managing threats to the near shore marine environment (e.g. pollution, microplastics, etc.) 6. Gather information on non-CCAMLR activities and their impact within MPAs and marine ASPAs |
| ***WORKPLAN TO BE DEVELOPED*** |
| **Science knowledge and information needs:** |

|  |
| --- |
| **2c. Implementing a systeamtic approach to the protected areas system** |
| **Priority:** |
| **Context:** Annex V to the Protocol on Environmental Protection to the Antarctic Treaty (the Protocol) establishes a framework for designating Antarctic Specially Protected Areas (ASPAs) and Antarctic Specially Managed Areas (ASMAs). These areas are intended to support the objective of protecting comprehensively the Antarctic environment. Important work has been done to underpin the development of a representative series of ASPAs, including spatial analyses to identify distinct ‘Environmental Domains’ and ‘Antarctic Conservation Biogeographic Regions’. The Antarctic Treaty Parties have agreed that these spatial frameworks are useful references to guide the designation of ASPAs within a systematic environmental-geographic framework, and the Committee for Environmental Protection (CEP) has recognised the need for a more systematic approach to the development of the protected area system. Regionality: This issue is of continent-wide importance. |
| **Interlinks with:** Climate change implications, Tourism and NGO activities, Biodiversity knowledge |
| **Objectives:** Assess the effectiveness of the current series of ASPAs with regard to the provisions of Article 3.2 of Annex V and provide a framework for a systematic further development of the protected area system. |
| **DRAFT POTENTIAL Priority Actions:**   1. Assess the extent to which Antarctic IBAs are or should be represented within the series of ASPAs. 2. Undertake work to advance actions agreed by the Committee from discussions on the protected areas workshop (2019) [consider copying or linking to recommendations] 3. Consider further mechanisms for protection of outstanding geological values [and wilderness].   **REGULAR ACTIONS:**   * + Maintain and develop Protected Area database. |
| ***WORKPLAN TO BE DEVELOPED*** |
| **Science knowledge and information needs:** |

|  |
| --- |
| **2d. Implementing and improving the EIA provisions of Annex I** |
| **Priority:** |
| **Context:** The Protocol requires an EIA to be undertaken prior to an activity occurring in Antarctica, and applies to almost all scientific, logistical and non-governmental activities that occur in the region. The EIA process is a key tool in helping to meet the Parties’ ambitions of protecting the Antarctic environment. The real benefit is the contribution it can make to planning an activity. Building EIA concepts into the processes and procedures for organising an activity from the very beginning, helps to increase the rigour of the planning process and greatly improves the identification of alternative, more environmentally friendly options. Increasing pressures on the Antarctic environment (through for example climate change and expanding human activity) means that the management benefits of the EIA tool will be more and more important. It is therefore important to continue to review and, where appropriate, improve the effectiveness of the Antarctic EIA system. |
| **Interlinks with:** Climate change implications, Tourism and NGO activities, Biodiversity knowledge |
| **Objectives:** Ensure clear guidance to all those responsible for activities in Antarctica on conducting appropriate assessments of the activities. Assist through guidance material Parties in assessing, authorizing and permitting activities on basis of EIAs. Allow for a continuous improvement of EIA process, including EIA follow-up. |
| **THEMES FOR POTENTIAL Priority Actions:**   1. [Refine the process for considering CEEs and advising the ATCM accordingly]. 2. Develop guidelines for assessing cumulative impacts. 3. Review EIA guidelines and consider wider policy advising ATCM on updating, stengthening or otherwise improving existing rules and measures. 4. Consider application of strategic environmental assessment in Antarctica. 5. Develop guidance on how to do an environmental baseline condition survey   **REGULAR ACTIONS:**   * Review draft CEEs as required |
| ***WORKPLAN TO BE DEVELOPED*** |
| **Science knowledge and information needs:** |

|  |
| --- |
| **2e. Understanding and protecting Antarctic Biodiversity** |
| **Priority:** |
| **Context:** Fundamental knowledge about the environment is required in order to understand changes, impacts, risks, which species are found where, what are their dynamics, etc. While significant advances have been made in recent years, Antarctica’s biological and ecological domains remain, to a large extent, unexplored. This hampers efficient management actions. Regionality: This issue is of continent-wide importance. |
| **Interlinks with:** Climate change implications; Monitoring and state of the environment reporting, protected areas system; EIA provisions |
| **Objectives:** Keep up to date and take into account trends in biodiversity and threats and implement relevant management actions with respect to [unique] Antarctic Biodiversity [and/or biodiversity at risk]. |
| **THEMES FOR POTENTIAL Priority Actions:**   1. Consider status and threats to Antarctic biodiversity to inform management/protection of Antarctic biodiversity. 2. CEP to consider further scientific advice on wildlife disturbance [define wildlife disturbance]. 3. Assess the protection of Antarctic seals 4. Continue informal discussions on the recommendations in CEP XXIV - WP 34.   REGULAR ACTIONS:   * + Consider the conservation status of Antarctic species threatened by climate change (link to CCRWP). |
| ***WORKPLAN TO BE DEVELOPED*** |
| **Science knowledge and information needs:** |

|  |
| --- |
| **2f. Designating and managing Historic Sites and Monuments** |
| **Priority:** |
| **Context:** Humans’ presence in Antarctica is, seen in the global context, extremely short. Since the first sighting of the continent in 1820, the extent to which humans have left their mark here is relatively limited. In such a context, the limited historical evidence of a connection between man and land becomes extremely visible and special. Parties therefore have given full recognition to the historic sites, structures and objects as part of humankind’s cultural heritage. The Environment Protocol makes the Historic Sites and Monuments (HSM) list the key mechanism for the protection of historic values in Antarctica. |
| **Interlinks with:** Tourism and NGO activities; Climate Change Implications; The protected areas system |
| **Objectives:** Provide Parties with guidance and support in assessing and managing heritage. |
| **THEMES FOR POTENTIAL Priority Actions:**   1. Develop criteria for maintenance and management of HSMs, especially in the context of changing climate change and the impact on the environment and therefore the needs of the site. 2. Implement a regular review process (within 15 years cycles) of HSMs for effectiveness of management/conservation plans (if relevant) with regards to climate change and it's impacts on the special values and potential clean up. 3. Further develop criteria for the Conservation Management Plan for a site. |
| ***THE WORKPLAN WILL BE INSERTED HERE*** |
| **Science knowledge and information needs:** |

|  |
| --- |
| **3. Operational Priorities** |

|  |
| --- |
| **3a. Effective Operation of the CEP and Strategic Planning** |
| **Priority:** |
| **Context:** The CEP was established under the Protocol to the Antarctic Treaty to advise the ATCM on matters relating to the protection of the Antarctic environment. After more than 25 years of work, the Committee has consolidated itself as a highly relevant and important component of the Antarctic Treaty system. The CEP agenda is normally full and broad and the Committee is many ways “the workhorse of the ATCM”. Focus on strategic planning provides for CEP activities focused on the environmental issues requiring the greatest attention. |
| **Interlinks with:** |
| **Objectives:** Ensure that the CEP systematically, works to provide advice in implementing the objectives of the Protocol to the ATCM prioritized, strategic and efficient manner. Facilitate for a broader participation by Members in the work of the Committee. |
| **THEMES FOR POTENTIAL Priority Actions:**   1. Use the 5YWP more actively to frame the CEP meetings. 2. Consider long-term objectives for Antarctica (50-100 years’ time). 3. Consider opportunities for enhancing the working relationship between the CEP and the ATCM. 4. [Consider opportunities for enhancing broader participation by Members in the work of the Committee] 5. Implement a regular review of priorities based on ATCM requirements and changing circumstances.   **REGULAR ACTIONS:**   * + Keep the five-year work plan updated. |
| ***WORKPLAN TO BE DEVELOPED*** |
| **Science knowledge and information needs:** |

1. Gist of objectives discussed and provided through informal workshop. Wording will be finetuned through further process. [↑](#footnote-ref-1)
2. Note: The gist of the objectives listed here were discussed and provided through informal workshop. Wording will be finetuned through further process. The actions held in in this draft have been identified by the CEP informal workshop as relevant actions to develop further to make them relevant, clear, achievable and measurable. [↑](#footnote-ref-2)