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***Summary***

During the 2021-22 intersessional period the Subsidiary Group on Management Plans (SGMP), in accordance with its Terms of Reference 1 to 3, reviewed one draft Antarctic Specially Protected Area (ASPA) management plan referred by the Committee for intersessional review. The SGMP recommends that the Committee adopts the attached revised management plan for ASPA 145 Port Foster, Deception Island, South Shetland Islands.

Also, under its Terms of Reference 4 and 5, the SGMP cconsidered options for efficient pre-meeting review of revised management plans submitted to the CEP for consideration and adoption, based on experiences from the pre-meeting subforum review of revised management plans to CEP XXIII.

At CEP XXIII, interested Members participated in the Agenda Item 9a pre-meeting subforum review of revised Management Plans during CEP XXIII. They raised issues and proposed edits, many of which were addressed prior to the meeting. The establishment of the pre-meeting discussions on management plans was a response to the shortened, virtual meeting in 2021. The review of draft management plans is an important and increasing task for the CEP and it is appropriate for the Committee to consider ways to promote efficient consideration during the annual meeting, while providing the opportunity for all interested Members and Observers to contribute to ensuring management plans are clear, consistent, and likely to be effective. A summary of the options considered is provided for CEP consideration

SGMP also discussed with SGCCR and proposed to undertake the task within the purview of SGMP mandate under ToR 4&5.

1. ***Tasks agreed by CEP XXIII for the work of the SGMP during the intersessional period***

For the intersessional period 2021-22 the SGMP had been commissioned to work under the Terms of Reference (ToR) agreed by CEP XIII (Appendix A) and in relation to the tasks incorporated in the Work Plan of the Group, as agreed by CEP XXIII which is presented below, as reflected in paragraph 153 (CEP XXIII Final Report):

| Terms of Reference | Suggested tasks |
| --- | --- |
| ToRs 1 to 3 | Review draft management plans referred by the CEP for intersessional review and provide advice to proponents (including the four pending plans from previous intersessional period) |
| ToRs 4 and 5 | Work with relevant Parties to ensure progress on review of management plans overdue for ﬁve year review |
| Based on experiences from the pre-meeting subforum review of revised management plans to CEP XXIII, consider options for efficient pre-meeting review of revised management plans submitted to the CEP for consideration and adoption. |
| Review and update SGMP work plan |
| Working Papers | Prepare report for CEP XXIV against SGMP ToRs 1 to 5. |

The SGMP was convened by the CEP Vice-Chair from India. SGMP members (CEP Members and Observers) participated in the intersessional work, noting that the draft management plan for ASPA 145 Port Foster was available for comment from any CEP member during the SGMP process. Discussions took place using the CEP Discussion Forum.

1. ***Task under Terms of Reference 1 to 3.***
2. **Review of the draft management plan for ASPA 145 Port Foster, Deception Island, South Shetland Islands**

At CEP XXIII (2021) Chile and Spain submitted Working Paper 39 rev.1 *Revised Management Plan for Antarctic Specially Protected Area No. 145 Port Foster, Deception Island, South Shetland Islands*. Noting the major changes, including the proposed addition of a new sub-site to the ASPA, the Committee agreed with the proponents’ recommendation to refer the draft revised management plan to the SGMP for review in the intersessional period (CEP XXIII Final report, para. 83). The SGMP’s review of the management plan was coordinated by the SGMP member from Australia.

In October 2021, the SGMP convener issued an invitation to all CEP contact points to submit comments on the draft management plan.

In December 2021 the SGMP provided its initial advice to the proponents, recommending some modifications to the draft revised management plan. The SGMP’s full advice is available on the Discussion Forum. In particular, the group suggested that the proponents:

* provide a clearer and expanded the description of the special features / values of the Area (for all three sub-sites);
* clarify the vertical and horizontal extent of the Area (for all-subsites), including by reviewing and updating the boundary coordinates and improving the representation of the Area boundary in the map(s);
* clarify provisions for accessing the area, in particular transit by ships / small boats and reflecting these on supporting maps; and
* improve the map(s) to show key features and management provisions for the Area.

The SGMP advised that, with these and other minor modifications, the plan was likely to be effective in achieving the stated objectives for management of the Area.

In February 2022 Chile and Spain provided an updated draft management plan and a separate document explaining its responses to the SGMP’s advice. The SGMP reviewed the updated draft, with members providing further suggestions to the proponents during late February and early March 2022. These comments mostly related to clarifying the description of the Area boundaries, and ensuring the boundaries were accurately shown in the maps.

On 17 March 2022 Chile and Spain provided a further updated draft management plan and maps. The SGMP concluded that the updated draft management plan was well written, of high quality, and adequately addressed the key points raised in its earlier advice. The resulting revised draft management plan is presented in Attachment A to this Working Paper. Introductory comments and a coversheet prepared by Chile and Spain are presented at Appendix B.

*Advice to the CEP*

**The SGMP recommends that the CEP approves the revised management plan prepared by Chile and Spain for ASPA 145 “Port Foster, Deception Island, South Shetland Islands”(Attachment A).**

1. **Review of other draft Management Plans under ToRs 1 to 3**

At CEP XV (2012) the Committee considered draft revised management plans prepared by Chile for ASPA 144 'Chile Bay' (Discovery Bay), Greenwich Island, South Shetland Islands and ASPA 146 South Bay, Doumer Island, Palmer Archipelago, and decided to refer these management plans to the SGMP for intersessional review (CEP XV Final Report para. 92). At CEP XVII (2014) the Committee considered further draft revised management plans prepared by Chile for ASPA 125 Fildes Peninsula, King George (25 de Mayo) Island and ASPA 150 Ardley Island (Ardley Peninsula), Maxwell Bay, King George (25 de Mayo) Island, and decided to refer these management plans to the SGMP for intersessional review (CEP XXVII Final Report para. 153).

At CEP XXI (2018), Chile submitted WP *11 Status of Antarctic Specially Protected Area No. 144, Chile Bay (Discovery Bay), Greenwich Island*, which reported on an analysis of the status of ASPA 144, and recommended that the Committee evaluate the continuing need for protection of the area as an ASPA. Noting planned work to develop guidance / criteria for delisting ASPAs, the Committee welcomed Chile’s willingness to keep the proposal under consideration, and noted that it would be appropriate for the SGMP’s consideration of the management plan to be placed on hold, pending further discussions and decisions on the possible de-designation of the Area. At CEP XXIII (2021) the Committee adopted *Guidelines for de-designation of ASPAs* (CEP XXIII Final Report Appendix 3).

The SGMP has reported to previous meetings regarding its review of the draft management plans for ASPA 125 Fildes Peninsula and ASPA 146 South Bay. The management plans are still under review by the proponent (Chile), so there is no progress to report at the time of the presentation of this paper.

1. ***Task under ToRs 4 and 5***
2. **“Work with relevant Parties to ensure progress on review of management plans overdue for five year review”**

Through the SGMP forum, Parties were invited to contact the SGMP if they so wished. No requests were received from Parties that may need advice to initiate the five-year review of Management Plans, but we should recall that the SGMP is available to advise, facilitate or guide the review tasks when necessary. A list of the Management Plan of ASPA and Antarctic Specially Managed Area (ASMA) due for review during ATCM XLIV is available via link at ATS website, <https://www.ats.aq/devphBackEnd/StatusReport/pdf?lang=e>.

Based on experiences from the pre-meeting subforum review of revised management plans to CEP XXIII, consider options for efficient pre-meeting review of revised management plans submitted to the CEP for consideration and adoption.

During XLIII-ATCM (virtual CEP XXIII, 2021) required new approaches to ensure that our important work was completed, despite the reduced meeting time available for discussions. The Chair of the CEP organized a series of subforums so that views on the many papers submitted could be exchanged and discussed prior to the actual CEP meeting. During this pre-meeting activity, no decisions were made and all materials were available for discussion during the CEP. A summary of each forum was prepared in the form of a “non-paper” that was translated. The formal conclusion of discussions was taken during the virtual CEP meeting.  
  
The United States coordinated the subforum on agenda item 9a (Management Plans). At CEP XXIII, the coordinator suggested that the Subsidiary Group on Management Plans (SGMP) in the future could consider options for efficient pre-meeting review of revised management plans submitted to the CEP for consideration and adoption. Members requested that the SGMP discuss how to improve the management plan review process and report back to the Committee with suggestions on how to increase its efficiency (CEP XXIII report para 14). In this regard discussion started in CEP web forum under the task of SGMP (ToR 4-5).

**Proposed Pre-Meeting review of ASPA and ASMA Management Plans**

**Background**

Annex V to the Protocol on Environmental Protection to the Antarctica Treaty, entitled *Area Protection and Management*, established a system of Antarctic Specially Protected Areas (ASPAs) and Antarctic Specially Managed Areas (ASMAs). This Annex details elements required for ASPA and ASMA Management Plans and states that a review of a Management Plan shall be initiated at least every five years. Given that there are currently more than 80 ASPAs and ASMAs, the review of Management Plans for a given Committee for Environmental Protection (CEP) meeting could require a considerable amount of discussion time on the floor of the meeting.

CEP XXIII (2021) was held virtually, which limited the amount of time available for discussions for all agenda items. The Chair of the CEP organized a series of subforums so that views on the many papers submitted could be exchanged and discussed prior to the actual CEP meeting. During this pre-meeting activity, no decisions were made and all materials were available for discussion during the CEP. A summary of each subforum was prepared in the form of a “non-paper” that was translated. The formal conclusion of discussions was taken during the virtual CEP meeting.

Polly Penhale from The United States served as the Moderator for the subforum on Agenda Item 9a (Management Plans). The subforum discussions were well supported, with twelve Members and two Observers participating in the review of the proposed new and revised Management Plans for twenty-eight ASPAs and one ASMA. A result of the cancellation of the 2020 ATCM/CEP meeting was an usually large group of Management Plans to review for the 2021 meeting. However, due to the large number of current ASMAs and ASMAs, and the probability that the system of ASPAs and ASMAs could expand in the future, it is likely that the number of plans to review for each CEP meeting will increase over time.

The pre-meeting review resulted in a number of issues being raised that could be addressed prior to the meeting. One issue was the use of an outdated Cover Sheet (also referred to as the Checklist) for a Working Paper on an ASPA or ASMA (Template A, Annex to Resolution 2 (2021) “*Revised Guide to the presentation of Working Papers containing proposals for Antarctic Specially Protected Areas, Antarctic Specially Managed Areas or Historic Sites and Monuments”.)* This resulted in the lack of an identification of Important Birds Areas within the ASPA or ASMA in several Management Plans. Other issues included editorial matters such as spelling errors, missing map or figure legends; incorrect species names; lack of clarification on matters such as handling of poultry waste or use of RPAS, etc. Early identification of such issues provided time for Members to submit a Rev. 1 of the Management Plan, if appropriate. Early identification also allowed Members to identify issues for which clarification or further discussion during the CEP was required.

At CEP XXIII, the coordinator suggested that the Subsidiary Group on Management Plans (SGMP) in the future could consider options for efficient pre-meeting review of revised Management Plans submitted to the CEP for consideration and adoption. Members requested that the SGMP discuss how to improve the management plan review process and report back to the Committee with suggestions on how to increase its efficiency.

**Recommendation for a pre-meeting review of Management Plans**

This Discussion Paper proposes a pre-meeting review of new and revised Management Plans submitted to the CEP for consideration and endorsement. The process is based on the success of the 2021 subforum established for Agenda Item 9a. The pre-meeting review process aims to encourage those Members and Observers who have interest and expertise in Management Plans in general and with knowledge and familiarity of regional or site-specific environments to comment on the submitted Management Plans prior to the CEP meeting. Issues raised and suggested edits presented prior to the meeting would provide an opportunity for the proponent(s) of a Management Plan to consider comments and to provide responses to or revisions of the plans prior to the meeting. A summary of the pre-meeting discussions, with recommendations from the pre-meeting review would be presented to all Members. The formal conclusion of discussions would be taken during the CEP meeting.

**Elements of a pre-meeting review of Management Plans**

Step 1

A Moderator for the pre-meeting review of Management Plans would be identified by the Convener of the SGMP. The Moderator could be the Convener of the SGMP or the Convener could appoint another CEP member. The Secretariat may provide assistance as needed.

Step 2

Following the Working Paper deadline, the Moderator would review each Working Paper presenting a Management Plan to ensure that the Cover Sheet (Checklist) is the current version. This Cover Sheet identifies whether the proposed Management Plan is considered “Major” or “Minor” and thus provides a good guide for those Members reviewing the plan. The Moderator would also identify obvious editorial issues, such as missing maps or missing figure legends. The Moderator could then inform proponents of such issues. Such early and direct advice from the Moderator would allow proponents to submit revisions prior to the start of the pre-meeting review.

Step 3

The Moderator would organize the Management Plans into a spreadsheet, sorted by Antarctic Conservation Biogeographic regions (Resolution 3 (2017)) and by the Environmental Domains Analysis for the Antarctic Continent (Resolution 3 (2008)). This spreadsheet could help Members focus on areas of interest and expertise.

Step 4

The Moderator would post the Pre-meeting Discussion Subforum on the SGMP webpage. This would include an Opening Message with spreadsheet, as well as separate entries for each of the Management Plans for review. Members would be able to comment on the individual plans as appropriate. A deadline for comments would be included.

Step 5

The Moderator would prepare an overview report of the pre-meeting subforum discussion. The overview with recommendations would be organized into several threads:

* Thread 1: Draft Management Plans which have been reviewed by the Subsidiary Group on Management Plans.
* Thread 2a: Revised draft Management Plans which have not been reviewed by the Subsidiary Group on Management Plans and which are proposed to be adopted with no revisions.
* Thread 2b: Revised draft Management Plans which have not been reviewed by the Subsidiary Group on Management Plans and which are proposed to be adopted with minor revisions.
* Thread 2c: Revised draft Management Plans which have not been reviewed by the Subsidiary Group on Management Plans and which are proposed to be adopted with major revisions.
* Thread 3: Revised draft Management Plans which have not been reviewed by the Subsidiary Group on Management Plans and which are proposed submitted to the SGMP for intersessional review.

The Moderator or the Chair of the SGMP would introduce the results of the pre-meeting subforum. As an example, for CEP XXIII, recommendations were made as follows:

* The proposed Management Plans for new ASPAS which had undergone intersessional review by the SGMP are endorsed;
* Those Management Plans in Thread 2a and 2b which received support without edits in the discussion are endorsed as proposed;
* Those Management Plans in Thread 2a for which edits were resolved are endorsed as edited;
* Those Management Plans in Thread 2a for which recommended edits were not resolved would be addressed during the 9a discussions; and
* The Management Plans in Thread 3 is recommended for transmission to the SGCP for intersessional review, per request of proponents.

**Suggested timeline for the operation of the pre-meeting review**

Setting the dates of the pre-meeting review depends on the Working Paper deadline and the time at which the management plans (translated if necessary) are posted in the ATS website.

* 6 weeks prior to the CEP meeting: Working Paper submission deadline
* 6 weeks prior to the CEP meeting: Moderator begins to review management plans and may contact the proponent directly prior to the posting below, to identify obvious issues as described above
* 4 weeks prior to the CEP: Initial Posting of the Opening message, accompanied by the individual management plans under review
* 4 to 1.5 weeks prior to the CEP: Moderator begins to assemble a spreadsheet of issues raised and outcomes of the discussion
* 1.5 weeks prior to the CEP: End of Comments on the management plans:
* 1 week prior to the CEP: Summary of Discussions to the SGMP Convener

**Suggested Summary Report to the SGMP Convener**

There are several models of how a summary of the discussions could be presented to the Convener. For CEP XXIII, the report included a summary of the number of Members and Observers who took part in the review of x number of ASPAs and ASMAs. For each Thread, a brief summary of the outcome of discussion was stated. Recommendations were made as to whether the Management plans could be recommended for adoption as proposed or revised, where discussion is recommended for Management plans for issues were not resolved, where transmission to the SGMP for intersessional review is recommended. Again, the recommendations are only advisory and any Member could call for discussion of a management plan during the CEP.

Accompanying the Summary Report was a spreadsheet. Pertinent information was assembled in a spreadsheet with the following column headers:

ASPA Number, Proponent, Commenter, Issue(s), Outcome, and Discussion needed?

The Outcome column identified results, detailed in the Report, such as “Proponent submitted a Rev 1”, “Sub-forum discussion did not lead to a resolution”, “Some issues resolved, some remain for discussion”, etc. The “Discussion Needed ?” column identified whether the Moderator suggested that no discussion would be needed at the CEP based on the outcomes of the pre-review or whether discussion would be required for resolution.

**Summary**

At CEP XXIII, interested Members participated in the Agenda Item 9a pre-meeting subforum review of revised Management Plans during CEP XXIII. They raised issues and proposed edits, many of which were addressed prior to the meeting. This work in advance of the meeting did not preclude discussion at the full meeting, but served to reduce time for discussion of individual revised plans.

The establishment of the pre-meeting discussions on management plans was a response to the shortened, virtual meeting in 2021. The review of draft management plans is an important and increasing task for the CEP and it is appropriate for the Committee to consider ways to promote efficient consideration during the annual meeting, while providing the opportunity for all interested Members and Observers to contribute to ensuring management plans are clear, consistent, and likely to be effective.

Looking ahead to in-person meetings, such freed-up time within the overall CEP meeting could be used for other regular agenda items. Another idea would be to set aside one session not associated with the normal agenda business, but devoted to brainstorming about pressing topics or having a panel-led discussion on emerging topics. This could help engage a broader group of Members and Observers in advancing the work of the CEP.

**Recommendation to the CEP**

It is recommended that the CEP adopt the establishment of a pre-meeting subforum on the review of revised Management Plans, such as the approach in advance of CEP, as a standing practice as outlined in this discussion paper.

1. ***Review and update SGMP work plan***

The proposed additional task of SGMP considering SGCCR Report

‘During ATCM XL (2017), a decision was made to establish the CEP Subsidiary Group on Climate Change Response (SGCCR) to facilitate implementation of the Climate Change Response Work Programme (CCRWP) that was adopted through Resolution 4 (2015).  Issue 2 ‘Change to the terrestrial (including aquatic) biotic and abiotic environment due to climate change’ of the CCRWP (2016) included the Action to: ‘Review and revise where necessary existing management tools to consider if they aﬀord the best practical adaptation measure to areas at risk from climate change’. In order to deliver this Action, the SGMP and SGCCR Convenors discussed options to support a programme of work to develop guidance for addressing climate change in the process of identifying and managing protected areas, including identifying within which Subsidiary Group this work should reside.  It was proposed that this work is undertaken by the SGMP as an additional task under SGMP Term of Reference #5 ‘*Develop and suggest procedures that would assist in achieving a long-term goal aiming at ensuring that all ASPA and ASMA management plans contain adequate content, and are clear, consistent and likely to be effective*’, with the work considered and potentially undertaken during the intersessional period (2022-23).

1. ***Proposed Work Plan for the SGMP, for the intersessional period 2022-23***

The SGMP proposes the following Work Plan, to which other actions that CEP XXIV may consider appropriate may be added.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Terms of Reference** | **Suggested tasks** |
| ToR 1 to 3 | Review draft management plans referred by CEP for intersessional review and provide advice to proponents (including the three pending plans from previous intersessional period) |
| ToR 4 and 5 | Work with relevant Parties to ensure progress on review of management plans overdue for ﬁve year review |
| Review and update SGMP work plan |
| To develop guidance for addressing climate change in the process of identifying and managing protected areas (SGCCR action) |
| Working Papers | Prepare report for CEP XXV against SGMP ToR 1 to 5 |

1. ***Other issues: Operational matters, SGMP Members***

The current list of members of the SGMP is as follows:

* Anoop Kumar Tiwari (India) – anooptiwari.ncpor@nic.in
* Astrid Høgestøl (Norway) –[astrid.hogestol@npolar.no](mailto:astrid.hogestol@npolar.no)
* Ceisha Poirot (New Zealand) – [c.poirot@antarcticanz.govt.nz](mailto:c.poirot@antarcticanz.govt.nz)
* Ewan McIvor (Australia) - [Ewan.McIvor@aad.gov.au](mailto:Ewan.McIvor@aad.gov.au)
* Heike Herata (Germany) - [heike.herata@uba.de](mailto:heike.herata@uba.de)
* Kevin Hughes (the United Kingdom) – [kehu@bas.ac.uk](mailto:kehu@bas.ac.uk)
* Martín Andrés Díaz (Argentina) - [ydz@mrecic.gov.ar](mailto:ydz@mrecic.gov.ar)
* Polly Penhale (the United States) – [ppenhale@nsf.gov](mailto:ppenhale@nsf.gov)
* Verónica Vallejos (Chile) – [vvallejos@inach.cl](mailto:vvallejos@inach.cl)

Observers:

* Amanda Lynnes (IAATO) - [alynnes@iaato.org](mailto:alynnes@iaato.org)
* Claire Christian (ASOC) - [claire.christian@asoc.org](mailto:claire.christian@asoc.org)

Parties are invited to propose more members to the Group. Nonetheless, we should recall that all CEP members are invited to participate in the discussions or intersessional tasks that are established.

1. ***Advice to the CEP***

The SGMP provides the following advice to CEP:

* That the three management plans pending in the previous periods continue to be within the scope of the SGMP, in order to provide advice once the proposing country has made the revised versions available to the Group and that the CEP endorses the proposal to explore mechanisms and additional tools to facilitate the review of pending plans.
* That the CEP approves the management plan; ASPA 145 “Port Foster, Deception Island, South Shetland Islands.
* That the CEP consider under ToRs 4-5 options for supporting proponents to conclude the revision of management plans that remain under the scope of the SGMP for several intersessional periods
* That the CEP consider. the establishment of a pre-meeting subforum on the review of revised Management Plans, such as the approach in advance of CEP, as a standing practice
* That the CEP consider to undertake task under the action plan of SGCCR to develop guidance for addressing climate change in the process of identifying and managing protected areas
* That the CEP consider the Work Plan and suggests appropriate modifications if needed, based on the deliberations during CEP XXIV.

***Appendix 1 Revised Terms of Reference for the Subsidiary Group on Management Plans. (CEP XIII. Final Report. Appendix 1)***

1. Examine any draft new or revised Management Plan to consider, in consultation with relevant experts if appropriate:

* whether it is consistent with the provisions of Annex V to the Protocol, particularly Articles 3, 4 and 5[[1]](#footnote-1), and with relevant CEP guidelines[[2]](#footnote-2);
* its content, clarity, consistency and likely effectiveness[[3]](#footnote-3);
* whether it clearly states the primary reason for designation[[4]](#footnote-4); and
* whether it clearly states how the proposed Area complements the Antarctic protected areas system as a whole[[5]](#footnote-5).

1. Advise proponents of suggested amendments to the draft Management Plan to address issues in relation to 1) above.
2. Submit a Working Paper to the CEP with recommendations for the adoption or otherwise of each new or revised draft Management Plan, identifying where the Plan reflects comments received by Members, and where they have not been, the reasons for not doing so. The Working Paper is to include all revised Management Plans and the information required by the ATCM’s Legal and Institutional Working Group.
3. Provide advice to the CEP as necessary for the purpose of improving Management Plans and the process for their intersessional review.
4. Develop and suggest procedures that would assist in achieving a long-term goal aiming at ensuring that all ASPA and ASMA management plans contain adequate content, and are clear, consistent and likely to be effective[[6]](#footnote-6).

***Appendix 2: Introductory Comments by Chile and Spain***

**Revised management plan for ASPA No. 145, Port Foster, Deception Island, South Shetland Islands**

In 1987, due to the proposal presented by Chile, two Port Foster sites were designated as SSSI No. 27, under Recommendation XIV-5, to protect the benthic values associated with two types of seabed, at depths of between 50 and 150 m (sub-site A), and between 100 and 150 m (sub-site B). The site was renamed ASPA No. 145 in accordance with Decision 1 (2002). After two extensions of the management plan, a revised version was approved and incorporated into the package for the Antarctic Specially Managed Area (ASMA) No. 4, Deception Island.

Studies carried out by the Spanish Antarctic Programme indicate the southern sector of Port Foster, the zone surrounding Fildes Point, contains remarkable marine biodiversity associated to the rocky bottoms, hardly found at other locations within Port Foster. Given that this sector is also the zone within the island that receives the most vessels with visitors, Chile and Spain considered necessary to give the site protection including it as a new sub-site of ASPA No. 145.

The draft management plan was presented to CEP XXIII (2021) attached to ATCMXLIII WP39 rev.1 *Revised Management Plan for Antarctic Specially Protected Area No. 145 Port Foster, Deception Island, South Shetland Islands*. CEP XXIII referred the draft management plan to the Subsidiary Group on Management Plans (SGMP) for review during the intersessional period 2021-2022.

In response to comments received from the SGMP, Chile and Spain refined the revised management plan including clarifying the description of the values to be protected; clarifying the information of the three proposed sub-sites, A and B, and the new sub-site C; correcting the boundary coordinates of sub-site A; including the location of Deception Island in the Antarctic Peninsula region (Map 1), new bathymetric cartography (Map 3); modifying Map 2 (former Map 1) with more recent topography and the bathymetric cartography embedded on it, including also the 11 subsites of ASPA 140; clarifying the description of the benthic species present within the Area, including a new Figure 2 with representative pictures of the sites; including new information about the geological and volcanic characteristics of Port Foster, and about the sight of other animals; clarifying the access to the Area and the movement within it; improving the description of the removal of artefacts at the seabed within the Area; and improving the wording to report the activities to be developed. The literature has been revised and the recently published papers have been referenced.

This review is aimed at improving the conservation of the benthic marine fauna in a unique environment within Antarctica.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| ***ASPA No. 145 PORT FOSTER, DECEPTION ISLAND*** | |
| 1. **Is a new ASPA proposed?** | No. |
| 1. **Is a new ASMA proposed?** | No. |
| 1. **Does the proposal relate to an existing ASPA or ASMA?** | Yes. After two extensions of the management plan, |
| First designation: | SSSI No. 27 |
| First adoption of management plan: | Recommendation XIV-5 (1987) |
| Any revisions to management plan | A revised version was approved through Measure 3 (2005) |
| Current management plan | Measure 3 (2005) |
| Any extensions of expiry dates of management plan: | Two extensions, approved by Measure 2 (2000) and Measure 5 (2009). |
| Renamed and renumbered by Decision 1 (2002) as: | ASPA No. 145. |
| Other relevant measures: | The Area was incorporated into ASMA No. 4, Deception Island, by Measure 3 (2005). |
| 1. **If the proposal contains a revision of an existing management plan, please indicate the types of amendment:** | |
| 1. major or minor? | There are both substantial and minor amendments. |
| 1. any changes to the boundaries or coordinates? | Yes. The protected area is expanded with a sub-site in the southeast sector of Port Foster. |
| 1. any changes to the maps? If yes, are the changes in the captions only or also in the graphics? | Yes. Changes in the captions and also in the graphics. A new bathymetric map is also included. |
| 1. any change to the description of the area that is relevant to identifying its location or its boundaries? | Yes. Changes in the description of the sub-sites, including a new third one (sub-site-C); polygons that delimit the sub-site A was corrected. |
| 1. any changes that affect any other ASPA, ASMA or HSM within this area or adjacent to it? In particular, please explain any merger with, incorporation of or abolition of any existing area or site. | No. |
| 1. Other – brief summary of other kinds of changes, indicating the paragraphs of the management plan in which these are located   (especially helpful if the plan is long). | Modifications to clarify the information are presented in the following sections:   * Introduction, in paragraphs 1, 2, 4, 5, 7. Also, new paragraphs were included (3, 6 y 8) and one was deleted. * 1, Description of Values to be Protected, in paragraphs 1, 2, 3 and 6. New paragraphs were included (4 and 5), and one was moved to the Introduction. * 2, Aims and Objectives, in bullets 1 and 4. A new bullet was included, for non-native species, and one was deleted. * 3, Management activities, in the five bullet points. * 5, Map and Figures, two new maps were included (location of Deception Island in relation to AP and SSI (Map 1) and a bathymetric map of Port Foster (Map 3)), and the map presenting the three sub-sites in Deception Island was modified (Map 2). One new figure was included. * 6 (i) Geographical coordinates, boundary markers and natural features, text was corrected in GENERAL DESCRIPTION and new text was included in paragraph 2.   In BOUNDARIES a new paragraph 1 was included to describe the Area; boundaries points for sub-sites A and B were corrected (para. 2 and 3) and a new two paragraph (4 and 5) were included. For sub-site C part of the text was corrected and new text was included (para. 6), as part of the text was moved to section 1, and a new paragraph was included (para. 7).  New information to describe GEOLOGICAL AND VOLCANIC CHARACTERISTICS was included (para. 1 to 3).  In BENTHIC SPECIES new text was included in paragraphs 1 and 3, while part of the text was modified in paragraph 4.  New information about OTHER ANIMALS was included at the end of the section.   * 6(ii) Access to the Area, the text was modified and corrected, presenting now four paragraphs. * 6(iii) Location of structures within and adjacent to the Area, words were corrected in paragraph 2. * 6(iv) Location of other protected areas in the vicinity, a new paragraph 1 was included and text was modified in paragraph 2. * 6(v) Special Zones within the Area, the text was modified. * 7(i) General permit conditions, text were corrected in bullet points 1 and 5. * 7(ii) Access to and Movement within or over the Area, the text was modified and new information was included, presenting now 5 paragraphs. * 7(iii) Activities which may be conducted within the Area, two new bullet points (4 and 5) were included. * 7(iv) Installation, modification or removal of structures, two new bullet points were included (4 and 5). * 7(v) Location of field camps, the text was modified and corrected. * 7(vi) Restrictions on materials and organisms that may be brought into the Area, new text was included in paragraphs 2 and 3. * 7(vii) Taking of, or harmful interference with, native flora and fauna, a new paragraph was included (para. 3). * 7(viii) The Collection or removal of materials not brought into the Area by the permit holder, text was modified in paragraph 3 and a new paragraph was included (para. 4). * 7(x) Measures that may be necessary to continue to meet the aims of the Management Plan, text was modified in paragraph 2, and a new paragraph was included (para. 3). * 7(xi) Reporting requirements, the text was totally modified and new paragraphs included (4 and 5). * 8, Supporting Scientific Documents, were updated with information on the results of the studies carried out in the Area. |
| 1. **If a new ASPA or ASMA is proposed, does it contain a marine area?** | It is not a new area, but it contains a marine area. |
| 1. **If yes, does the proposal require the prior approval of CCAMLR in accordance with Decision 9 (2005)?** | Although it is a site where CCAMLR activities do not take place, it does require their consideration. |
| 1. **If yes, has the prior approval of CCAMLR been obtained?** | Yes. |
| If yes, please provide the CCAMLR Final Report and Paragraph No. | In 2012, the CCAMLR Scientific Committee reaffirmed the importance of this area for scientific research, stating that it will probably not be exploited and recommending approval of the management plan (para. 5.61 and 5.62), which was ratified by the Commission the same year (para. 5.63 (i) and 5.64). |
| 1. **If the proposal relates to an ASPA, what is the primary reason for designation (*i.e.* which part under Article 3.2 of Annex V)?** | The area is protected mainly because it pertains to a unique marine ecosystem of special interest for scientific research. |
| 1. **If relevant, have you identified the main Environmental Domain represented by the ASPA/ASMA? (Refer to the ‘Environmental Domains Analysis for the Antarctic Continent’ appended on Resolution 3 (2008).)**   If yes, the main Environmental Domain should be noted here. | Yes, the main associated domain is G. |
| 1. **If relevant, have you identified the main Antarctic Conservation Biogeographic Region represented by the ASPA/ASMA? (Refer to the ‘Antarctic Conservation Biogeographic Regions’ appended to Resolution 6 (2012).)**   If yes, the main Antarctic Conservation Biogeographic Region should be noted here. | Yes, the ACBR 3, in the Northeast Antarctic Peninsula. |
| 1. **If relevant, have you identified any Antarctic Important Bird Areas (Resolution 5 (2015)) represented by the ASPA/ASMA? (Refer to the ‘Important Bird Areas in Antarctica 2015 Summary’ appended to ATCM XXXVIII - IP 27 and the full report available at:** [**http://www.era.gs/resources/iba/**](http://www.era.gs/resources/iba/)**)**   If yes, the Important Bird Area(s) should be noted here | No. |

1. Modified from “Terms of Reference for an Intersessional Contact Group to Consider draft Management Plans” ToR #2 (CEP VII Report, Annex 4). [↑](#footnote-ref-1)
2. Currently including – for ASPAs – Resolution 2 (1998) Guide for the Preparation of Management Plans for Antarctic Specially Protected Areas and Resolution 1 (2000) Guidelines for Implementation of the Framework for Protected Areas set forth in Article 3, Annex V of the Environmental Protocol. [↑](#footnote-ref-2)
3. From “Guidelines for CEP Consideration of New and Revised Draft ASPA and ASMA Management Plans” paragraph 8 (CEP VI Report, Annex 4), and “Terms of Reference for an Intersessional Contact Group to Consider draft Management Plans” ToR #2 (CEP VII Report, Annex 4). [↑](#footnote-ref-3)
4. Agreement at CEP VIII (Report paragraph 187). [↑](#footnote-ref-4)
5. Agreement at CEP VIII (Report paragraph 187). [↑](#footnote-ref-5)
6. Term of Reference added at CEP XIII (Report paragraph162) [↑](#footnote-ref-6)