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Summary

Belgium, Türkiye and the United Kingdom have prepared a draft Antarctic Specially Protected Area Management Plan for Farrier Col, Horseshoe Island, Marguerite Bay, following support from the Committee for Environmental Protection (CEP) at CEP XXIV. Belgium, Türkiye and the United Kingdom recommend that the CEP refer the draft Management Plan to the Subsidiary Group on Management Plan (SGMP) for intersessional review.

Introduction

At CEP XXIV, Belgium, Türkiye and the United Kingdom submitted ATCM XLIV WP38, which provided a prior assessment for a proposed new ASPA on Farrier Col, Horseshoe Island, Marguerite Bay, Antarctic Peninsula. The information was provided in a form consistent with the purpose and provisions of the *Guidelines: A prior* *assessment process for the designation of ASPAs and ASMAs* and outlined the environmental, scientific, wilderness and aesthetic values of the proposed ASPA.

The proposed ASPA would afford protection to oligotrophic lakes that are of outstanding scientific value. Sediment cores from one of the lakes contains material radiocarbon dated to 36,000 years old, with unequivocal evidence of biological occupation from 29,000 years ago for aquatic mosses and 21,000 years ago for zooplankton. This is the longest known biological occupation of any lake in the Antarctic Peninsula region, most being less than 9000 years old.  Thus, these lakes were likely refugia for species through the last glacial cycle – one of very few locations like this.

The proposed ASPA would also protect environmental values associated with the lakes, which are representative of the small number of similar water bodies found in the region. Oligotrophic lakes of the southern Antarctic Peninsula are not currently represented in the protected area network. The lakes also contain the freshwater shrimp *Branchinecta gaini* (the largest freshwater invertebrate in Antarctica), which is at the southern extent of its range. The proposed area also has considerable wilderness and aesthetic values.

The Committee agreed that the values of the proposed ASPA merited special protection and endorsed the development of a Management Plan for the area led by the three proponents. It also encouraged interested Members and Observers to work with the proponents informally during the intersessional period in the development of a Management Plan for potential submission at CEP XXV (CEP XXIV Report, para. 118).

***Development of the draft Management Plan***

During the intersessional periods, Belgium, Türkiye and the United Kingdom prepared a draft Management Plan for the proposed ASPA (see Attachment A) in accordance with the requirements of Annex V to the Protocol and the *Revised guide to the preparation of Management Plans for Antarctic Specially Protected Areas*, appended to Resolution 2 (2011) (a Cover Sheet is provided at Annex A).

***Recommendations***

The draft Management Plan is submitted for consideration by the Committee for Environmental Protection. Consistent with the *Guidelines for CEP Consideration of New and Revised Draft Management ASPA and ASMA Management Plans*, Belgium, Türkiye and the United Kingdom recommend that the CEP refer the draft Management Plan to the Subsidiary Group on Management Plan (SGMP) for intersessional review.

***Annex A.***

**ASPA No. XXX Farrier Col, Horseshoe Island, Marguerite Bay**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **1. Is a new ASPA proposed?** | Yes |
| **2. Is a new ASMA proposed?** | No |
| **3. Does the proposal relate to an existing ASPA or ASMA? [[1]](#footnote-1)**  (If so, list all Recommendations, Measures, Resolutions and Decisions pertaining to this ASPA/ASMA, including any previous  designations of this area as an SPA, SSSI or other type of protected area. In particular, please include the date and relevant Recommendation/Measure for the following: | No |
| First designation: | N/A |
| First adoption of management plan: | N/A |
| Any revisions to management plan: | N/A |
| Current management plan: | N/A |
| Any extensions of expiry dates of management plan: | N/A |
| Renamed and renumbered by Decision 1 (2002) as: | N/A |
| Other relevant measures: | N/A |
| **4. If the proposal contains a revision of an existing management plan, please indicate the types of amendment:** | |
| (i) major or minor? | N/A |
| (ii) any changes to the boundaries or co-ordinates? | N/A |
| (iii) any changes to the maps? If yes, are the changes in the captions only or also in the graphics? | N/A |
| (iv) any change to the description of the area that is relevant to identifying its location or its boundaries? | N/A |
| (v) 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. | N/A |
| (vi) Other - brief summary of other types of changes, indicating the paragraphs of the management plan in which these are located (especially helpful if the plan is long). | N/A |
| **5. If a new ASPA or ASMA is proposed, does it contain any marine area?** | No |
| **6. If yes, does the proposal require the prior approval of CCAMLR in accordance with Decision 9 (2005)?** | N/A |
| **7. If yes, has the prior approval of CCAMLR been obtained?** | N/A |
| If yes, please provide the CCAMLR Final Report and Paragraph No. | N/A |
| **8. 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)?** | (b) representative examples of major terrestrial, including glacial and aquatic, ecosystems and marine ecosystems  (e) areas of particular interest to ongoing or planned scientific research  (g) areas of outstanding aesthetic and wilderness value |
| **9. 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 to Resolution 3 (2008).)**  If yes, the main Environmental Domain should be noted here. | Yes, Environment Domain B - Antarctic Peninsula mid-northern latitudes geologic |
| **10. 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, ACBR 3: North-west Antarctic Peninsula |
| **11. 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**.** | None |

1. [↑](#footnote-ref-1)