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Abstract

At the 43rd ATCM (Paris, 14-24 June 2021), ‘India recalled its IP 104, submitted to ATCM XXXVIII, which had summarised recommendations pending in relation to tourism and non-governmental activities in the Antarctic Treaty area. India proposed updating the paper to present to ATCM XLIV to facilitate discussions.’[[1]](#footnote-1)

This Information Paper (IP) is based on the assumption that the past ATCM discussions have amply shown that a strategic vision of –and approach to a pragmatic yet robust action plan is to be seen in conjunction with –and not in divorce- from the larger concerns related to authority, legitimacy and effectiveness of governance both on land and at sea. A proactive, precautionary and persistent approach --combining the best practices of government standard setting and IAATO’s regulatory framework— holds the key to realizing an effective strategic action plan for Antarctic tourism and its multifaceted, multi-spatial and multi-scalar regulation. It shows –with the help of a few examples-- how the term ‘strategic’ has been understood, approached, analysed and discussed at the ATCMs over the past decades.

It is hoped that this IP would also provoke the ATCM discussions on what ‘building back better’ could –and *should*—mean for Antarctic governance in general and Antarctic tourism regulation in particular, by highlighting (through selective italicization of certain sections of text[[2]](#footnote-2)) some of the enduring concerns and key policy insights and recommendations that have accumulated over the past few decades at the ATCMs. In some respects, it also speaks to the astute reference made by ASOC in IP 81[[3]](#footnote-3) at the Paris ATCM (June 2021) to the need for developing Antarctic specific ways of ‘building back better’ in the larger context of building resilience for the Antarctic as a natural reserve devoted to peace and science, and its multi-layer governance in totality; including Antarctic environment and dependent and associated ecosystems.[[4]](#footnote-4) The Netherlands in WP 35 *Permanent facilities for tourism and other non-governmental activities in Antarctica*, has also made an important reference to the principle of ‘building back better’.

The IP is structured as follows:

1. Introduction: Conceptualizing ‘Building Back Better’ *in* and *for* the Antarctic?

2. Origins and Evolution of ‘Strategic’ Vision for Antarctic Tourism in ATCM Discussions

3. From Strategic Vision to Strategic Action

4. India’s Understanding of Strategic Vision of and Approach to Antarctic Tourism

1. Introduction: Conceptualizing ‘Building Back Better’ in and for the Antarctic

As pointed out in a seminal study on the subject[[5]](#footnote-5), the multi-dimensional term ‘Building Back Better’, has received a great deal of academic and policy attention in ‘post disaster environments’ after the 2004 Indian Ocean Tsunami, and the International Building Back Framework (IBBF) has three major categories --i.e., disaster risk management; community recovery and effective implementation-- and eight principles; namely structural resilience, multi-hazard based land-use planning, psychological and social recovery, economy recovery, institutional mechanism, legislation and regulation, monitoring and evaluation. A recent OECD study titled ‘*Building Back Better: A Sustainable Resilient Recovery after COVID 19’*, points out that ‘unchecked, global environmental emergencies such as climate change and biodiversity loss could cause social and economic damages far larger than those caused by COVID-19’, and ‘Biodiversity and natural infrastructure such as forest, wetland and mangrove ecosystems, are essential inputs for many economic activities, and are central to hundreds of millions of livelihoods. Natural ecosystems are also essential pillars of resilience. *Yet most of this natural capital is undervalued in the economy, or valued only as a harvestable commodity and not for the vital ecosystem services provided*.’[[6]](#footnote-6) (emphasis added).

***What does ‘Building Back Better’ mean in case of Antarctic tourism?***

The question needs critical reflection by all the stakeholders. Our colleague from the Netherlands have already made reference to both the term and the desirability of internalizing it for Antarctica in WP 35, *Permanent Facilities for Tourism and Other Non-Governmental Activities in Antarctica*.[[7]](#footnote-7) Similar to IP 104 Rev (Sofia, ATCM, 2015), this Information Paper adopts the following classification of key Antarctic tourism stakeholders provided in a seminal study on the subject:[[8]](#footnote-8) (a) *Regulators*: ‘government representatives directly involved in Antarctic policy’; (b) *Organisers*: ‘tour operators and industry representatives’; and (c) *Monitors*: ‘representatives of environmental NGOs and Antarctic tourism researchers’.[[9]](#footnote-9) While doing so it takes due cognizance of diverse perspectives and priorities within each category of stakeholder, and the role played by wider geopolitical, geoeconomic and legal contexts and trends.

2. Origins and Evolution of ‘Strategic’ Vision for Antarctic Tourism in ATCM Discussions

**The IP 104 Rev (Sofia, ATCM, 2015)**had shown that many of the issue-areas related to the regulation of Antarctic tourism have remained on the ATCM agenda, and, in some cases even repeatedly discussed over a long period of time. The IP 104 also invited attention to the fact that both the texts and the contexts of several enduring concerns too have changed over the past five decades or so. As the numbers of stakeholders in Antarctic governance and their concerns have multiplied over the years, the value of a building-block approach to the ‘strategic vision’ and the importance of making good use of the institutional memory of the ATS has also been realized by the Parties. India, through the medium of IP 104, had also underlined the critical importance of a more focused discussion on how best to formalize, operationalize and institutionalize the insights, Resolutions, Recommendations and Measures accumulated over the decades at various ATCMs. It was also pointed out that the major onus of responsibility/accountability/action lies on the part of Antarctic tourism *Regulators* and that there are limits to self-regulation by the *Organizers*.

It is useful to note that some of the enduring concerns that remain central to the ongoing discussion on the strategic vision for Antarctic tourism today surfaced early on in the ATCMs during the 1960s. For example, one such concern related to the adverse effects of tourist activities on the *conduct of science and scientific stations.[[10]](#footnote-10)*

***Areas of Special Interest to Tourists***

Another major contemporary concern, namely the question of designating certain *areas of special interest to tourists* also started receiving attention during 1970s.[[11]](#footnote-11) Needless to say, this basket of issues is closely related to the important issue of tourism monitoring for frequently visited sites, which is currently under discussion at the ATCMs. It is worth reiterating that agenda item 12 of **8th ATCM** (Oslo, 9-20 June 1975) related to ‘*Areas of Special Interest to Tourists’*, and a number of useful recommendations were made in this regard.[[12]](#footnote-12) The Final Report of the **11th ATCM** (Buenos Aires, 23 June-7 July 1981), which was held against the sad backdrop of the 1979 tragic air crash, noted: *Regarding Areas of Special Tourist Interest, work was begun on the principles that might be adopted if such Areas were to be designated but discussion indicated a measure of doubt as to whether it would be prudent to proceed further with the designation of such Areas. It was agreed that there should be further study of the issues raised in discussion with a view to further consideration of the topic at the Twelfth Consultative Meeting.*

There was no further consideration of ‘*Areas of Special Tourist Interest’* at the next **12th ATCM** (Canberra, 1983).[[13]](#footnote-13) and the ATCPs returned to this important issue-area at the **14th ATCM (**Rio de Janeiro, 5-16 October 1987), acknowledging that ‘so far tourism and non-governmental activities have had minimal adverse impact, very significant numbers of people were now involved in these activities and, *given the concentration of such activities in various areas*, there was potential for serious impacts, both in environmental terms of possible damage to fragile ecosystems and *compounding existing waste problems* and in scientific terms on national research programs.’[[14]](#footnote-14) And it was at the **15th ATCM** (Paris, 9-20 October 1989), that one could discern a growing concern over the risk that, ‘*tourism and non-governmental activities if uncontrolled or excessive, could have potentially serious adverse impacts on scientific investigations and the Antarctic environmen*t.’[[15]](#footnote-15) On the list of a number of important issues raised by the delegation of the United Kingdom in a WP presented at the Paris Meeting[[16]](#footnote-16) was the following question: *What roles should Areas of Special Tourist Interest or the management of activity within designated areas have with respect to recreational activity?*

***The Decade of 1990s****:* ***The Madrid Protocol and the Growing Focus on Environmental Impacts Assessment of Tourism and Non-Governmental Activities***

The **6th ATCM,** held in Bonn (7-18 October 1991), witnessed an unprecedented return and rise of a number of enduring concerns. especially given the new context of the Madrid Protocol and its Annexes. These included: ‘*supervision of tourists on the continent, registration and licensing of shipping, provision of air-navigation arrangements and emergency and rescue services, the need to educate those involved in all aspects of tourism, the scientific tourists sites as to avoid interference with the sites of scientific research and the need to integrate both existing and new recommendations in a single code*.’

At the **18th ATCM,** held in Kyoto (11-22 April 1994), the IP submitted by the UK concluded on a revealing note: ‘the face of Antarctic tourism is changing. With these changes come new challenges for Antarctic policy makers. New operators are entering the market, often with little or no experience of the area, resulting in an increased number of passengers carried aboard such ships. The days when only a handful of operators brought tourists to the Antarctic aboard expedition-sized vessels appear to have ended.’[[17]](#footnote-17) The only general agreement was that ‘the objective at this Meeting was not to create new rules and regulations but to provide guidance to those existing Antarctica and those organizing and conducting tourism and non-governmental activities there.’[[18]](#footnote-18)Accordingly, some of the listed obligations under **Recommendation XVIII-1 (1994): Tourism and Non-governmental Activities**[[19]](#footnote-19) addressing organizers and operators were as follows: (1) to provide prior notification of, and reports on, activities to the competent authorities of the appropriate Party or Parties; (2) to conduct environmental impact assessment of planned activities; (3) to ensure effective response to environmental emergencies, especially with regard to marine pollution; (4) to respect scientific research and the Antarctic environment, including restricting regarding protected areas, and the protecting of flora and fauna; and (5) to prevent the disposal and discharge of prohibited waste.

By the time the ATCPs met at Seoul for the **19th ATCM** (8-19 May, 1995), a realization had dawned upon them that whereas the existing requirements for tourism and non-governmental activities covered advance notice of such activities, gap in terms of post-activity reports were yet to be addressed. ‘**Resolution 3 (1995): Reporting of Tourism and Non-governmental Activities**’ was adopted.[[20]](#footnote-20) The Final Report of Nineteenth Antarctic Treaty Consultative Meeting noted the diversity of concerns that were expressed by some of the key stakeholders:[[21]](#footnote-21) ‘*that the reporting burden for tourism should be no greater (or less) than for other activities*’ (IAATO); ‘*that there may be value in having some information concerning on-board waste production and disposal at gateway ports’* (Canada); and ‘*that* *the impact of tourism on science’* needs to be taken into serious consideration (Russia). The Delegation of the Netherlands also invited attention of the Meeting to ‘*the issue of compliance enforcement for gateway ports*.’

The **20th ATCM** (Utrecht, 29 April-10 May 1996), did not pursue further the concerns raised in the previous ATCM with regard to port state control. The Meeting ‘*stressed the importance of effective self-regulation by the tour industry’* and urged IAATO to ‘ensure that its members conform fully to the provisions of the Protocol; disseminate ATCM Recommendations and other texts relevant to tourism; produce further guidelines and codes of conduct where appropriate; and encourage all tours companies operating in Antarctica to become members of the Association.’[[22]](#footnote-22) ASOC ‘urged all non-governmental operators to start producing Environmental Impact Assessments consistently now as the best way to be prepared when the Protocol comes into force’ and ‘to use all possible means to encourage compliance with the provisions of Annex I, for instance by making station visits conditional upon such compliance.’ One finds a number of concerns related to ‘cumulative effects of tourism activities’, ‘navigational safety’ and ‘safety of ships’ being expressed at the **21st ATCM** (Christchurch, 19-30 May 1997) but few statements recommending policy or action or both. Some Delegations did refer to the IMO ‘Polar Code’ for ‘ships sailing in polar waters, and considered that the technical issues raised by this Code should be discussed by ATCM XXII.’[[23]](#footnote-23) There is no evidence in the Final Report of the **22nd ATCM** (Tromsø, 25 May-5 June 1998) to suggest, as desired by the previous ATCM, that any discussion of the technical issues raised by the IMO ‘Polar Code’ took place. Whereas the key focus of tourism-related discussions was on the important ‘Antarctic Visitor Site Project’ lead by the US, UK and Federal Republic of Germany, ‘the importance of using accurate place names in site visit reports was noted by several Delegations.’[[24]](#footnote-24) The information presented in the IAATO report was highly appreciated but ‘several delegates asked questions about the flagging of tourist vessels and the number of tourists visiting various sites. It was noted that it would be useful if future reports also included information on the flag state of tourist vessels and information on the number of tourists that visit the various sites each season, in order to have information on the distribution of the possible effects of tourism on the individual sites.’[[25]](#footnote-25)

At the **23rd ATCM** (Lima, 24 May-4 June 1999) one concern that loomed large related to the ‘number of large passenger vessels and vessels of countries that are not Party to the Antarctic Treaty, or the Environmental Protocol, now entering Antarctic waters.’ ASOC invited attention to environmental impacts of large-scale tourism and proposed that ‘consideration be given to introducing strategic impact assessment as means of assessing the possible environmental impact due to the growth in tourism and other activities in Antarctica.’[[26]](#footnote-26)The Final Report of **24th ATCM** (St. Petersburg, 9-20 July 2001) graphically revealed a rather short engagement with Antarctic tourism policy matters. A number of delegates and IAATO expressed concerns ‘about the practical management of adventure tourism on national programs and tour operators that may become involved in search and rescue for unsupported adventure tourists.’[[27]](#footnote-27) The Meeting noted that ‘there is an increase in the diversity of tourism activities, which may present new management challenges.’[[28]](#footnote-28)

As far as **25th ATCM** (Warsaw, 10-20 September 2002) is concerned, IP 104 had recalled how ASOC brought back on the agenda of the ATCMs a number of complex but compelling issues regarding port state jurisdiction in IP 063, the executive summary of which noted: ‘International law has recognized that port states may affirmatively take measures to inspect vessels visiting their waters and enforce internationally-recognized maritime standards for ship operations and other environmental rules. Such port state regimes are in place in virtually every other part of the globe. *In order to provide an added element of enforcement of maritime standards and the provisions of the Madrid Protocol, merchant and tourist vessels, bound for the Antarctic Treaty Area, and calling at gateway ports, should be subject to inspection*.[[29]](#footnote-29)

***A New Protocol on Antarctic Tourism?***

It was noted in the IP 104 that at the **26th ATCM** (Madrid, 9-20 June 2003) there was some evidence of the maturing of discussion on Antarctic tourism regulation issues[[30]](#footnote-30), but consensus on *how* best to turn, both enduring and emerging, multifaceted concerns (as expressed by the Regulators, Organizers and Monitors) into regulatory policies remained rather illusive. Issues related to *safety*, i*nsurance*, *port state control*, *search and rescue*, *cumulative environment impacts,* and *information data base* appeared to be in competition with one another for greater attention. There had been no formal collective articulation and assertion of priorities and policy directives since 1995 when the ‘**Resolution 3**: *Reporting of Tourism and Non-governmental Activities* was adopted. On the issue of a ‘new legal instrument’, the Final Report of the Meeting noted: ‘Some delegations questioned whether a new legal instrument was necessary for a targeted and efficient approach to these issues. In this respect, options appeared to be: i) the elaboration of a new Protocol on Tourism, ii) the elaboration of a new Annex to the Madrid Protocol, iii) the adoption of a specific Measure, iv) The use and review of the existing guidelines on tourism activities.’[[31]](#footnote-31) As the following analysis reveals, it is the last option, namely ‘the use and review of existing guidelines on tourism activities’ that is acting as one of the key drivers behind the work in progress.

***Connecting the Dots****:* ***Emerging******Strategic Intersectionality, Entangled Issues and Outstanding Concerns***

The **28th ATCM** (Stockholm, 6-17 June 2005), saw the return and rise of the strategic focus on *creation of areas of special tourist interes*t. Issues that were discussed fell under five broad categories: *Site specific guidelines; Land-based tourism; Creation of areas of special tourist interest; and Accreditation*.’[[32]](#footnote-32) In the overarching context of land-based tourism, the complex but compelling issue of tourist infrastructure on land, invited –*and continues to invite*-- a good deal of debate in Stockholm. While some delegations felt that the Madrid Protocol should be implemented ‘in such a way as to prevent the construction of infrastructure to support activities primarily for the conduct or support of tourism’, others felt the need for a more in-depth understanding of the issue, including current domestic laws which might make it ‘difficult to prohibit permanent and semi-permanent facilities for tourism and other non-governmental activities.’ **IP 12**, ‘Creation of Areas of Special Tourist Interest’, pointed out foresightedly that the increase in tourism may bring Parties to considering limiting tourism to certain areas.[[33]](#footnote-33) The **29th ATCM** (Edinburgh, 12-23 June 2006) did return to the issue of tourist infrastructure but without any consensus; “The United Kingdom tabled a draft Resolution on Limiting Permanent Non-Governmental Infrastructure in Antarctica. This proposed that Parties should refrain from authorizing permanent land-based facilities in Antarctica that are not in support of national Antarctic science programmes or associated with a government operator. Whilst many delegations supported the draft some delegations believed that clearer definitions were needed. Despite lengthy debate, consensus on the draft, or any alternative draft considered, could not be reached. The Meeting decided not to establish an inter-sessional contact group, but instead to address this issue again at ATCM XXX.[[34]](#footnote-34)

At the **30th ATCM** (New Delhi, 30 April-11 May 2007), a significant step forward was taken by the ATCPs with the passing of two Resolutions: ***Resolution 4 (2007): Ship-based Tourism in the Antarctic Treaty Area*** and ***Resolution 5 (2007): Tourism in the Antarctic Treaty Area*.** Resolution 4 (2007) recommended that:

‘*Parties, consistent with their national law, 1. discourage or decline to authorize tour operators that use vessels carrying more than 500 passengers from making any landings in Antarctica; and 2. encourage or require tour operators to: a) coordinate with each other such that not more than one tourist vessel is at a landing site at any one time; b) restrict the number of passengers on shore at any one time to 100 or fewer, unless otherwise specified in applicable ATCM Measures or Resolutions; and c) maintain a minimum 1:20 guide-to-passenger ratio while ashore, unless otherwise specified in applicable ATCM Measures or Resolutions*.’ Resolution 5 (2007) recommended that: ‘*the Parties discourage any tourism activities which may substantially contribute to the long-term degradation of the Antarctic environment and its dependent and associated ecosystems*.’ Both Resolutions, by their very nature and scope, raised highly pertinent issues related to the need for inspection and compliance.

At the **31st ATCM** (Kyiv, 2-13 June 2008), United Kingdom through WP 51 ***Developing a Strategic Vision of Antarctic Tourism for the Next Decade***. The WP noted that ‘Measures and Resolutions agreed during recent years were largely directed at the conduct of tourism within Antarctica, and that there had been little discussion about whether Parties should place greater controls on the overall size, geographic limits or diversity of tourism activities in Antarctica.’[[35]](#footnote-35) The UK proposed that ‘the ATCM take a proactive approach through the development of a *strategic* vision of tourism. The United Kingdom had discussed options for developing such a strategy with government, NGOs and industry, and found general support for the overall concept.’ The UK further ‘proposed that development of the vision should include general principles for the overall development of tourism in Antarctica and should aim to articulate, as far as was practicable, a more precise volume and form of tourism that Parties would wish to see in the future. Essentially, the aim of the vision would be to clarify: what the ATCM expected tourism activities in Antarctica to look like – for example, in terms of volume, geographic and seasonal limits, and diversity; how tourism in Antarctica would be managed in order to deliver such a vision; how information about tourism activities would be collected, analysed and reported; and how the Antarctic environment would be monitored to identify any potential impacts of tourism activities.’[[36]](#footnote-36) The UK proposed that ‘such a vision, as a non-mandatory and aspirational tool, be developed in time for ATCM XXXII to form part of the celebrations of the 50th Anniversary of the signing of the Antarctic Treaty.’

It was at the **32nd ATCM** (Baltimore, 6-17 April 2009) that *strategic vision* for Antarctic tourism was further broadened and deepened. ASOC (IP 53 ‘Key Elements of a *strategic vision* for Antarctic Tourism’), argued ‘*that there is an urgent need for Antarctic Treaty Parties to develop a clear vision of tourism in the Antarctic, and to agree on a Tourism strategy that delivers step by step on that* vision *through time*.’[[37]](#footnote-37) ASOC ‘characterised tourism as a whole system composed by a departure region, a transit region, a destination region, the tourism industry, and the tourists themselves, which helped to conceptualise tourism as more than visitation of certain landing sites’ and ‘considered that the unending growth of Antarctic tourism was not desirable, required or inevitable.’ ASOC’s contention was that ‘*Tourism activities in Antarctica should demonstrably have no more than a minor or transitory impact on the environment. A precautionary approach should be used to manage tourism in the absence of conclusive scientific evidence about tourism impacts. Certain types of commercial tourism would need to be discouraged or prohibited*.’[[38]](#footnote-38)

The **34th ATCM** (Buenos Aires, 20 June-1 July 2011), saw some forward movement on how to further advance the *strategic vision* for Antarctic tourism, with a number of delegations participating in the discussion. ‘India, supported by several other Parties, suggested that *it was important for the ATCM to focus not only on the adequacy of current measures, but also on the adequacy of their implementation by national authorities*.’[[39]](#footnote-39) India, (supported by several Parties), also ‘referred to the importance of *considering Antarctic issues within a wider global context, and highlighted the value of developing linkages with other relevant international instruments and organisations*.’[[40]](#footnote-40)‘The Netherlands felt that the development of certain forms of extreme tourist activities in Antarctica should be discouraged. *It feared that the ATCM, by not developing tourism policies fast enough to keep up with developments in the industry, would face shifting baselines for decision making*. It felt that the Parties have the right to withhold permits for activities they deem incompatible with the intrinsic or wilderness values of Antarctica, even if such activities do not cause direct environmental harm, and that the ATCPs should, in the Netherlands’ view, jointly or individually, prevent that Antarctica become a playground for extreme activities that Parties would prohibit in their own national natural reserves.’[[41]](#footnote-41) The Meeting agreed that ‘it was highly desirable to take a more strategic approach to the ATCM’s review of tourism policies, identify gaps, and set priorities for future discussion, taking into account existing regulatory instruments and guidelines and implementation thereof.’[[42]](#footnote-42)

At the **35th ATCM** (Hobart, 11-20 June 2012), the important intervention was made by the Netherlands (WP 27 rev. 1, *Report of the Intersessional Contact Group ‘Outstanding Questions’ on Antarctic Tourism*), listing out five priorities, as identified by the ICG: improving information exchange and cooperation; measuring and managing cumulative impacts of visitation; the merits of regulatory instruments to prevent or regulate the further expansion of tourist activities; the increasing diversity of activities in Antarctica; and the potential development of regulations in respect of permanent facilities for tourism in Antarctica.[[43]](#footnote-43) The critical issue of ‘cumulative impacts’ of tourism on sites frequently visited and challenges posed by data deficit and data access were also identified. The **36th ATCM** (Brussels, 20-29 May 2013), adopted **Decision 5 (2013) Multi-Year Strategic Work Plan for the Antarctic Treaty Consultative Meeting**, under which one of the priority areas was “reviewing and assessing the need for additional actions regarding area management and permanent infrastructure related to tourism, as well as issues related to land-based and adventure tourism, and addressing the recommendations of the CEP tourism study.’[[44]](#footnote-44)

3. From Strategic Vision to Strategic Action

The 38th ATCM (Sofia, Bulgaria, 1-10 June 2015) –on the floor of which India had the honour of introducing IP 104 rev-- stood out in terms of widely shared concern among all the three categories of stakeholders that a large number of issues –having remained on the agenda of previous ATCMs over the past five decades and more— were now in urgent need of coherent and systematic action plan for ensuring ecologically responsible and safe tourism management in ecologically exceptional Antarctica. The final report of the 38th ATCM summed up the key message of WP 24, titled ‘Adopting a Strategic Approach to Environmentally Managed Tourism and Non-Governmental Activities in Antarctica’ (introduced by New Zealand and jointly prepared with the United Kingdom, Norway and the Netherlands) as follows: ‘Acknowledging the effort made at previous ATCMs to review tourism policies, this paper highlighted that little headway had been made on consolidating this work and progressing towards setting priorities for future discussion. It recognised that tourism was expanding in Antarctica and that tourism activities were diversifying. The proponents encouraged the Meeting to adopt a forward thinking, proactive approach to the management of tourism and non-governmental activities in Antarctica, with a view to drafting a work programme to develop a strategic vision for the management of tourism.’[[45]](#footnote-45) ASOC expressed the view that ‘it was time to move from strategic thinking to strategic action.’[[46]](#footnote-46) The importance of identifying and addressing both outstanding issues/questions/gaps and priorities on Antarctica tourism too was highlighted. One of the key recommendations made by ASOC in IP 109 Antarctic Tourism and Protected Areas, was ‘that Parties consider strategically using ASPAs and ASMAs to regulate current and potential future tourism. It recognised that ASMAs were one of the best tools for the management of tourism, including at the subregional level. It noted that ASMA coverage could be usefully extended to that effect. It also suggested that ASPAs could be designated to protect from tourism sites that meet the criteria of Article 3(2) of Annex V to the Environment Protocol.’[[47]](#footnote-47) Furthermore, as noted in the Final Report of the 38th ATCM:

New Zealand welcomed a more strategic approach towards this issue and suggested that this line of reasoning could be expanded to particular examples of areas potentially threatened by the increase of touristic activities in the Antarctic. The United Kingdom added that ASMAs may be a useful management tool for managing tourism in Antarctic interior areas, where there are also a range of scientific and other activities. IAATO agreed that a strategic approach towards the use of protected areas and other site management tools was important to address all human activities in Antarctica, not only the activities of non-governmental organisations.[[48]](#footnote-48)

Given the centrality of meticulously collected data and information exchange to the realization of a strategic approach to Antarctic tourism, yet another major contribution at the 38th ATCM came from Argentina in IP 128 Areas of tourist interest in the Antarctic Peninsula and South Orkney Islands region: 2014/2015 Austral Summer Season’.[[49]](#footnote-49) The IP provided useful data about the tourist visits to one of most visited areas in the region based on the ‘voyages made by vessels during the 2014/15 summer season, operating through the port of Ushuaia.’[[50]](#footnote-50)

The decision to establish an ICG on ‘Working towards Developing a Strategic Approach to Environmentally Managed Tourism and Non-Governmental Activities in Antarctica’, which was also expected to take into account the outcomes of 2011/2012 Intersessional Contact Group on ‘Outstanding Questions’ on Antarctic Tourism –with New Zealand and India acting as joint convenors-- was a clear indication of the dawning perception that movement towards a collective strategic action was no longer a matter of simply choice but sheer necessity.

***Working Together Towards a Strategic Approach to Antarctic Tourism!***

The **39th ATCM** (Santiago, 23 May-1 June 2016) saw momentum gathering around discussions directed at working out a more nuanced yet systematic *strategic approach* to Antarctic tourism. New Zealand introduced WP28 *Report of the Intersessional Contact Group ’Developing a Strategic Approach to Environmentally Managed Tourism and Non-Governmental Activities’*, jointly prepared with India. The final report of the Santiago ATCM noted[[51]](#footnote-51) that ‘The ICG had identified priority areas and gaps within the existing tourism management framework which had been recognised in previous ICGs and Working Papers addressing tourism (e.g., ATCM XXXI - WP 51, ATCM XXXII - WP 10 and Resolution 7 (2009), ATCM XXXVII - WP 24 and ATCM XXXVIII - IP 104 rev.1).’ Some of the key recommendations were that the ATCM: ‘consider its report; agree to work to develop a common vision of Antarctic tourism at ATCM XL; conduct a comprehensive review of progress in implementing the recommendations of the 2012 CEP Tourism Study, and agree to a Multi-year Work Plan to implement outstanding areas of work focused on tourism.’ Furthermore, ‘New Zealand emphasised the need for the Parties to agree on a *common vision* for the development of tourism in Antarctica in order to better consider effective measures that were able to manage its continued growth and diversification, and invited Parties to provide input regarding specific elements of the strategic vision for consideration at ATCM XL.’

At the **40th ATCM** (Beijing, China, 22 May-1 June 2017), the ongoing discussion at the ATCM on strategic approach to Antarctic Tourism was taken to the next level by New Zealand by introducing, *WP 31* *A Strategic Approach to Environmentally Managed Tourism*. The **WP 31** recalled ‘that ATCM XXXIX agreed to commence work to develop a common vision of Antarctic tourism (ATCM XXXIX - WP 28), and ‘noted that WP 31 laid out a general framework that builds on the ATCM’s previous work on tourism, including the framework provided by Resolution 7 (2009) General Principles of Antarctic Tourism.’ New Zealand recommended in WP 31 that the ATCM adapt a strategic approach aimed at ensuring that ‘Antarctic tourism’ –tourism with a difference—‘serves to enhance global understanding of the need to protect Antarctica and should have no more than a minor or transitory impact’ and ‘that the environmental impact of tourist and non-governmental activities in Antarctica are understood through a system of environmental monitoring and data collection, and that negative environmental impacts are prevented through proactive responses to that data’.

The **WP 31** called upon the ATCPs to ‘*take a consistent approach to site management that includes the development of criteria assessing the suitability of a site for tourism and sets thresholds for its use’*; have a common understanding of how to regulate Antarctic tourism and actively do so, including through strong and effective instruments that seek to address issues arising from tourism and non-governmental activities in a *proactive* way; and ‘efficiently and effectively implement and enforce new and existing instruments relating to tourism and non-governmental activities, and apply a consistent and precautionary approach to the authorisation of these activities; and work ‘constructively with the tourism industry on the identification and resolution of issues arising from tourism and non-governmental activities.’ Yet another important emphasis placed by New Zealand in **WP 31** was that ‘all tourist and non-governmental activities in Antarctica remain under the governance of the Antarctic Treaty System and its ATCPs, which will regularly review the effectiveness of the regime.’ New Zealand underlined the critical importance of a strategic approach focussed on active and effective management of tourism activities by the Parties.

While noting **Resolution 7** (2009) remained relevant and represented the agreed common values of the ATCM as they relate to tourism, New Zealand stressed that a strategic approach to environmentally managed tourism required *further operationalization of these principles*. It was noted that ‘a strategic approach to environmentally managed tourism should be supported and guided by comprehensive monitoring and Populate the multi-year strategic work plan to begin operationalising the strategic approach from ATCM 41 onwards.’

Some of the issues seen at the core of a strategic vision of Antarctic tourism (e.g. port state control) at the previous ATCMs were conspicuous by their presence on the agenda of the Beijing ATCM.

At the **41st ATCM** (Buenos Aires, Argentina, 2018), there was evidence of connecting the dots!The thoughtful mention of ‘*Trends and Patterns’* in the Final Summary of 41st ATCM in the sub-title of Item 7a, Tourism and Non-Governmental Activities in the Antarctic Treaty Area, was highly suggestive of the fact that basket of tourism related issues/concerns had started overflowing with wide-ranging issues –both old and new-- and forming complex patterns. Both the numbers provided by IAATO for 2017-18 season and preliminary estimates for 2018-19 season in IP 71 were quite telling and underlined the importance of trend analysis for strategic approach to Antarctic tourism regulation. As noted in the Final Report:

*Antarctic tourism continued to be primarily focused on traditional commercial ship-borne tourism in the Antarctic Peninsula, which accounted for over 95% of all landed activity.* In the 2017-18 season, 42,576 people landed in Antarctica, including those from IAATO land-based operators, which surpassed the previous season. IAATO noted that this was in part due to vessels being operated with higher passenger capacity and that the industry was benefitting from strong world economic growth. Additional site-specific information was highlighted in IP 72, submitted by IAATO. IAATO’s estimates for the 2018-19 season indicated that passenger numbers would rise to circa 55,764 individuals, in line with *global trends of travel growth* to remote and high latitude places. More than 100 different nationalities were represented by tourists who visited the Antarctic during the 2017-18 season.[[52]](#footnote-52)

It was widely felt by the Parties that wide-ranging impacts and implications –including legal-- of the ‘trend of increasing tourist numbers and diversification of tourism activities warranted their attention’[[53]](#footnote-53), including those emanating from the presence of non-IAATO operators, unauthorised activities (Russia, IP 53), including unauthorized yacht visits, and lack of data about their environmental impacts. The **WP 22** *A Practical Approach to Antarctic Tourism Management* (UK and USA) while reminding the Parties that tourism could have a positive impact if ‘managed appropriately to ensure that it had no more than a minor or transitory impact on the environment’. Moreover, ‘tourism should: have no negative impact on national Antarctic programmes; fully comply, both in practice and in spirit, with the rules of the Antarctic Treaty and the Environment Protocol; and create Ambassadors for Antarctica.’ The United Kingdom ‘emphasised that significant Measures agreed by the ATCM and designed to regulate and improve the management of tourism were not yet in force including: Measure 4 (2004), Measure 1 (2005) and Measure 15 (2009).’ This remains the case in 2022! The important intervention by the Netherlands in WP 22 could also be seen as the reinforcement of the vital normative dimension of the ‘strategic vision’ for Antarctic tourism regulation and management. As noted in the Final Report, ‘the Netherlands, *underlined the importance of attention to impacts on the wilderness values of Antarctica*. It noted that these values are explicitly mentioned in Article 3 of the Protocol and in the General Principles of Antarctic Tourism (Resolution 7 (2009)).’ Whereas ASOC’s intervention in IP 61 ensured that the long-standing concern with ‘Areas of Special Interests to Tourists’ remained at the centre stage of ongoing discussions. ASOC’s intervention was duly noted as follows:

Noting that polar tourism was expected to grow, ASOC raised the matter of how the current Antarctic tourism regulatory system would respond to growth and provided a first attempt to answer this question. *It recommended that the Meeting: review the current regulatory and management system for tourism to ensure adequate resilience and effectiveness in the future, including the adoption and/or review of Site Guidelines; consider ways to improve the assessment and monitoring of cumulative impacts, particularly at the most visited sites and on a regional basis; and continue to expand the network of ASPAs and ASMAs taking into consideration tourism growth on a regional basis*. ASOC further noted that with projected increases in visitor numbers and other measures of tourism growth, and a continued focus of visitation at particular sites, it will be necessary for the ATCM to develop a more targeted look at visited sites to ensure that activities have a minimal impact.[[54]](#footnote-54)

It is useful to cite in full/verbatim the summary provided in the Final Report of the 41st ATCM of the WG II discussion on Antarctic tourism and non-governmental activities, as it reveals the intersectionality of the old/enduring and new/emerging challenges in the pursuit of a strategic action plan for the regulation and management of Antarctic tourism:

1. The Meeting noted several key issues raised by Parties in the course of the discussion, including:
   * concern about the increasing pressures on the environment, in particular regarding the pressures on landing sites and on search and rescue resources, presented by the anticipated growth in volume of tourism, in terms of both the number of vessels and number of visitors, and in high-risk adventure tourism activities;
   * the need to consider cumulative impacts when assessing tourism activities including those unauthorised or of non-IAATO members;
   * the desire to maintain *wilderness values*;
   * the importance of providing national authorities with the correct legal instruments and tools to respond to unregulated or unauthorised activities in the Antarctic;
   * the need to find additional mechanisms to improve the *monitoring of tourism*;
   * the need to consider the implications of *potential SAR burdens on national programmes and personnel associated with increased activities in Antarctica*;
   * a further consideration of the understanding of the terms non-permanent, semi-permanent and permanent in light of the EIA provisions of the Environment Protocol;
   * the desirability of *improving communications*, in particular the speed of communication, between Parties regarding tourism issues, noting that the Competent Authorities Forum was helpful, but potentially not sufficient, in this regard; and
   * the desirability of developing an interactive mapping tool on the ATS website (based on the Geographical Information tool demonstrated for the inspections database) that could help illustrate visitation over time for sites covered by *Site Guidelines*.

The **42nd ATCM** (Prague, Czech Republic, 1-11 July 2019) had a rich and highly useful discussion on Antarctic tourism regulation but the engagement with the term ‘strategic’ became somewhat liminal. The term ‘strategic’ is conspicuous by its clear absence in the relevant sections of the Final Report. This can be perceived however as a strategic pause in the sense that most of the WG II space was allotted to a *review* of tourism policies and a focused discussion on ‘competent authorities’. Item 17 in the Final Report of the Prague ATCM was titled as follows: ‘*Tourism and Non-Governmental Activities in the Antarctic Treaty Area, including Competent Authorities Issues*.’[[55]](#footnote-55)

The United Kingdom presented **WP 19** *Antarctic Tourism Workshop, 3-5 April in Rotterdam, The Netherlands: Chair’s Summary and Key Recommendations* and **IP 11** *Antarctic Tourism Workshop, 3-5 April in Rotterdam, The Netherlands: Chair’s Report*, jointly with the Netherlands. The Meeting was informed that the Antarctic Tourism Workshop was guided by work presented in IP 26 *Proactive Management of Antarctic Tourism: Time for a Fresh Approach* (Netherlands, New Zealand), and the key impetus behind the workshop was the ‘very significant growth in the number of Polar Ships following the negotiations of the Polar Code and IAATO’s projections that ship-borne tourism could so much as double in the next few years.’[[56]](#footnote-56) Significantly both the workshop and the papers addressed three baskets of important interrelated issues – growth in tourism, diversification, and compliance – and resulted in important recommendations to the ATCM under each category.

The Final Report of the 42nd ATCM noted that Rotterdam workshop had recommended that the ATCM: (1) ‘strongly encourage those Parties that had yet to do so to *expedite the approval of Antarctic Tourism regulations*, *notably Measure 4 (2004) and Measure 15 (2009);* (2) work with COMNAP, SCAR and IAATO, and on the basis of advice from the CEP, to ensure that guidelines relating to conduct of visitors ashore were in line with current best practice and presented in a format appropriate for all visitors, and that the guidelines were easily identifiable on the ATS website; (3) and explore the idea of levying an administrative fee on tourism operators to support environmental monitoring work, including through considering parallels with the administrative fees levied by CCAMLR on fishing operators.’ As noted in the Final Report, the Meeting agreed to the first two recommendations and with regard to the third one, it was noted that: ‘Several Parties expressed support for the introduction of an administrative fee on tourism operators, but noted the importance of agreeing the rationale for collecting such a fee. The Meeting agreed that further discussions were needed to develop a deeper understanding of how fees could be collected, administered, and used. Interested Parties were encouraged to have further informal intersessional consultation and to submit papers to ATCM XLIII containing concrete proposals describing possible systems for levying fees and administering resulting funds.’ This issue awaits further consideration by the stakeholders.

Besides eminently deserved appreciation these recommendations received some useful responses from all the three stakeholders; Regulators, Organisers and Monitors. These included the need for placing sufficient resources at the disposal of the Antarctic Treaty Secretariat to ‘provide oversight for all visitors as growth continues’ (UK); ‘establishing reference areas to which tourists would not be able to enter’ and comparing them with ‘visited areas to better assess tourism impacts’ (ASOC); ‘inclusion of seasonal limitations in specific site guidelines’ (ASOC); and ‘developing and reviewing Visitor Site Guidelines, recognising the importance of aligning these with current best practice and making them widely available' (IAATO).

On the complex and compelling challenge of tourism diversification –marked by both new types of activities and activities happening in a new ways or sites, it was pointed out that ‘operators may propose new activities to be considered for permit or authorisation directly to a competent authority without first obtaining peer review through IAATO’ and ‘such actions could result in inconsistent assessment of the new activity across competent authorities.’ In order to effectively meet this challenge, the workshop Rotterdam workshop had recommended that the ATCM: ‘develop a framework to underpin greater consistency of standards between competent authorities in assessing the potential safety and environmental implications of new or novel activities.’

And on the final issue of ‘compliance’, the Rotterdam workshop had recommended that ATCM: ‘invite Parties to *identify a working level competent authority contact*, in addition to the senior responsible official’; *develop terms of reference for enhanced engagement between Competent Authorities* and *establish an ongoing subsidiary group*; *develop a proposal for an international tourism observer scheme*, building on national experiences and IAATO’s model; *continue to reach out to Non-consultative Parties whose operators or nationals engaged in Antarctic tourism activities*; continue *to encourage all Parties to ensure they regularly updated the EIES on which tourism and non-governmental activities they have authorised and ask the Secretariat to ensure that this information was made clearer and more obviously locatable on their website*; encourage Parties to *include inspections of tourism activities within existing inspection regimes*; and *ask Working Group 1 to provide advice on how those operating in Antarctica could most effectively gather and share evidence of suspected non-compliance*.’ No surprise, as noted in the Final Report, the Meeting expressed overall support for the general principles reflected in the recommendations.[[57]](#footnote-57)

Thedebate on tourism and other non-governmental activities at the **43rd ATCM** (Paris, France, 12-24 June 2021) had a sharper focus on policy and management. The meeting saw an important intervention by Netherlands in WP 35, *Permanent Facilities for Tourism and Other Non-Governmental Activities in Antarctica*.[[58]](#footnote-58) It was after a considerable gap that this complex issue-area had been brought back on the agenda with such foresight and farsightedness. It was stated early on in WP 35:

One of the questions that has received substantial attention within the broader ATCM debate relates to the desirability or need to prohibit or regulate possible future initiatives to erect permanent facilities for tourism or other non-governmental purposes, such as hotels in Antarctica and accommodation for tourist in or near research facilities, in Antarctica. ATCM discussions on this topic between 2004 to 2008 have not resulted in consensus on specific policy responses, however, since then circumstances have changed. The ATCM has made further steps in its considerations on Antarctic tourism, including the adoption of the General Principles of Antarctic Tourism in 2009, which constitutes a jointly agreed framework for the adoption of more specific policy measures. *Furthermore, IAATO has adopted more explicit policy on this issue and recently a number of developments in Antarctica has shown that concerns relating to permanent facilities for tourism or other non-governmental purposes should not be considered theoretically*.’[[59]](#footnote-59)

The Netherlands also sounded the following note of caution: ‘*Permanent facilities for tourism and non-governmental activities may challenge or threaten ATS principles and values in various ways*.’ Another important point made by the Netherlands was that ‘since the last intensive debates on the topic of permanent facilities for tourism in Antarctica (2004-2008), circumstances have changed’. Moreover, it was pointed out by the Netherlands: ‘The COVID-19 crisis provides an unprecedented momentum for green and inclusive economic recovery based on the principle of ‘***building back better’*.** It also underlines the importance of stepping up our global climate ambition, ambitious carbon reduction targets and active international promotion of the need for climate measures.’ In light of these changed circumstances, WP 35 recommended the ATCM to revisit this topic and invited Parties to: ‘exchange views on the basis of this Working Paper; share information on past and present initiatives to establish permanent facilities for tourism in Antarctica and possible related concerns; agree to engage in intersessional discussions on the question whether the ATCM should take action relating to future plans for permanent facilities for tourism in Antarctica and, if so, what action might be appropriate.’

Given the complex nature of this important concern related to ‘permanent facilities’ for tourism and non-governmental activities, little surprise that WP 35 invoked a great deal of interest and responses. The Final Report of the Paris ATCM noted[[60]](#footnote-60) that ‘IAATO reaffirmed that its members were not interested in constructing or funding permanent facilities, such as hotels, in Antarctica, noting that such activity would conflict with IAATO bylaws, which provided that activities must have no more than a minor or transitory impact, and would risk degrading the very wilderness and aesthetic values that brought tourists to Antarctica.’[[61]](#footnote-61) Whereas ‘ASOC expressed support for ongoing intersessional discussions under the proposed terms of reference and noted that the ATCM had not adopted major measures on tourism management since 2009, encouraging the Meeting to show leadership on this issue. It also highlighted the need to clarify which forms of land-based tourism support or uses count as permanent tourism facilities and stressed the importance of taking a precautionary approach to managing such activities.’[[62]](#footnote-62) And ‘Parties commented on concerns raised by WP 35 regarding possible future permanent facilities for tourism including: environmental impacts; impacts on search and rescue capacity of national Antarctic programmes; and the potential for abandoned infrastructure should business circumstances change. A view was expressed that ‘semi- permanent’ camps erected over multiple seasons in the same locations could raise some similar issues, noting that this could also be considered in the intersessional discussions.’[[63]](#footnote-63) The Meeting agreed to establish an ICG on permanent facilities for tourism and other non-governmental activities in Antarctica, with the following terms of reference: To share and collate information on past and present initiatives to establish permanent facilities for tourism and other non-governmental activities in Antarctica; To exchange views on the desirability and possible content of a definition of permanent facilities for tourism and other non-governmental activities in Antarctica; To exchange views on possible concerns relating to such facilities, including, for instance, environmental concerns and pressure on the search and rescue capacity of national programmes; To discuss the question of whether the ATCM should take action relating to future plans for permanent facilities for tourism and other non-governmental activities in Antarctica and, if so, what action might be appropriate; and Depending on progress and outcomes of discussions on the previous item, to develop a clear proposal on the issue of permanent facilities for tourism and other non-governmental activities in Antarctica that may be submitted to ATCM XLIV.’[[64]](#footnote-64) The Netherlands would act as convener and report to the next ATCM on progress made in the ICG. The terms of references graphically convey the challenge involved in putting together the various building blocks –with each building block having multiple concerns—in pursuit of a strategic approach to effective regulation and management of Antarctic tourism.

4. India’s Understanding of Strategic Vision of and Approach to Antarctic Tourism

What does ‘Building Back –and forth- Better’ mean in case of Antarctic tourism? Most likely –and quite understandably so-- different stakeholders –i.e., *Regulators*: ‘government representatives directly involved in Antarctic policy’; *Organisers*: ‘tour operators and industry representatives’; and (c) *Monitors*: ‘representatives of environmental NGOs and Antarctic tourism researchers’— will not have exactly the same answer. Yet, it is this diversity of experiences, perspectives and policies that accounts for the resilience and adaptability of the Antarctic governance model. What makes these stakeholders a collective in the pursuit of a strategic approach to regulating Antarctic tourism is their commitment to the Preamble to the Antarctic Treaty: Recognizing that it is in the interest of all mankind that Antarctica shall continue for ever to be used exclusively for peaceful purposes and shall not become the scene or object of international discord.

It has been noted in a recent study[[65]](#footnote-65): “Growth and diversification of tourism activities in Antarctica have not been matched by proactive strategies for planning or management.” The authors further point out that while they acknowledge that ‘full implementation of an adaptive management approach is not easily achievable due to the unique Antarctic regime’, they are of the view ‘that comprehensive site-specific and regional adaptive management models could be applied as the first step for a more systematic implementation. This incremental approach could contribute to enhanced stakeholder participation and improved decision-making processes, ultimately leading to a more proactive and effective management of Antarctic tourism, essential for the conservation of the continent.’

IP 104 had shown that many of the issue-areas related to the regulation of Antarctic tourism have stayed on the ATCM agenda over nearly five decades. Moreover the contexts in which various ‘enduring concerns’ were initially approached, analysed and discussed have also changed. As the numbers of stakeholders and their concerns continue to multiply a building-block approach to the ‘Strategic Vision’ would need this institutional memory to avoid the risk of repetitive discussions and duplication of efforts.

The term ‘Building Back Better’ has also been deployed for ‘reimaging tourism’ in the context of Covid-10 pandemic.[[66]](#footnote-66) What does ‘post-pandemic normal’ entail for various forms of tourism as it returns to both the old and the new sites across the globe? To quote Anna Spenceley et al., ‘Looking forward, there is much talk of ‘building back better’. For tourism, this should not mean a return to business as usual but planning for forms of tourism that address climate change and biodiversity loss, and which are more inclusive, equitable and integrated with sustainable development principles. How can we learn from our experience with COVID-19 to ensure a more resilient and sustainable future for this industry? Nobody can predict how the pandemic will evolve, nor the recovery timeline, but stakeholders can identify plausible scenarios and create plans that work across these. Future directions need to build consensus on more sustainable pathways through best practice environmental management and encourage visitors to be more respectful of people, wildlife and the receiving environment.’[[67]](#footnote-67)

To state the obvious perhaps, the challenge, in view of steadily expanding basket of concerns –many, if not most, of which are interconnected in a complex pattern-- would be to be to envision, conceptualize and operationalize the strategic vision –and strategic approaches emanating from them—on this demanding intersectionality. It is indeed encouraging to note the growing appreciation in the ATCMs of the urgent need for a holistic strategic approach that enables connecting the dots through an acknowledgement of long standing, long discussed concerns related to tourism in the ATCMs.
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