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***Summary***

During the 2019/21 intersessional period the Subsidiary Group on Management Plans (SGMP), in accordance with its Terms of Reference 1 to 3, reviewed three draft Antarctic Specially Protected Areas (ASPA) referred by the Committee for intersessional review.

The SGMP recommends that the Committee adopts the attached three revised management plans:

* New ASPA Rosenthal Islands, Anvers Island, Palmer Archipelago (United States);
* New ASPA Léonie Islands and south-east Adelaide Island, Antarctic Peninsula (United Kingdom and the Netherlands);
* New ASPA Inexpressible Island and Seaview Bay, Ross Sea (China, Italy and Republic of Korea).

Also, under its Terms of Reference 4 and 5, the SGMP considered options for supporting proponents to conclude the revision of management plans that have remained under the scope of the SGMP for several intersessional periods. A summary of the options considered is provided for CEP consideration.

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

For the intersessional period 2019/2020 the SGMP had been commissioned to work under the Terms of Reference (ToR) agreed by CEP XIII (which can be found in Annex A) and in relation to the tasks incorporated in the Work Plan of the Group, as agreed by CEP XXII which is presented below, as reflected in paragraph 161 (CEP XXII Final Report):

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **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 four 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 |
| Consider options for supporting proponents to conclude the revision of management plans that remain for several intersessional periods under the scope of the SGMP. |
| Review and update SGMP work plan |
| Working Papers | Prepare report for CEP XXIII against SGMP ToR 1 to 5 |

The SGMP was convened by the CEP Vice-Chair, Patricia Ortúzar from Argentina. SGMP members participated in the intersessional work, noting however that all plans were available for comment from any CEP member during the SGMP process. Discussions took place using the CEP Discussion Forum.

Due to the pandemic situation that led to the cancellation of the ATCM scheduled for Finland in 2020, the intersessional period on which this document reports covers the 2019/2021 period. It should be noted that most of the work of the SGMP envisaged according to the work plan adopted during ATCM XLII - CEP XXII had been completed at the end of the 2019/2020 intersessional period.

1. Task under Terms of Reference 1 to 3.
   1. Review of Management Plans under Tors 1 and 3.

The SGMP was commissioned to give further advice and complete the review process of three of the five Management Plans, initiated in 2014, once the proponent (Chile) provided the updated versions of those management plans. Management plans correspond to the following Antarctic Specially Protected Areas (ASPAs):

* ASPA No. 125: Fildes Peninsula, King George (25 de Mayo) Island (Chile).
* ASPA No. 146: South Bay, Doumer Island, Palmer Archipelago (Chile).
* ASPA No. 150: Ardley Island (Ardley Peninsula), Maxwell Bay, King George (25 de Mayo) Island (Chile).

These three management plans are still under review by the proponent (Chile), so the revised versions on which the SGMP would provide advice were not available for this purpose. Therefore, there is no progress to report at the time of the presentation of this paper.

We recall that the revision of the management plan corresponding to ASPA 144 “Chile Bay (Discovery Bay), Greenwich Island, South Shetland Islands" which was under the scope of the SGMP, was placed on hold by CEP XXI, pending further discussions and decisions on the possible de-designation of the Area (paragraph 68 of the CEP XXI Final Report)

Also, the management plan corresponding to ASPA 145 “Port Foster, Deception Island, South Shetland Islands”, whose review was also ongoing under the scope of the SGMP, was the subject of consultations and intersessional work between Chile and Spain according to what was reflected under paragraph 77 of the CEP XXII Final Report, when the proponent (Chile) informed the SGMP that they were working with Spain on the revision of the limits of ASPA 145 Port Foster, Deception Island, South Shetland Islands. Chile had noted that the boundaries may be extended to improve protection of the marine life in the region. These Parties agreed to report to the Committee on the results of this work. If the proposal to extend the limits arises from the discussions between Chile and Spain, the Management Plan will no longer continue under the scope of the SGMP.

Also, CEP XXII agreed to forward, for review by the SGMP, the draft management plans related to the proposals for the designation of three new ASPAs:

* Rosenthal Islands, Anvers Island, Palmer Archipelago (United States);
* Léonie Islands and south-east Adelaide Island, Antarctic Peninsula (United Kingdom and the Netherlands);
* Inexpressible Island and Seaview Bay, Ross Sea (China, Italy and Republic of Korea).

The results of the reviews of these three new proposals are reported below:

*ASPA No. XX [NEW PROPOSAL] Rosenthal Islands, Anvers Island, Palmer Archipelago (United States)*

At CEP XXII, United States submitted WP 6 “Proposal for a new Antarctic Specially Protected Area at the Rosenthal Islands, Anvers Island, Palmer Archipelago”. The United States recommended that the Committee forward the proposal to the SGMP for review in the intersessional period (paragraph 100 CEP XXII Final Report). The CEP recommended referring the plan for intersessional review (para 110 of the CEP XXII Final Report).

As reflected in paragraph 101 (CEP XXII Final Report), while expressing support for the proposed ASPA, some Members raised questions regarding the nature of the proposed area, 75 percent of which was marine, and to the ecological and environmental values of the area. Those Members encouraged further discussion on these aspects of the management plan during intersessional review by the SGMP. The SGMP’s review of the management plan was coordinated by the SGMP Convener.

On October 2019, the SGMP convener issued an invitation to all CEP contact points to submit comments on the draft management plan.

In December 2019 the SGMP provided its initial advice to the proponent, recommending some modifications to the draft revised management plan. The SGMP’s full advice is available on the Discussion Forum. SGMP members included some suggestions and consultations to the proponent, with the purpose of improving the effectiveness of the plan. The main comments were related to:

* Clarification about the northern limit of the proposed Zone.
* A consultation on how the designation will strengthen protection with respect to risks that it could face without the designation.
* The provision of a set of geographical coordinates in the limits section of the plan.
* Further clarification about the prohibition of aircraft landings within the Zone.
* More description of the activities considered appropriate for "educational and outreach purposes".
* Identification and location on the camp map.

The SGMP members stressed that the plan provides a good description of the proposed area and its values and is of high quality. SGMP members also indicated that the provisions and structure of the plan are consistent with other management plans. They also indicated that the plan, with the suggested modifications, is likely to be effective in achieving the goals and objectives.

In January 2020 United States provided an updated draft management plan and a consolidated checklist with comments from the proponent.

The SGMP concluded that the United States had appropriately addressed feedback from the SGMP and that the updated draft management plan was well written, of high quality and is likely to be effective in achieving the goals and objectives.

The resulting final revised draft management plan is presented in Attachment A to this Working Paper. Introductory comments and a coversheet prepared by the proponent are presented in Appendix 2.

We should note that information on the proposed ASPA had also been submitted to CCAMLR’s Working Group on Ecosystem Monitoring and Management (WG-EMM). The CCAMLR Commission and its appropriate scientific and technical bodies considered the proposal for the new protected area in 2019. The Commission considered the discussion by the Scientific Committee (SC-CAMLR-38, paragraphs 6.1 to 6.3) on the Rosenthal Islands and agreed to give its prior approval to the draft management plan for a new ASPA in this area (CCAMLR-38 Report (Meeting of the Commission 21 Oct – 1 Nov 2019) as adopted on Friday 1 Nov 2019: Para 6.1).

Advice to the CEP

**The SGMP recommends that the CEP approves the revised management plan prepared by United States** **for ASPA [XX]** *Rosenthal Islands, Anvers Island, Palmer Archipelago* **(Attachment A).**

*ASPA No. XX [NEW PROPOSAL] Léonie Islands and south-east Adelaide Island, Antarctic Peninsula*

At CEP XXII, the United Kingdom and the Netherlands submitted WP 35 Draft Antarctic Specially Protected Area Management Plan for the Léonie Islands and south-east Adelaide Island, Antarctic Peninsula. A previous assessment had already been submitted by the proponent for this proposed multi-site ASPA to CEP XXI. As reflected in paragraph 104 (CEP XXII Final Report) the Committee expressed support for the proposed ASPA and highlighted the benefits of the prior assessment process for potential new protected areas. The CEP recommended referring the plan for intersessional review (para 110 of the CEP XXII Final Report). The SGMP’s review of the management plan was coordinated by the SGMP member from Uruguay.

On October 2019, the SGMP convener issued an invitation to all CEP contact points to submit comments on the draft management plan.

In December 2019 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. SGMP members included some suggestions and consultations to the proponents, with the purpose of improving the effectiveness of the plan. The main comments were related to:

* The provision of more information on the presence of geological values at the sites.
* The addition of specific values relating to flora and fauna and the location of installations/structures at each site to the maps to provide greater clarity regarding their location.
* Clarifications on the boundaries of the Area.

SGMP members recognized that the draft management plan provides a good description of the proposed Area, its values and proposed arrangements for regulation and management of activities is consistent with other existing management plans. Also highlighted, was the very high quality of the draft management plan, which has been well considered and prepared and that contains provisions that, with the suggested modifications, are likely to be effective in achieving the stated aims and objectives.

In February 2020, the United Kingdom and the Netherlands provided an updated draft management plan and a consolidated checklist with comments from the proponent.

The SGMP concluded that the United Kingdom and the Netherlands had appropriately addressed feedback from the SGMP and that the updated draft management plan was well written, of high quality and is likely to be effective in achieving the goals and objectives.

The resulting final revised draft management plan is presented in Attachment B to this Working Paper. Introductory comments and a coversheet prepared by the proponent are presented at Appendix 3.

Advice to the CEP

**The SGMP recommends that the CEP approves the revised management plan prepared by United Kingdom and the Netherlands** **for ASPA [XX]** *Léonie Islands and south-east Adelaide Island, Antarctic Peninsula* **(Attachment B).**

*ASPA No. XX [NEW PROPOSAL] Inexpressible Island and Seaview Bay, Ross Sea*

At CEP XXII, China, Italy and the Republic of Korea submitted WP 47 Proposal for a new Antarctic Specially Protected Area at Inexpressible Island and Seaview Bay, Ross Sea (China, Italy and Republic of Korea). The proponents informed that two workshops had been held in Xiamen and Rome in the 2018/19 intersessional period involving all parties with an interest in the area. The Committee noted in particular the collaborative nature of the process, and that matters raised during discussions on the proposed area at CEP XXI had been considered during the development of the draft management plan. The Committee expressed support for the proposed ASPA.

The CEP recommended referring the plan for intersessional review (para 110 of the CEP XXII Final Report). The SGMP’s review of the management plan was coordinated by the SGMP member from Australia.

On October 2019, the SGMP convener issued an invitation to all CEP contact points to submit comments on the draft management plan.

In December 2019 the SGMP provided its initial advice to the proponent, recommending some modifications to the draft revised management plan. The SGMP’s full advice is available on the Discussion Forum. SGMP members included some suggestions and consultations to the proponent, with the purpose of improving the effectiveness of the plan. The main comments were related to:

- clarifying guidance for visitors to HSM 14, including to avoid inadvertent entry to the ASPA  
- clarifying provisions for access to the Area by boats, and access within and near the Area on foot  
- providing further details regarding the camp sites located within the Area  
- reflecting that the proposed ASPA is located within the Ross Sea Region Marine Protected Area designated by CCAMLR.

SGMP members recognised that the draft management plan is clear, of high quality, and is likely to be effective in achieving the proposed management objectives for the area. SGMP members also recognised the value of the effective international cooperation and stakeholder consultation during the process to prepare the draft management plan.

In February 2020, China, Italy and Republic of Korea provided an updated draft management plan and a consolidated checklist with comments from the proponent.

The SGMP concluded that China, Italy and Republic of Korea had appropriately addressed feedback from the SGMP and that the updated draft management plan was well written, of high quality and is likely to be effective in achieving the goals and objectives.

It is noted that information on the proposed ASPA had also been submitted to CCAMLR’s Working Group on Ecosystem Monitoring and Management (WG-EMM). The CCAMLR Commission and its appropriate scientific and technical bodies considered the proposal for the new protected area in 2019. The Commission considered the discussion by the Scientific Committee (SC-CAMLR-38, paragraphs 6.2 and 6.3) on the Inexpressible Island and Seaview Bay and agreed to give its prior approval to the draft management plan for a new ASPA in this area (CCAMLR-38 Report (Meeting of the Commission 21 Oct – 1 Nov 2019) as adopted on Friday 1 Nov 2019: Para 6.1).

The resulting final revised draft management plan is presented in Attachment C to this Working Paper. Introductory comments and a coversheet prepared by the proponent are presented at Appendix 4.

Advice to the CEP

**The SGMP recommends that the CEP approves the revised management plan prepared by China, Italy and Republic of Korea for ASPA [XX]** *Inexpressible Island and Seaview Bay, Ross Sea* **(Attachment C).**

1. Task under ToRs 4 and 5
   1. “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.

* 1. Consider options for supporting proponents to conclude the revision of management plans that remain for several intersessional periods under the scope of the SGMP.

This task was included in the work plan in order to discuss and advise the Committee about possible mechanisms to provide assistance for the completion of the five-year review of Management Plans, when these plans remain for a long time under the scope of the SGMP, in the cases where such revisions are delayed and could benefit from cooperation from the SGMP and other Parties.

For the first round document, participants discussed different alternatives / tools to assist in such reviews. As a working modality, the following guiding questions were proposed:

* What management plans would be included in this assistance process?
* How long should it be considered before initiating an assistance process for the review of these management plans?
* What aspects of the management plan would be subject for assistance?
* Who could provide assistance?
* What sources of information could be useful to assist in the completion of the revision processes of the Management Plans?
* What other assistance mechanisms could be considered?
* Who would be responsible for the compilation of the information (e.g. point 5 and 6), coordination and monitoring of the advisory process?
* Who would be responsible for completing the review and submitting the working document to the Committee?

During the consultations, valuable contributions were received that allow for potential progress in providing additional assistance to Parties that are in the process of reviewing ASPA Management Plans and whose review is delayed within the scope of the SGMP.

From the contributions received, there seems to be consensus regarding the possibility of the SGMP providing additional assistance once there is a significant delay in the completion of the review. The “case-by-case” approach so far has more support than the establishment of a new fixed procedure that leads to referral of any management plan that is “delayed” to an external review process. Several participants considered art 6.3 of Annex V as the normative parameter that allows to affirm that the need for additional assistance should occur before the end of a 5-year period, after which, according to said article, a new revision should be started.

The importance of understanding the reasons for the delay in the conclusion of a review process, was also stressed. In this sense, participants identified the information that the proponent can provide, at the earliest possible stage, as a key aspect when defining the need and possibilities of providing assistance for the completion of the revision of a Management Plan under the SGMP scope.

Therefore, if there is no consensus for a change in the terms in which the SGMP currently works, the mechanism by which this assistance would be provided would be similar to the current one, where the country in charge of management of the ASPA would continue to be responsible for the completion of the review. The change would be that the members of the SGMP could provide specific information about the aspects of the plan identified in the first year of review by SGMP and still require modifications. In this process, they could consult with key actors identified in the first round.

The collaborators (members of the SGMP) could resort to a number of possible sources of information and key actors that could be useful to assist the Party in charge of the review could be taken into account when implementing the process of additional assistance.

In Appendix 5, a summary of the discussions is included. It is suggested that CEP consider this Appendix as a source of consultation on alternatives, key actors and sources of information that may be useful to guide Parties, based on a "case by case" analysis, to consider options for supporting proponents to conclude the revision of management plans that remain for several intersessional periods under the scope of the SGMP

Finally, the SGMP recommends that the CEP invites proponents experiencing challenges with the timely review of a management plan to present information to the Committee (i.e. describing the challenges, the likely time frame for completing the review, and identifying areas where external assistance would be helpful or required). The CEP could then consider the matter and provide advice direct to the proponent(s) to assist them to complete the review, and/or establish a role for the SGMP to provide formal/coordinated assistance.

* 1. Proposed Work Plan for the SGMP, for the intersessional period 2018/19

The SGMP proposes the following Work Plan, to which other actions that CEP XXIII 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 four 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 |
| Working Papers | Prepare report for CEP XXI against SGMP ToR 1 to 5 |

1. Other issues: Operational matters, SGMP Members

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

* Patricia Ortúzar - Coordinator- (Argentina) [pvo@mrecic.gov.ar](mailto:pvo@mrecic.gov.ar)
* Eduardo Juri (Uruguay) **-** [cientifica.director@iau.gub.uy](mailto:cientifica.director@iau.gub.uy)
* Anoop Kumar Tiwari (India) – [anooptiwari@ncaor.org](mailto:anooptiwari@ncaor.org)
* 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)
* 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 related to the proposals for the designation of three new ASPAs.
* That the CEP consider the results of the discussion held under ToRs 4-5 as a source of consultation on alternatives, key actors and sources of information that may be useful to guide Parties, based on a "case by case" analysis, to consider 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 Work Plan and suggests appropriate modifications if needed, based on the deliberations during CEP XXIII.

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.

4) Provide advice to the CEP as necessary for the purpose of improving Management Plans and the process for their intersessional review.

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[[6]](#footnote-6).

Appendix 2 Introductory comments by United States

Proposal for a new ASPA at the Rosenthal Islands, Anvers Island, Palmer Archipelago

The Rosenthal Islands are located on the western coast of Anvers Island, in the Palmer Archipelago, Antarctic Peninsula, at 64°36'S 64°15'W. The site was first formally recognised for its exceptional ecological and scientific values when it was designated as a Restricted Zone under Antarctic Specially Managed Area (ASMA) No.7 Southwest Anvers Island and Palmer Basin in Measure 1 (2008). The purpose of the Restricted Zone under the ASMA was to provide protection to sensitive bird colonies throughout the breeding season, and also plant communities, by limiting access to those conducting essential scientific research, monitoring or maintenance between 1 October to 15 April inclusive. The Restricted Zone was also designated because it was considered important to protect the near-pristine state of the Rosenthal Islands, which fewer than ~60 people are estimated to have ever visited. The Restricted Zone was applied to the Rosenthal Islands under the ASMA while more detailed information was being assembled with a view to proposal of the site as an Antarctic Specially Protected Area (ASPA) because of its exceptional qualities.

Since designation of the site as a Restricted Zone in 2008, tourism on the Antarctic Peninsula has continued to increase, and a greater diversity of sites is now being visited. The number of yachts visiting Antarctica has also increased over this period. Already it is known that several tourist yachts have visited the site. In view of the near pristine state of the Rosenthal Islands, and that such sites are becoming increasingly rare in the Peninsula region, the United States is concerned that strict protection is now put in place to ensure that this value is not compromised or lost.

The United States has now gathered additional scientific information on the site, and proposes designation of the Rosenthal Islands and the adjacent islands, coastline and associated marine area as a new ASPA. The proposal is strongly supported by world renowned ornithologist Dr William Fraser, who has particular knowledge of the Rosenthal Islands, having been one of the first people to have visited the area in 1975, and who has conducted repeated but infrequent research in the region since.

The United States has undertaken a review of the published and unpublished literature on the site, compiled available scientific data on birds made available by Dr Fraser, examined high resolution remote sensing imagery indicating the likely presence of bird and vegetation communities at sites where visits have not yet proven possible, has examined records of all known past visits, and has consulted with scientists who have visited the area. A brief field visit was made in December 2016 to gather up-to-date data on breeding birds, make the first survey of terrestrial invertebrates at the site, improve mapping, and to make a first-hand evaluation of site values under Annex V to the Protocol on Environmental Protection to the Antarctic Treaty.

The Rosenthal Islands were identified to meet a number of criteria for designation as an Antarctic Specially Protected Area under Annex V to the Protocol, in particular as an area:

* with important or unusual assemblages of species, including major colonies of breeding native birds or mammals;
* that is a representative example of regional avian and marine ecosystems, in particular because of the diversity of breeding birds present;
* of particular interest to on-going or planned scientific research;
* to be kept inviolate from human interference so that future comparisons may be possible with localities that have been affected by human activities; and
* of outstanding aesthetic and wilderness value.

With respect to Criterion (a) listed above, 7324 pairs of Gentoo penguin were breeding within the Area in 2012/13, which meets the threshold for identification as a Birdlife International Important Bird Area (IBA) under IBA Criteria A4: “The site is known or thought to hold congregations of ≥1% of the global population of one or more species on a regular or predictable basis” (defined as 5680 breeding pairs for Gentoo penguins). This reaffirms IBA No.88, which had been identified previously.

With respect to Criterion (d) listed above, it is intended to protect the relatively undisturbed state of the Area to the maximum extent practicable, although not to prohibit, prevent or unnecessarily impede well-conceived and justified scientific research.

Following the appraisal of site values, a proposal for a new Antarctic Specially Protected Area and draft Management Plan and maps for the Rosenthal Islands were prepared. A number of boundary options were evaluated, including the more limited scope of the existing ASMA Restricted Zone, and the proposed Antarctic Specially Protected Area (ASPA) was defined to include all of the Rosenthal Islands, and the ecologically associated adjacent islands, peninsulas and local marine environment, to encompass a total area of approximately 111 km2.

Enlargement of the original Restricted Zone is considered justified because there has been an observed close relationship between fauna breeding on the islands and peninsulas and the adjacent marine environment, which appears to be important as a local foraging area. While more data on this ecological relationship are needed, it was considered prudent and precautionary to include the marine embayment south of the Rosenthal Islands, associated faunal communities around this embayment, and a one-kilometer buffer from the islands as the boundary of the Area.

On Anvers Island, the boundary has been defined to follow the boundary of ASMA No.7, which is a one-kilometer buffer inland from the coastline. In part this is for pragmatic reasons to maintain consistency with the ASMA boundary, and in part in recognition of the constantly and rapidly changing ice coastline, which is receding in response to a changing climate, and which is also exposing new areas of ice-free ground.

In the boundary appraisal consideration was given to how far north the Area should be extended. A scattering of off-shore islands extends northwards all along the coast of Anvers Island to Cape Grönland. These islands are inaccessible, have had few surveys, and reliable data on their ecological values are not available. Examination of high resolution remote sensing imagery did not reveal evidence of any substantial breeding bird colony (guano staining) on islands close to the proposed northern boundary, nor was there evidence of seals present. Some evidence of bird activity on islands in the northeast of the proposed Area was apparent in imagery, although breeding and numbers would need verification. Some species of wildlife (e.g. terns, skuas) are not detectable using remote sensing. Most of the islands in the north appear quite bare, and some have probably emerged from under ice relatively recently.

In effect, the proposed northern boundary provides a ‘buffer’ to the islands of higher ecological value in the core of the Rosenthal group further south. The line of latitude is coincident with the Palmer ASMA. While it is not essential to make the ASPA consistent, in the absence of a clear justification for extending further north at this time, this seems a pragmatic place at which to draw the line. This helps with the simplicity of boundaries, and ease of operational identification at sea or from the air. On balance, considering the lack of data on islands and comparative lack of features of high value to the north, the proponent considered the pragmatic boundary consistent with the ASMA to be preferable.

The primary reasons for designation of the Area are:

* The outstanding diversity and number of breeding birds, which are representative of the region;
* The exceptional importance of the Area for ornithological and ecological research;
* The unusual Imperial shag (Leucocarbo atriceps *bransfieldensis*) colony, which appears to have maintained a resident breeding population at a similar level since first surveyed in 1975, in contrast to a regional trend of population decline for this species;
* The apparently extensive vegetation communities, although it is acknowledged that more research on this aspect is needed;
* The value as a reference site for comparative studies and long-term monitoring;
* The almost pristine condition of the Area because it has been rarely visited; and
* The exceptional aesthetic and wilderness values.

The proposed area is not the subject of any actual harvesting of marine living resources, and the potential for harvesting within the proposed area is also extremely limited and remote owing to its rugged coastline and numerous shoals, which are potentially dangerous. The proposed Area is approximately 75% marine, and it was considered appropriate to provide CCAMLR with the opportunity to review the proposal because it is intended that any potential taking of marine living resources other than for scientific research would be prohibited under the ASPA management plan.

The CCAMLR Commission and its appropriate scientific and technical bodies considered the proposal for the new protected area in 2019. The Commission considered the discussion by the Scientific Committee (SC-CAMLR-38, paragraphs 6.1 to 6.3) on the Rosenthal Islands and agreed to give its prior approval to the draft management plan for a new ASPA in this area (CCAMLR-38 Report (Meeting of the Commission 21 Oct – 1 Nov 2019) as adopted on Friday 1 Nov 2019: Para 6.1).

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| ASPA No. XXX Rosenthal Islands, Anvers Island, Palmer Archipelago | | |
| **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?** | 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:* | Measure 1 (2008), Measure 2 (2009), Measure 14 (2010) | |
| **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.* | | N/A |
| **5. If a new ASPA or ASMA is proposed, does it contain any marine area?** | | Yes |
| **6. If yes, does the proposal require the prior approval of CCAMLR in accordance with Decision 9 (2005)?** | | Yes |
| **7. If yes, has the prior approval of CCAMLR been obtained?** | | Yes |
| *If yes, please list the CCAMLR Final Report and Paragraph No.* | | CCAMLR-38 Report (Meeting of the Commission 21 October to 1 November 2019) as adopted on Friday 1 November 2019: Para 6.1. |
| **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)?** | | (a) areas kept inviolate from human interference so that future comparisons may be possible with localities that have been affected by human activities;  (b) representative examples of major terrestrial, including glacial and aquatic, ecosystems and marine ecosystems;  (c) areas with important or unusual assemblages of species, including major colonies of breeding native birds or mammals;  (e) areas of particular interest to ongoing or planned scientific research;  (g) areas of outstanding aesthetic and wilderness value. |
| **9. Have you identified the main Environmental Domain represented by the ASPA/ASMA (Resolution 3 (2008))?** | | Yes. Environment B – Antarctic Peninsula mid-northern latitudes geologic’ and ‘Environment E – Antarctic Peninsula, Alexander and other islands |
| **10. Have you identified the main Antarctic Conservation Biogeographic Region represented by the ASPA/ASMA (Resolution 3 (2017))?** | | Yes. Region 3 – Northwest Antarctic Peninsula |
| **11) Have you identified any Antarctic Important Bird Areas represented by the ASPA/ASMA (Resolution 5 (2015))?** | | Yes. IBA No.88 Islet south of Gerlache Island was identified prior to the proposal of this protected area. Data on birds in the area have been updated and if the ASPA is adopted the IBA will meet IBA Criterion A4 for Gentoo penguins: “The site is known or thought to hold congregations of ≥1% of the global population of one or more species on a regular or predictable basis”.  The proponent has therefore informed Birdlife International (manager of the global IBA database) on:   * the protected area proposal for the Rosenthal Islands; * the latest data on birdlife and other values within the proposed ASPA; * how the proposed ASPA meets IBA criteria; * the draft ASPA management plan; and * the potential change in the IBA No.88 boundary such that it would comply with the new ASPA when / if adopted.   Following adoption, Birdlife International will be further informed and update its database accordingly. |

Appendix 3. Introductory comments by the United Kingdom and the Netherlands

**Proposal for a new ASPA at the Léonie Islands and south-east Adelaide Island, Antarctic Peninsula**

The United Kingdom and the Netherlands jointly propose the designation of the Léonie Islands and south-east Adelaide Island, Antarctic Peninsula, as an Antarctic Specially Protected Area (ASPA) under Annex V to the Protocol, primarily to protect a combination of outstanding scientific, environmental, wilderness and aesthetic values and, in particular, relating to the avifauna and terrestrial biological communities within the Area.

At CEP XXI, the United Kingdom and the Netherlands submitted ATCMXLI WP018 rev.1, which provided a prior assessment for a proposed new multi-site ASPA on the Léonie Islands, Ryder Bay, Antarctic Peninsula. The Committee welcomed the comprehensive information presented in the paper, agreed that the values within the proposed ASPA merit special protection, and expressed its support for the development of a draft management plan for the area, led by the United Kingdom and the Netherlands.

Following a review of the scientific literature and consultation with scientists who have carried out research in the area, the United Kingdom and the Netherlands prepared a draft management plan for the proposed new ASPA. In a further development, following discussion and consideration of how best to protected wilderness and aesthetic values in the Area, a further site on the southeast of Adelaide Island was added to the draft management plan for the proposed multi-site ASPA. The draft management plan was presented to CEP XXII (2019) attached to ATCMXLII WP35 *Draft Antarctic Specially Protected Area Management Plan for the Léonie Islands and south-east Adelaide Island, Antarctic Peninsula*.

CEP XXII referred the draft management plan to the Subsidiary Group on Management Plans (SGMP) for review during the intersessional period 2019-2021. In response to comments received from the SGMP, the United Kingdom and the Netherlands refined the draft management plan including clarifying the presence of geological values within the Area, improving the description of biosecurity requirements when moving between sites, better defining the Area boundary and clarifying the location of installations and structures. The management plan maps were also revised with the inclusion of satellite imagery, improved labelling and a better depiction of the Area boundary.

The revised draft management plan for the proposed ASPA on the Léonie Islands and south-east Adelaide Island, Antarctic Peninsula, is presented for consideration by the CEP.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| ASPA No. XXX, Léonie Islands and south-east Adelaide Island, Antarctic Peninsula | |
| 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? | 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. | N/A |
| 5. If a new ASPA or ASMA is proposed, does it contain any marine area? | Yes. The marine component is c. 3.3 km2 and is located at a dynamic glacier front. The marine component is included within the Area only to allow use of permanent features in the description of the Area boundary. Values in the marine environment are not afforded additional protection. |
| 6. If yes, does the proposal require the prior approval of CCAMLR in accordance with Decision 9 (2005)? | No. The criteria triggering referral to CCAMLR, as described in Decision 9 (2005), were not met. Safety concerns would prevent harvesting within 1 km of a dynamic glacier front. There are no provisions specified in the draft management plan which might prevent or restrict CCAMLR related activities. |
| 7. If yes, has the prior approval of CCAMLR been obtained? If yes, please list 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)? | The primary reasons for designation of the multi-site ASPA are to protect (a) areas kept inviolate from human interference so that future comparisons may be possible with localities that have been affected by human activities; (b) representative examples of major terrestrial, including glacial and aquatic, ecosystems and marine ecosystems; (c) areas with important or unusual assemblages of species, including major colonies of breeding native birds or mammals; areas of particular interest to ongoing or planned scientific research; and (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))? Yes/No (If yes, the main Environmental Domain should be noted here). | Yes. 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))? Yes/No (If yes, the main Antarctic Conservation Biogeographic Region should be noted here). | 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 ATCMXXXVIII IP27 and the full report available at: http://www.era.gs/resources/iba/)? Yes/No (If yes, the Important Bird Area(s) should be noted here). | The ASPA islands are contained within Antarctic Important Bird Area (IBA) No. 47236 (AQ205), which was designated in 2018 (after the ‘Important Bird Areas in Antarctica 2015 Summary’ was published). |

Appendix 4 Introductory comments by China, Italy and Republic of Korea

Proposal for a new ASPA at Inexpressible Island and Seaview Bay, Ross Sea

Inexpressible Island and Seaview Bay is located in Terra Nova Bay, Victoria Land, Western Ross Sea at 74° 54.2' S, 143° 43.5' E. The proposed area is distinctive and the primary reasons for its designation as an ASPA are that it hosts one of the oldest Adélie penguin (*Pygoscelis adeliae*) colony and an important breeding site of South Polar Skua (*Stercorarius maccormicki*). Such a peculiar ecosystem is related to the adjacent Terra Nova Bay polynya and allows comparison with other nearby sites with different sea ice dynamics along the year. Moreover, in the proposed area, several lakes are influenced by guano nutrient inputs from birds, while others are not impacted.

The first documented record of an Adélie penguin breeding group in the Area was in 1963, and continuous monitoring has been carried out from the 1980s to the present, with so far one of the earliest statistical record of the Adélie penguin in the Ross Sea region. The active penguin colony in the Area has had continuous occupation for the past ~7,000 year, which is the longest existing Adélie penguin colony in the Ross Sea region. The proposed area includes crucial penguins’ foraging access area to Terra Nova Bay polynya.

The proposed area is listed as an important bird area (IBA178) by Bird Life International and is described as Domain S (McMurdo-South Victoria Land geologic) based on the Environmental Domains Analysis for the Antarctic continent. Moreover, the proposed area sits within Antarctic Conservation Biogeographic Region (ACBR) 8 Northern Victoria Land.

China, Italy and Korea are jointly proposing the designation of an ASPA in the proposed area for long-term special protection because of the outstanding scientific and ecological values and its potential vulnerability to disturbance from scientific, logistic and tourist activities.

The exceptional scientific and ecological values of the Area are based on the following:

* The Adélie penguin colony of Inexpressible Island is one of the longest monitored Adélie penguin population in Ross Sea region since 1963 and lasted in the past 30 years. Long-term population monitoring will provide support for studying the dynamics of breeding penguin populations, and the relationship between populations and climate change.
* It is the longest continuous occupation breeding colony of Adélie penguin in Ross Sea area, and the subfossil bone samples that retain DNA and guano in recent 7,000 years of the Adélie penguin have been cryopreserved in the area. Study on the remains would provide a rich and unique sample library for studying the historical dynamics, climate change and molecular evolution on the geologic scale.
* The Inexpressible Island penguin’s population may act as a source for neighboring subpopulations of Adélie penguin colonies in Edmonson Point and Adélie Cove.
* South Polar Skua nests are distributed around Adélie penguin colony of the proposed area, and the Skuas have a low breeding success in the Terra Nova Bay area in comparison with other areas. Long-term monitoring and research on the reproductive population dynamics, ecology and interspecific relationships of the top trophic level omnivorous South Polar Skua not only supports the conservation of the species, but also helps to reveal the response of lower trophic levels to climate change.
* The Adélie penguin colony located in a high-quality habitat nearby the polynya. The easier foraging access between breeding colonies and sea, could have a positive impact on the feeding efficiency and diet composition of Adélie penguins thus explaining the possible differences in the breeding success rate, and allowing comparison studies with other areas of the Ross Sea.
* The presence of the polynya offers opportunity to study the undisturbed marine food-web structure and functioning under ice free conditions allowing comparisons with the nearby areas where sea ice coverage is more persistent. This proposed area is a reference site concerning studies on the marine food-web structure and the effect of sea ice dynamics on the ecosystem.
* Several fresh-water lakes within the penguin breeding area are present and are influenced by guano input and sea spray, which determine a particular physiochemical and trophic status with higher levels of nutrients. Highly influenced and some not influenced lakes by guano and sprayed sea water would provide references for the comparative limnetic ecological study.
* The beaches of Inexpressible Island have risen by 30 m in the Holocene, and there are the best-preserved ocean and glacial landforms in Terra Nova Bay. The unique geomorphological feature is of great scientific value for studying geological and glacial changes, the evolution of penguin distribution patterns, and Holocene climate change.

The proposed area is located in the eastern central part of Inexpressible Island, including the Seaview Bay and the northern part of the South Bay. The total area of the proposed ASPA is 3.31 km2, of which 2.32 km2 is terrestrial and 0.99 km2 is marine area. The total extent of the borders is 7.86 km. Eastwards, the boundary of the ASPA is mainly marine, and includes the foraging access routes that penguins use intensively to access the sea. Westwards, the boundary borders the current South Polar skua nesting area and the historical distribution area of the Adélie penguin, including freshwater lakes far away from the birds’ nests.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| ASPA No. XXX Inexpressible Island and Seaview Bay, Ross Sea | |
| 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? | 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 |
| 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. | N/A |
| 5. If a new ASPA or ASMA is proposed, does it contain any marine area? | Yes. The total area of the ASPA is 3.31 km2, of which 0.99 km2 is marine area. |
| 6. If yes, does the proposal require the prior approval of CCAMLR in accordance with Decision 9 (2005)? | Yes. |
| 7. If yes, has the prior approval of CCAMLR been obtained? | Yes |
| If yes, the reference to the relevant paragraph of the relevant CCAMLR Final Report should be given | CCAMLR-38 Report (Meeting of the Commission 21 October to 1 November 2019) as adopted on Friday 1 November 2019: Para 6.3. |
| 8. If the proposal relates to an ASPA, what is the primary reason for designation (*ie*, which part under Article 3.2 of Annex V)? | (e) areas of particular interest to on-going or planned scientific research |
| 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))? | Yes. Domain S (McMurdo-South Victoria Land 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))? | Yes. ACBR 8 Northern Victoria Land. |
| 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/>)? | Yes. IBA178. |
|  |  |

Appendix 5

**Summary of the debates: *Consider options for supporting proponents to conclude the revision of management plans that remain for several intersessional periods under the scope of the SGMP.***

• On the need for an additional assistance procedure

Participants considered that an additional assistance mechanism could be useful for finalizing the revisions of the management plans pending in the SGMP. However, it was noted not that there is no agreement on the need to have a standard and fixed procedure.

There were also nuances regarding the assessment of the magnitude of the problem in terms of the number and frequency of cases in which this mechanism may be necessary, with some participants anticipating a low frequency of cases while another participant indicated that the cases would not be so infrequent.

In this context, several of the participants made comments in line with the importance of understanding the reasons for the delay in the conclusion of a review process. In this sense, they identified the information that the proponent can provide, at the earliest possible stage, as a key aspect when defining the need and possibilities of providing assistance for the completion of the revision of a Management Plan under the SGMP scope.

To assess each situation, a participant proposed the possibility of having advice from the SGMP at the end of the first intersessional period that might be presented and considered by the CEP on whether the considered management plan would need special assistance.

Also, situations in which there is no clear course of action or steps taken in a reasonable period of time were also indicated as criteria for assessing the need for additional assistance.

In line with the previous ideas, the majority of participants indicated using the case-by-case approach, instead of considering applying a mechanism that automatically sends management plans that are not completed in an intersessional period within the SGMP.

The balance between flexibility and stagnation and concern regarding ad hoc procedures that could generate more delays were also was pointed out by a participant.

• About the deadlines to consider before starting an additional assistance process

Regarding how much time should be considered before starting the assistance process, several positions were presented:

On this aspect, several Parties also raised the need to consider case by case. In line with this, the inconvenience of establishing a rigid period of time was also mentioned.

We should also highlight that several participants considered art 6.3 of Annex V as the normative parameter that allows us to affirm that the need for additional assistance should occur before the end of a 5-year period, after which, according to said article, a new revision should be started.

From another point of view, one of the participants suggested that after a period of two years in which a review is not completed, the coordination of a review should pass from the Proponent to the SGMP and have an “external” coordinator to moderate the discussion.

Regarding the deadlines for the assistance process itself, one participant noted that the timeframe for concluding a review process will depend on the nature of any assistance that may be required, and how long it might take to provide and act on that assistance as it does not require the same amount of time to perform additional monitoring tasks than to complete maps.

• About the aspects on which additional assistance could be provided.

As a starting point to determine which aspects of a Management Plan might require additional assistance, it was pointed out that in principle it should be only those, which, according to the SGMP advice, needed to be modified or supplemented.

Also, since the coordination of the ICG, a list of potential sources of information was indicated by which additional information could be obtained to complete the reviews.

The list provided in the initial post included:

* ASPAs Post-visit reports.
* Scientific publications developed within the ASPA.
* Technical or management reports about the management of the ASPA.
* Reports of logistic support personnel (e.g. shelter repairs, maintenance of beacons or signs that are within the Area)
* Satellite images or aerial photographs.
* Inspection reports

One participant contributed by linking potential sources of information with the sections of a management plan to which they could apply:

* Fieldwork/site inspection support would support a review of all aspects of the management plan
* Literature review – link to Section 6 Description of the Area
* Site specific information support (by those familiar with the Area) – Sections 6 and 7
* Stakeholder consultation and text review
* Provision of data or information
* Support in creating maps – Section 5

Another Party contributed by marking more examples of assistance that could include:

* identifying existing sources of research / monitoring data relevant to describing the values of the Area and their status
* undertaking research / monitoring in the Area
* providing logistics to allow a Party to access an Area for research or management visits
* providing data for or preparing maps / figures
* providing advice or information about best practice approaches applied elsewhere to similar Area protection / management challenges
* participating in meetings or workshops to discuss issues and solutions.

The ‘ASPA inspections’ were also indicated as a tool for Parties who are not the original proponent of an ASPA to support ASPA management plan reviews. These could be conducted by opportunity, during a formal Treaty Inspection, or as a guideline for scientists visiting the Area under permit, etc. Resolution 4 (2008) provides a ‘Checklist to assist in the inspection of ASPA and ASMA’. A review of this checklist/document might be a useful consideration.

Additionally, remote monitoring was indicated as a useful source of information for those cases where a remote location ASPA has not been visited for a period of many years.

* About key actors that could provide assistance

The ICG coordinator proposed, for discussion, a list of potential key actors that could provide assistance. Parties, whose researchers, managers, technicians or logistics personnel had carried out activities in the ASPA in question in recent years, were mentioned as possible key actors for the provision of additional information. It was also suggested that other Parties, even if their personnel have not worked in the field, could also provide information obtained through remote techniques or assist in the processing and / or compilation of information or data analysis.

Most of the participants agreed with this list. Contributions were also received from the participants, pointing out the scientific community in general and the stakeholders, with early participation, as a key to successful management. On the latter, one participant noted that this facilitates consensus building and incorporating relevant knowledge when planning protected areas management. The sooner all relevant stakeholders are involved in the process of making decisions, the better.

One party clarified that the process would need to go through the SGMP as it is composed of CEP representatives and Members – it would allow for transparency and a broad communication to every Member as the work of the SGMP is available on the CEP forum. The proponent(s) can always contact interested Parties or encourage them to actively participate in that assistance process.

* Additional assistance mechanisms

Participants were consulted about other additional assistance mechanisms. From the coordination of the ICG two possible additional mechanisms were indicated, for the participants' consideration:

* Establishment of an advisory group for decision-making on key aspects of the Plan, formed by Parties’ personnel with links to the ASPA. This mechanism could be considered when the aspects to be completed include issues related to the objectives of the area, limits or general coherence of the Plan.
* Joint visit to the Zone. This option would enable the collection of additional field information when necessary, although it could be expensive and logistically challenging.

While several participants agreed on these possible additional mechanisms. One participant suggested the possibility of simply adding a new topic under the SGMP in the CEP forum.

* Assignment of roles in the compilation of information and presentation of the revised document to the CEP (in case the additional assistance process is implemented)

Participants were consulted about the responsibility in the compilation instance of the additional information and the presentation of the final version of the revised plan to the CEP.

As for the person responsible for the compilation of the information provided by the collaborators, the majority suggested that there should be no changes with respect to the process by which the SGMP works, noting that this would be a mechanism that should simply assist the proponent to complete their revision. Something similar was indicated about the responsibility in presenting the revised plan to the CEP. One participant indicated the importance of avoiding unnecessary complexity in the review work of Management Plans.

In this context, it was also indicated that it is perhaps useful if the proponent Party identifies a point of contact to receive relevant information. It might be helpful if the related SGMP review coordinator was also kept ‘in the loop’.

One Party noted that depending on the circumstances, and nature of assistance provided, it may be appropriate for other Parties to join as co-proponents. Otherwise, the paper presenting the revised management plan to the CEP for consideration could appropriately identify any contributors to the review process.

One participant suggested that the process of assistance might be similar to that for new proposals: a convener circulates the last approved plan and opens the discussion to all Parties for comments. All information, concerns or comments the proponent might have at the time the assistance is initiated should also be presented at that stage (or none if there isn’t any). All Parties (including the proponent) have a certain amount of time to contribute to the revision (e.g. 6 months?), and at the end of that time the convener hands-in the information to the proponent. The proponent then has a certain amount of time to present a revised plan.

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 a nd 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)