



Agenda Item: ATCM 11
Presented by: Netherlands
Original: English
Submitted: 05/04/2013

Report of the Informal Contact Group on the Increasing Diversity of Tourism and other Non-Governmental Activities in Antarctica

Report of the Informal Contact Group on the Increasing Diversity of Tourism and other Non-Governmental Activities in Antarctica

Fact finding, experiences with domestic law and exchange of views on the need of further guidance from the ATCM

Abstract

During the last two decades, types of tourism and other non-governmental activities have become more diverse. At ATCM XXXV this development was discussed as one of the ‘outstanding questions’ on tourism policy for the ATCM (ATCM XXXV/WP 27rev1, question j)). This present document is the report of the informal Intersessional Contact Group (ICG) that was established at ATCM XXXV to prepare further discussions on this issue at ATCM XXXVI. After an introduction, Section 2 and Attachment I provide an overview of examples of types of activities that contribute to the diversification of tourism and other non-governmental activities in Antarctica. These examples have been categorised according to types of activities. Next, Section 3 summarizes the responses by participants to questions on domestic experiences and approaches relating to the diversification of tourism activities. Finally, Section 4 includes a proposal for the continuation of the debate at ATCM XXXVI.

1. Introduction

The ATCM has noted frequently the diversification of types of tourism activities in the Antarctic. For instance, at the XXIVth ATCM, the meeting "noted that there is an increase in the diversity of tourism activities, which may present new management challenges" (Final Report ATCM XXIV, para. 106). Currently, all types of tourist and other non-governmental activities that fall within the jurisdictional scope of the Contracting Parties’ implementing systems are subject to the provisions of the Protocol and additional instruments (e.g. Measure 4(2004)). However, as types of tourism activities become more diverse, Contracting Parties (and particularly competent authorities) may more often be confronted with the question what the more precise consequences of the Protocol’s provisions are in respect of certain types of activities. At previous ATCMs, this discussion has received some attention in relation to certain specific types of activities, for instance, the organisation of marathons and large scale sport events in Antarctica.

In light of earlier discussions, the 2011-12 Intersessional Contact Group of the ATCM on ‘Outstanding Questions’ on Antarctic tourism identified this policy issue on diversification of activities in Antarctica as one of the ‘outstanding questions’ for the ATCM (see doc. ATCM XXXV/WP 27rev1 and doc. ATCM XXXV/IP 67):

Question j):

Currently, Antarctica is, in principle, open for any type and form of tourism and other non-governmental activities, provided they are conducted in accordance with the Environmental Protocol. Would further policy guidance from the ATCM on this issue be desirable in view of the continuing increase of the diversity of activities in Antarctica? More specifically, should Antarctica be open to all types of activities or should “priority [...] be given to tourism focusing on educational enrichment and respect for the environment” (Final Report of ATCM XXXII, 2009, para. 208)?

Discussions on this question at the XXXVth ATCM (Hobart, June 2012) showed that certain Consultative Parties emphasize that the regulation of human activities should be based on objective criteria, while others appear to be concerned that a strong focus on ‘measurable impacts’ will result in substantial (cumulative) changes in the Antarctic over time.

In order to prepare discussions on this issue at ATCM XXXVI, the XXXVth ATCM agreed “that the Netherlands would convene an informal contact group working until ATCM XXXVI to prepare for the ATCM’s review of tourism policies.” According to the Final Report of the ATCM, “[t]he group will:

- Identify examples of activities that contribute to a diversification of tourism in Antarctica;
- Exchange information on experiences and challenges with applying domestic law in respect of those activities;
- Exchange views on the question j) identified by Parties in WP 27 Rev.1, of whether further policy guidance from the ATCM on this issue is desirable, taking into account the Protocol and other existing instruments on tourism in Antarctica.”

The discussions in the informal ICG and in this paper focus on the first and second bullet points. Argentina, Australia, France, Germany, Japan, New Zealand, Norway, Spain, the United States of America, and ASOC and IAATO participated in the discussions. Section 2 of this paper and **Attachment I** provide examples of activities that contribute to a diversification of tourism in Antarctica). Next, Section 3 summarizes the responses by participants to questions on domestic experiences and approaches relating to the diversification of tourism activities. Finally, Section 4 includes a proposal for the continuation of the debate at ATCM XXXVI.

2. ‘Fact finding’: Diversity of human activities in Antarctica

Examples of activities that contribute to a diversification of tourism in Antarctica

Examples of activities that contribute to a diversification of tourism and other non-governmental activities in Antarctica over the last 10 years have been identified in **Attachment I**. As the term ‘examples’ indicates, the aim is not to give a complete overview. Consequently, it is difficult to draw conclusions regarding the ‘growth’ or ‘speed’ of diversification or the growth within certain types of activities.

The overview in **Attachment I** is developed on the basis of different sources:

- the EIA Database, available at the site of the Antarctic Secretariat;
- ATCM working- and information papers;
- Information on Antarctic activities available on the internet (e.g., websites of various kinds, including tourist blogs, as well as videos available on Youtube);
- Academic literature and research reports;
- Data available at www.iaato.org;
- Additional suggestions from participants of the informal ICG.

All examples of activities listed in the appendix are to be found in the sources that have been studied, so none of the examples are fictional. IAATO commented in the informal ICG that in relation to the internet sources, it should be noted that press coverage does tend to ‘exaggerate’ events for personal PR purposes (e.g., activities presented as being unique/records/‘first time’-activities are actually not always that special). ASOC commented that in certain cases also the opposite – understatement of the significance of new events - may be true.

Categories of activities planned and conducted in Antarctica

Using these sources, examples of activities are identified and divided over various categories of activities (see below). The categorisation recognises that there are different ‘levels’ of tourism

activities: modes of transport to Antarctica (e.g., ship-based tourism), expeditions with the primary purpose of accomplishing a certain route in Antarctica (e.g., cross continent ski expeditions), as well as more specific activities that form part of larger expeditions in the Antarctic (e.g., snowshoeing during landings). Furthermore, categories of accommodations (e.g., camping) and ‘other non-governmental activities’ (e.g., art projects) were included as additional categories. In practice, overlap between these categories will often exist. As noted by ASOC, examples of diversification of activities may exist at all these levels, from standard landings to novel activities. For instance, while the main ‘mode of transport’ to travel to Antarctica may be a ship, certain specific activities (e.g., kayaking, overnight camping) may be combined with making a landing from the ship in Antarctica.

In relation to ‘support activities’, it was explained in the ICG that there might be a tendency to focus on the individual activities as listed in Appendix I, while in practice a particular activity is only feasible through much more comprehensive systems of support and logistics by private companies and possible increased use of infrastructure that was originally established with the aim to support scientific research.

I. Airborne and Seaborne Tourism (modes of transportation to Antarctica):

- Tourist expeditions with yachts;
- Tourist expeditions with small and mid-sized vessels (capacity not exceeding 500 passengers), making landings in Antarctica;
- Cruise only activities;
- Air over-flights;
- Fly-sail operations.

II. Expeditions with the primary purpose of accomplishing a certain (often challenging) route in Antarctica:

- Land-based trekking expeditions on foot, using ski’s and/or kites;
- Expeditions with motorized vehicles;
- Cycling and biking expeditions;
- Air-born expeditions (primary aim: routes in Antarctica with helicopters or air planes).

III. Specific categories of activities, often a sports activity (individual activity or group competition), being part of a larger expedition:

- Ocean related sports:
 - o Kayaking;
 - o Long distance swimming;
 - o Scuba diving;
 - o Surfing;
- Marathons and other athletic sports;
- Mountain-related sports and other extreme sports:
 - o Mountain climbing;
 - o Base jumping/skydiving;
 - o Downhill skiing and snowboarding;
 - o Heli-skiing;
 - o Skydiving and paragliding;
- Activities during landings (in addition to ‘conventional’ activities such as short distance hiking, photography, etc.):
 - o Snowshoeing;
 - o Sledding;

- Shopping for souvenirs, sending post cards, stamping passports, etc., at research stations and Port Lockroy;
- Swimming (Deception Island);
- Overnight camping – one/few nights.

IV. Overnight accommodation for tourism on land in Antarctica

- Camps and Semi-permanent facilities (overnight, temporary, seasonal or multiple-season)
- Permanent facilities, non-governmentally operated (year-round or multi-seasonal) with a primary tourism purpose;
- Permanent facilities, governmentally operated (year-round or multi-seasonal) with a primary tourism purpose.

V. Other non-governmental activities

- Film and photography projects;
- Educational activities (e.g., programs that link graduate or undergraduate students to research in Antarctica);
- Art projects (e.g., establishing sculptures);
- Other activities, e.g., religious activities.

Relationship between the overview and EIA

As the EIA Database constituted one of the sources for identifying different types of activities, available information on the level of EIAs was included in the overview. It is clear that not all of the activities listed in Appendix I (as examples of the selected category) are also included in the EIA Database. It is important to note that there may be several explanations for this:

- an activity is conducted outside the scope of application of the Contracting Parties to the Protocol (free rider concern);
- the responsible government (Contracting Party to the Protocol) was not aware of the activity (compliance issue);
- the activity was subject to an adequate environmental assessment at the IEE or CEE level, but the responsible government did not report the EIA;
- the activity was subject to a preliminary assessment in accordance with the domestic law of a Contracting Party and was therefore not reported (the EIA database does not include this first level of assessment).

Activities undertaken by governmental personnel

This informal ICG and this resulting working paper focus on tourism and other non-governmental activities. IAATO has raised the question how many of the identified activities have been/are being undertaken by Governmental personnel either in a work-related context or during their recreation periods. This question could not receive an answer within this informal ICG, but may certainly be relevant when discussing certain challenges that are connected to the spectrum of National Antarctic Program activities.

‘Authorisation’

A final remark in this section relates to the issue of authorisation. The last column of Appendix I is meant to indicate whether the activity did proceed or not and whether it has been authorised or not. This information is not complete, but was considered useful as for some activities it became clear that they had not proceeded, for instance because an authorisation was denied or the operator cancelled or postponed the activity. In examining this column, it should be recognized that not all Contracting Parties to the Protocol adopted a general permit/authorisation system for Antarctic

activities as part of their implementation legislation (see also Section 3 below). For these Contracting Parties, the column is only relevant for the question whether the activity did proceed.

3. Domestic experiences and approaches relating to the diversification of tourism activities

Against the background of diversification of tourism activities, as illustrated by Attachment I, the informal ICG discussed a number of questions with the aim to exchange experiences with the application of domestic law and policies regarding tourism and non-governmental activities in Antarctica (second bullet point of the mandate of this informal ICG).¹ Below, the answers and comments of the ICG participants have been summarized.

Governmental authorisation

Most Consultative Parties have general systems of prior governmental authorisation of Antarctic tourism and other non-governmental activities. Some participants explain that their system applies to all human activities and that the system does not make a distinction between governmental and non-governmental activities (e.g., France, Germany). The authorisation systems may be permit system (e.g., Australia, France, Germany), a certification system (Japan), or may be based on a general notification requirement (Norway, New Zealand). It should be noted that the jurisdictional scope of application of these various domestic systems differ from state to state (nationals and/or activities organised within its territory and/or ships flying its flag and/or activities departing from its territory).

The United States of America implemented the EIA obligations, the specific permit requirements of Annex II and V, and the other relevant provisions through the enactment of domestic legislation without also adopting a general authorisation system for the conduct of activities in Antarctica.

In view of Annex V of the Protocol, domestic systems must require an explicit authorisation for entering and carrying out an activity in an Antarctic Specially Protected Area, an authorisation that may only be issued in accordance with the requirements of any relevant management plan. New Zealand made this ASPA permit requirement explicit in its response.

Environmental Impact Assessment: Scope and practical experiences

Tourism and non-governmental activities must be subjected to a prior environmental impact assessment (EIA) in accordance with the Protocol (Art. 3(2)(c), Art. 8 and Annex I). Appendix I shows that Consultative Parties may take different approaches in respect of the required level of EIA (e.g., preliminary assessment or IEE). The assessment of cumulative impacts is highlighted as being challenging (e.g., Germany, New Zealand, Spain), particularly because of lack of timely available information on other activities in the planned Antarctic destination. Possible impacts on wilderness values have been mentioned as values that are less frequently acknowledged and assessed (New Zealand). France explained that defining specific criteria on wilderness in the CEP would be useful to better take this aspect into account in the EIA.

As far as logistic and support activities are concerned, France explains that these activities associated with non-governmental operations are taken into account in the EIA realized by the French national competent authority. (In the case of support to scientific operations they are dealt with separately and benefit from multi-year authorization that can be adjusted in case of technical changes.) In addition, France states that it appears essential to take fully into account all the support activities in the EIA, since bivouacs, temporary structures, transportations, emergency facilities, supply etc. are likely to have an important impact while the activities in support of which they are

¹ Questions relating to supervision and enforcement are not included to prevent overlap with the ICG on jurisdiction.

brought to Antarctica may have nearly no impact on the environment. New Zealand suggests that there may be merit in more proactively publishing EIAs relating to logistics providers.

Japan stated that no special concerns or questions in relation to the conduct of an EIA have been raised in Japan. The United States believes that the current EIA process sufficiently considers potential impacts to the Antarctic environment, as required by Annex I, including the consideration of cumulative impacts. The US does not believe the diversification of tourism activities that they have reviewed to date raise unique concerns or questions in relation to EIA assessment that differ substantially from other expeditions. Also Australia stated that in its view EIA processes as required by the Protocol provide the flexibility to consider the impacts of different types of activities, including activities associated with national Antarctic programs, as well as tourism and non-governmental activities. Argentina stated that it believes that the Guidelines for Environmental Impact Assessment are an appropriate tool for the EIA process, included tourism and non-governmental activities.

As far as the scope of EIA is concerned, France noted that human safety related issues fall outside this scope and particularly in view of the diversification of tourism activities in Antarctica, France considers this problematic: “An activity can result in a low environmental activity (or even no impact at all) while its impact in terms of search and rescue would be very high (example: base-jumping, mountain-climbing, skydiving etc.)” France thinks it is useful for the ATCM to discuss safety criteria for Antarctic activities that would allow national competent authorities to forbid or better regulate potentially dangerous activities.

Legal criteria for authorising and prohibiting activities

Participants explain that the level of impacts on the Antarctic environment constitutes the main legal ground for authorising or not authorising activities. As far as the relevant types of impacts and related values are concerned, several participants refer to Article 3, of the Protocol (Australia, Germany, New Zealand): when activities would violate the principles in Article 3, the activity should not be authorised. Compared to other domestic systems, the German system appears to be more explicitly based on the precautionary approach in the sense that a permit can only be issued when it has been established that there is no cause for concern that the assets recognised in Article 3(1) of the Protocol will be subject to adverse impacts, serious or detrimental changes, damage or hazards. Germany also explains that it would like to have the opportunity to prevent certain types of tourism and other non-governmental activities from being conducted in the Antarctic (e.g., extreme sport activities like marathons, expeditions with motorized vehicles); however, that this would only be possible on the basis of a mandatory decision of the ATCM.

The Norwegian legislation makes it possible to forbid or postpone an activity if “its implementation will or may result in impacts on the environment in Antarctica and its dependent and associated ecosystems which are contrary to the purpose of the present Regulations, provisions in the Regulations, or provisions issued pursuant to the Regulations, or international resolutions, advice, and recommendations adopted by the parties to the Antarctic Treaty system”. This link between the domestic legal competence to prohibit an activity and relevant ATS resolutions, advice, and recommendations appears to create a dynamic approach in ensuring a strong interrelationship between the domestic implementation system and ATS decision making.

Apart from environmental aspects, safety, insurance and contingency planning matters have also been mentioned as considerations that may play a role in assessing allowance of activities (Spain; Australia (after entering into force of Measure 4(2004))). As explained above, France noted that for the moment it has difficulties to assess and, if needed, prohibit activities on human safety- or legal grounds.

General prohibitions of categories of activities?

Many participants explain that the assessment of activities is based on a case-by-case approach. There are no examples provided of general prohibitions of categories of tourism and other non-governmental activities in domestic law. IAATO explains that their bylaws include a general

prohibition to conduct activities with more than minor or transitory impacts (see ATCM XXXI/IP 84). Germany explains that tourism and other non-governmental activities above that threshold might indeed be prohibited under its domestic legal system. ASOC advocated more clarity on the practical consequences of this criteria (e.g., for multi-season camps) and on the question how such impacts are monitored.

Examples of activities that have been prohibited or for which a permit/authorisation has been refused

The participants in the informal ICG also responded to the question whether concrete proposals for tourism or other non-governmental activities have been denied authorisation in the past, and if so, what reasons were given for the denial. The general impression on the basis of the responses is that authorisations are seldom refused and Australia made explicit that it had never denied an authorisation. However, the following examples of prohibited or refused activities have been provided:

- Under the Spanish domestic system, a non-governmental activity, which aim was to take 300 penguin eggs, was denied in 2000 because the activity could violate Annex II of the Madrid Protocol.
- In 2006 the German competent authority refused a permit for the installation of a sculpture of bronze in the Antarctic for an unlimited time period (see also Appendix I). In accordance with Germany's national law, all activities have to be limited in time. The German permit refusal was challenged before the Administrative Court Berlin, but this Court confirmed the decision of the competent authority.
- A number of years ago a non-governmental activity looking at installing a fairly extensive sculpture park was forbidden to proceed, as planned, by the Norwegian competent authority due to perceived impacts on wilderness values, thus being in contradiction with the underlying purpose of the Norwegian Antarctic environmental legislation.
- In 2010, the French national competent authority issued a "warning" against the operator of the yacht "l'Esprit d'Equipe" after one of its crew members was involved in damages of the Wordie House Hut (HSM n°62) the same year. Under French law, a "warning" is an administrative sanction that is equivalent to a five-year prohibition to request an activity authorization in the Antarctic Treaty area (which means a five-year prohibition to have activities in Antarctica). Such "warnings" are issued only if the operator voluntarily violated the French law related to Antarctica and/or the ATCM regulations.
- In 2011, France denied an application that aimed at organizing a crossing of Antarctica by ski and kite-surf. This denial was mostly based on procedural issues and – of course, as there was no infraction – no "warning" was issued.
- In 2011, an application in Germany for collecting earth and volcanic rock from Deception Island for rock paintings was withdrawn by the applicant after a request by the competent authority (see also Appendix I). This activity was considered not in line with the existing General Guidelines for Visitors to the Antarctic ("Do not take souvenirs, whether man-made, biological or geological items, including feathers, bones, eggs, vegetation, soil, rocks, meteorites or fossils.")

Example from the New Zealand Sub-Antarctic

A brief introduction to the regulations on tourism in the Sub-Antarctic region has been provided by New Zealand (the “Conservation Management Strategy” governing the New Zealand Sub-Antarctic Islands) as background information: “Most tourist cruises between New Zealand and Antarctica will pass through the Sub-Antarctic Islands and will therefore be subject to the respective regulations of the Sub-Antarctic Islands and the regulations of the Antarctic Treaty System (at different times during their voyage). Key features of the Sub-Antarctic Islands’ regulation that may be of interest include:

- a quota for numbers of tourist visitors per year and per day (no more than 50 or 100 per site per day)
- general prohibition on landings except at designated tourist landing sites
- tourist movements limited to designated tourist walkways
- an entry fee is charged to cover environmental impact management expenses
- the entry permit must list approved sites and activities
- activities must be shown to be compatible with the “natural reserve” status of the islands (current policy is that “adventure” activities, are not compatible as they do not benefit the islands)
- the use of motor vehicles is judged as incompatible with the natural reserve status of the islands
- commercial activities (such as filming) incur an extra fee
- all tourism must be ship based due to a prohibition on people being ashore after sunset
- all visits must be supervised by a government-appointed environmental observer.”

International cooperation in applying domestic systems

Almost all participants in the informal ICG underlined the importance of international cooperation in applying the domestic legal and administrative systems, particularly in relation to activities with multinational aspects. Although the importance was not just related to the topic of this informal ICG, some participants explained that the diversification of activities may further underline the importance of this issue. For instance, refusal of activities or strict domestic policy in respect of certain types of activities may increase the risk of ‘forum shopping’ by private operators. Furthermore, it was stated that in the case of new types of activities cooperation or exchange of views may be useful in order to have an overall picture of how new types of activities are handled by the various countries’ authorities, and potentially move towards some level of consistency in how they are dealt with (Norway). Among the ideas was also the option to list certain types of activities that are considered “risky” and that could be assessed by the national competent authorities on the basis of specific criteria in addition to those currently related to environmental protection (especially safety criteria) with the possibility for the national competent authority to refuse to allow an activity that would not be in conformity with such criteria (France). IAATO asked attention for Part 1 of Recommendation XVIII-1, which is still not legally binding, relating to specific information to be included in the Advance Notification of activities to competent authorities.

4. Discussion at ATCM XXXVI

It is proposed to continue the debate on the diversification of tourism and other non-governmental activities in Antarctica at ATCM XXXVI. Taking note of the examples of diversification in Section 2 and Attachment I, and based on the input of participants of the informal ICG, components for the discussions could include (non-exhaustive):

- a) experiences and challenges with applying domestic law² in respect of the diverse types of activities as illustrated in Attachment I, for instance:
- i. exchange of views on the challenges related to the assessment of cumulative impacts and impacts on Antarctica's wilderness values;³
 - ii. criteria that have been used by competent authorities for denying authorisation/prohibiting a certain proposed activity in the past (e.g., building on the examples provided in Section 3);
 - iii. exchange of views on the need to pay special attention to the facilities and activities that support land-based activities in Antarctica;
 - iv. experiences and lessons learnt from tourism management in other parts of the world, e.g., the Arctic and the sub-Antarctic;
 - v. exchange of views on the need to improve cooperation between competent authorities.
- b) Exchange of views on the question whether further policy guidance from the ATCM on this issue is desirable, taking into account the Protocol and other existing instruments on tourism in Antarctica.

² Consideration should be given to possible overlap with the French-led ICG on Jurisdiction.

³ Consideration should be given to the work of the CEP regarding possible practical guidance on how to take account of wilderness values in environmental impact assessment.

**Attachment I:
Examples of activities that contribute to a diversification of tourism in Antarctica**

Type of activity	Year	CP	Level EIA	Source:	Authorized/ Proceeded
I. Airborne and Seaborne Tourism (modes of transportation to Antarctica)					
Tourist expeditions with yachts					
Various operators	All seasons	Various CPs	PA or IEE	EIA Database www.iaato.org	Yes
Tourist expeditions with small + mid-sized vessels (capacity not exceeding 500 pass.), making landings in Antarctica					
Various operators	All seasons	Various CPs	PA or IEE	EIA Database www.iaato.org	Yes
Cruise only activities					
Various operators	All seasons	Various CPs	PA or IEE	EIA Database www.iaato.org	Yes
Air overflights					
Various operators	All seasons	Australia	PA or IEE	EIA Database www.iaato.org	Yes
Fly-sail operations					
Various operators	All seasons	Chile	PA or IEE	EIA Database; www.iaato.org ; see, e.g., http://www.antarcticaxxi.com/ . See also http://www.victory-cruises.com/antarctica_by_air_&_water.html : "Without navigating the Drake sea, we fly you to Antarctica aboard a jet plane for a beautiful 6 day Cruise. This takes about 2 hours, saving you a 3 day crossing."	Yes
II. Expeditions with the primary purpose of accomplishing a particular challenging route in Antarctica					
Land-based trekking expeditions by foot, on ski's and/or kites					
Extreme World Races 'COLD SWEAT' 2012: Centenary Race to the South Pole (7 teams/17 exp. Members)	2012	? (17 exp. members from 6 nations)	?	Video available at: http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=7eJDj0JS4Os	Yes
Sport activity "Antarctica 2011 centennial crossing"	2011	France	IEE	EIA Database (http://www.ats.aq/)	No, authorize. rejected
Sport challenge of crossing Antarctica on foot and kite	2011	France	IEE	EIA Database	No, authorize. rejected
South Pole 1911-2011 Outreach Expedition	2011	Norway	IEE	EIA Database	Yes, no more than M or T
Land-based and aircraft activities (ALE)	2011, 2010	United States	IEE	EIA Database	Yes
Land Based tourism:	2011	United	IEE	EIA Database	Yes

Antarctica 2011-12 Centennial Crossing: two-man expedition across Antarctica utilizing skis and kites		States			
Sailing / Kayaking and land-based tourism to the Antarctic Peninsula	2011	United States	IEE	EIA Database	No
Celebration of the centenary of Shackleton's Nimrod journey by retracing his route from Cape Rods to the 97 mile point from the Pole.	2008	New Zealand	IEE	EIA Database	No more than MorT
Antarctic Expedition-unsupported overland trip to the Pole.	2006	New Zealand	IEE	EIA Database	No ASPA permits issued
Adventure Ski expedition, Erebus volcano, Antarctica	2002	Japan	IEE	Adventure	Certified; no more than MorT; cancelled by operator
Expeditions with motorized vehicles					
World Record for completing a double traverse of Antarctica with trucks (Toyota Hilux AT44 6x6); 9,500 km in total (return crossing of the entire length of Antarctica) also to reach arguably the most remote place on the planet – The Pole of Inaccessibility.	2011-2012	UK?	?	http://www.extremeworldraces.com/safety/vehicles/	Yes
Transport of tourists near Union Glacier camp: “Two new, specially-adapted 4x4 passenger vans will be used for passenger shuttles.”	Since 2010	USA	IEE	http://www.antarctic-logistics.com/news.html#8	Yes
“The first there-and-back vehicle crossing of the Antarctic continent” (about 4000 km.); TransAntarctic Expedition with the Concept Ice Vehicle (CIV) - Andrew Moon and Andrew Regan	2010	UK?	?	http://www.transantarcticexpedition.com/civ Video test CIV: http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=Z_8GGIFxopQ&feature=plcp	Yes
‘Icechallenger’: a so-called ‘Icecool.is modified car’ on its way to Antarctica	2007	Non-CP: Iceland	?	http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=Ryz3eO1IBsU	?
Mission Antarctica 2048 (Wilco van Rooyen en Fokke van Velzen) – expedition with Solar Truck	2012-2013	NL	IEE	http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=VRMmkwnbrM8&feature=endscreen&NR=1	Activity was postponed by operator
Cycling and biking					
South Cycle Expedition by Eric Larsen: “the first-ever bicycle expedition to the Geographic South Pole” (supported by ALE)	2012-2013	USA	?	http://www.ericlarsenexplore.com/expedition/cyclesouth ; http://adventureblog.nationalgeographic.com/2012/12/17/polar-explorer-eric-larsen-begins-attempt-to-bike-to-the-south-pole/	Yes
500 miles journey to the South Pole on bike by Helen Skelton	2012-2013	UK	?	http://www.bbc.co.uk/cbbc/diaries/helen-skeltons-polar-challenge-for-sport-relief	Did proceed

Air born expeditions (primary aim: routes in Antarctica with helicopters or air planes)						
Circumpolar Speed Record Flight of flying around the world over the poles (World Flyers - Mickey Russell and Jay Jones)	2011	USA	IEE	US/EPA - EIA database; http://cfpub.epa.gov/ See also http://www.pr.com/press-release/331360		Did not proceed
Single flight over Antarctica (William C. Harrelson)	2013	USA	Prel. Eval.	(http://cfpub.epa.gov/)		Did not proceed
Record: two helicopter pilots fly around the world via the North and South Pole (Polar First)	2006-07	USA	IEE	EIA Database; See also http://www.polarfirst.com/		Yes, no more than M or T
Sailplanes Over Antarctic Regions. SOAR Camp at Marble Point	2005	New Zealand	IEE	EIA Database		Activity did not proceed
III. Specific categories of activities, often a sport activity being part of a larger expedition						
Ocean related sports						
<i>Kayaking</i>						
Ross Sea Kayaking Expeditions along Borchgjevik Coast	2010	New Zealand	IEE	EIA Database		Yes no more than M or T
<i>Scuba diving</i>						
Different tour operators from different CPs	Each year	Various CPs, e.g. Aus., NL	PA/IEE	See, e.g.: http://www.aqua-firma.com/experiences/Polar_Expeditions/ ; and http://www.auroraexpeditions.com.au/diving ; and http://www.ecophotoexplorers.com/antarctica_diving.asp		Yes
<i>Surfing</i>						
Surfing in Antarctica for a movie, directed by Thomas Miklautsch	2006	?	?	http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=lqJ_KAWvjsk&playnext=1&list=PLF9747F4A7F6505E3&feature=results_video		Did proceed
Surfing activities on some Antarctic beaches by Chris Malloy and Edwin Salem (US).	2008 (?)	?		http://www.arcticsurfblog.com/2011/11/kelly-slater-surfs-antarctica/ ; See for the video (uploaded in 2008): http://www.youtube.com/watch?feature=player_embedded&v=NiJ8QsxpLQ		Did proceed
Kepa Acero	2012-2013	?Dep. from Ushuaia, Arg	?	http://www.arcticsurfblog.com/2013/01/kepa-acero-antarctica/		?
<i>Long distance swimming</i>						
“Extreme swimmer Lewis Pugh has set a new world record for the most southerly long-distance swim, conquering the icy Antarctic waters at 65 degrees south.”	2006-2007	?	?	http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=M0kogs4KEso		Did proceed
‘One miles swim to Antarctica’ (Lynne Cox)	2002-2003	?	?	http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=J0W3OmYvONA ; and		Did proceed

	(?)			http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=M0kogs4KEso	
Marathons and other athletic sports					
Last Desert marathon (250km, 7 days, self supported).	Several races since 2006; last: 2012. Next: 2014	?		http://www.4deserts.com/thelastdesert/	?
2013 Marathon and half marathon on King George Island, organised by "Marathon Tours & Travel, the event organizer and exclusive tour operator, in conjunction with One Ocean Expeditions"	2012-2013	Canada	?	http://www.marathontours.com/index.cfm/page/Antarctica-Marathon-and-Half-Marathon/pid/10734 ("Due to the incredible popularity of this event, we are already sold out for 2013, 2014, 2015, and 2016. We are still accepting deposits for the 2014, 2015 and 2016 waitlist and confirming space for 2017.")	Scheduled for March 2013
'Antarctic Ice Marathon', organised by 'Polar Running Adventures', at Union Glacier Antarctica, with participation of forty-six athletes from 16 countries. One day later: ultramarathon (100 km).	Various years, most recently: 21 & 22 Nov 2012	USA	?	http://www.icemarathon.com/live/208.html ; and http://www.icemarathon.com/	Yes
Mountain related sports and other extreme sports					
Mountain climbing					
Various mountain climbing expeditions, also to pristine areas	Various years	Various CPs		Internet: http://www.planetmountain.com (search Antarctica)	Did proceed
First ascent of the Holtanna West Face (Alexander and Thomas Huber)	Dec. 2008	?	?	Video available on Youtube: 'Expedition Antarctica 2008 - Ice Age Clip' http://www.polarfirst.com/index.php?option=com_content&task=view&id=12&Itemid=26	Did proceed
Wolf Jaw mountain by the High Mountain Military Group	2008	France	IEE	EIA Database	Yes, MorT
Climbing expedition (4 men): Ulvetanna østvegg (Ulvetanna Eastern Wall)	2006	Norway	IEE	EIA Database	Yes, less than MorT
Base jumping					
First base jump in Antarctica from Peaks Holstinnd and Holtanna (Sam Beaughey, Manu Pellissier, Sébastien Collomb-Gros and Géraldine Fastnacht)	2009	France	IEE	EIA Data base and internet: http://www.planetmountain.com/english/News/shownews1.lasso?l=2&keyid=39450 (with video; also available on Youtube)	According to EIA database no permit, but activity did proceed
Red Bull Antarctic Project - Base jump (Queen Moud Land) by Russian climber and Base jumper Valery Rozov	2009?	Russia	?	Video available at http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=Kz62_t_j8Zs	Yes, see video
Downhill skiing and snowboarding					
Downhill skiing by Chris Davenport, Stian Hagen, and Andrea Binning	2009-2010	?	?	http://www.tetongravity.com/videos/Granite-Films-Australis-An-Antarctic-Ski-Odyssey-Trailer-	Did proceed

				1453059.htm , and http://www.antarcticskiodysey.com/ http://www.tetongravity.com/videos/Final-Video-Dispatch-Mission-Antarctic-The-North-Face-1807491.htm	
Snowboarding. Rue and Lucas Debari's Mission Antarctic, probably sponsored by The North Face	2012-2013	?	?		Did proceed
Heli-skiing					
Preparations for heli-skiing in Antarctica by 'Beyond Boundaries'; possibly heli-skiing already taking place from yachts.	2013	?	?	http://www.beyondboundaries.at/destinations/antarctica; http://www.newschoolers.com/ns/forums/readthread/thread_id/404579/	Uncertain
Skydiving and paragliding					
Skydiving over Antarctica by 3 Spanish skydivers : the "Red Bull Wingsuit Project"	2007	? Spain?	?	Video available at http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=vgxTOx7kaHQ	Did proceed
Mount Francais (Ant. Peninsula) Hang Gliding and Paragliding Expedition, 13 Dec 2005 - 25 Jan 2006. Yacht based ski touring, mountain-eering and free-flying exped. to Ant. Peninsula; team of 8 people.	2005	New Zealand	IEE	EIA Database	Authorised, but no permits for entering ASPAs
Paragliding in Antarctica; Volomania Antartide	2002	?Italy?	?	Video available on Youtube (Volomania Antartide)	Did proceed
IV. Overnight accommodation for tourism on land in Antarctica					
Camps and Semi-permanent facilities (seasonal – multiple seasons)					
One or more nights of camping ashore	Each season	Various CPs	?	e.g. http://www.oneoceanexpeditions.com/overnight_camping.php ; and http://www.hurtigruten.us/utis/news-on-front-page/sleeping-under-the-summer-sky-in-antarctica---well-how-about-in-a-test-hurtigruten-adds-overnight-camping-option-to-its-antarctica-sailings/	Did proceed
Camping facilities at Patriot Hills					
Camping facilities at Patriot Hills	Each seasons	Aus?		http://www.adventureassociates.com/specialtours/emperor/camp.html	Did proceed
Camping facilities at Vinson Massif base camp (ALE)					
Camping facilities at Vinson Massif base camp (ALE)	Each season	USA	IEE	EIA Database	Did proceed
Union Glacier camp: "guests will be directed to a new heated passenger terminal, where they will pick up a shuttle service to the camp. [...] The completely refurbished base camp now offers the height of Antarctic field comforts for up to 80 guests."					
Union Glacier camp: "guests will be directed to a new heated passenger terminal, where they will pick up a shuttle service to the camp. [...] The completely refurbished base camp now offers the height of Antarctic field comforts for up to 80 guests."	Since 2010	USA	IEE	http://www.antarctic-logistics.com/news.html#8	Yes

Permanent facilities with a primary tourism purpose					
E-base, King George Island, established by „2041” (NGO founded by Robert Swan): described as the first education base in Antarctica	2006	UK?	?	http://2041.com/about-2041/robert-swan/	Did proceed
V. Other non-governmental activities					
Film and photography					
shooting video report on emperors penguins huddle (John Downer Productions)	2011	France	IEE	EIA Database	Yes, no more than M or T
TV documentation: South Pole Race/Expedition to the geographic South Pole and attendant documentation	2010	Germany	IEE	EIA Database	Permit issued under conditions + restrictions
Wildlife movie on Emperor Penguins	2007	France	IEE	EIA Database	Yes, no more than MorT
Wildlife movie on Sea Leopard	2007	France	IEE	EIA Database	Yes, no more than MorT
Film expedition (tv) : Antarktisopplevelser (Antarctic Adventures), sailing expedition in the Antarctic Peninsula area	2006	Norway	IEE	EIA Database	Yes, less than MorT
Film production for “CBS News”: “60 Minutes” Antarctic Expedition	2006	USA	IEE	EIA Database	Yes, no more than MorT
Educational activities					
Students on Ice Expeditions	2007		IEE	EIA Database	Yes, no more than MorT
Project "Cool Classes" ("Coole Klassen")	2011-2012	Germany	IEE	http://www.dgp-ev.de/expeditionen.html ; See also: http://www.apecs.is/news-feeds/partner-news/5257-coole-klassen-a-german-project	Yes, no more than MorT
Art projects					
Art project proposal, developed in Germany, which would result in the „installation of a sculpture of bronze in Antarctica for an unlimited time period.”	2006	Germany	?	See “Freedom of art vs. environmental protection? The day after tomorrow”, 4 <i>Antarctic Treaty Secretariat Newsletter</i> , 2006/4, at 3; < www.ats.aq/uploaded/newsletters/pdf_31.pdf >. See also A. Neumann and T. Bunge, „New Challenges Pose New Management Problems, The Permanent Installation of a Bronze Sculpture”, 36:3-4 <i>Environmental Policy and Law</i> (2006), 158-163.	The German competent authority has denied a permit, which decision was confirmed by Admin. Court of Berlin.
Collecting of earth and volcanic rock from Deception Island to use them in a rock painting at Deception Island (application by German artist Ulrike Arnold)	2011	Germany	?	ICG comment Germany with reference to http://www.ulrikearnold.com/	Application withdrawn on request of German competent authority

Religious activities					
Public-religious mission in Antarctica	2008	Russian Fed.	IEE	EIA Database	Yes, no more than MorT