



Agenda Item: ATCM 12
Presented by: United Kingdom,
Australia, France,
Germany,
Netherlands,
Russian
Federation, South
Africa, Spain,
Sweden
Original: English
Submitted: 10/03/2014

Key Thematic Recommendations from 10 years of Antarctic Treaty Inspection Reports

Key Thematic Recommendations from ten years of Antarctic Treaty Inspection Reports

Working Paper submitted by the United Kingdom, Australia, France, Germany, the Netherlands, Russian Federation, South Africa, Sweden and Spain

Summary

The proponents of this paper have undertaken a review of all Antarctic Treaty Inspection Reports from 2003-2013 and drawn five key themes from the conclusions and recommendations of those reports. Under each of these themes, the proponents have then set out some of the headline general recommendations that have emerged as themes across different reports, and make proposals on how the ATCM might best take these forward. The paper also proposes a more structured approach to recording Inspection Reports and any related subsequent papers by Parties responding to those reports.

Introduction

The proponents consider that Antarctic Treaty Inspections, undertaken pursuant to Article VII of the Antarctic Treaty and Article 14 of the Protocol on Environmental Protection, are one of the key rights and responsibilities of an Antarctic Treaty Party. In the past 10 years, between them, the proponents have participated in ten different Inspection Programmes and welcomed many inspection teams to their Antarctic stations. The proponents appreciate the considerable financial and personnel expense required to mount an inspection programme and welcome the considered and detailed Inspection Reports produced and, in particular, their conclusions and recommendations.

The proponents have noted, however, that while the recommendations directly relating to specific stations, vessel, installations, etc., have been generally welcomed and considered by the relevant Treaty Party, many of the recent Inspection Reports have also contained more general conclusions and recommendations. These more general findings have generated some discussion at ATCM, but there has been little opportunity for more structured discussion of the themes arising from different Inspection Reports, operating in different parts of Antarctica, or in different years.

In undertaking the analysis, the proponents also noted that whilst the ATS website helpfully holds electronic versions of Inspection Reports, it is still not possible to start by identifying a station or other facility, and easily find all Inspection Reports, as well as any relevant subsequent papers relating to each inspection. Gathering this information in more structured way would significantly facilitate the preparations of inspection teams in the field, as well as providing a more transparent tool to record both Inspection Reports, and subsequent responses by Parties.

Recommendation

The proponents have undertaken a general analysis of all Inspection Reports submitted over the period 2003-2013 (list at Annex A) and have suggested five key themes that arise from the general conclusions and recommendations of those reports. The proponents recommend that the ATCM (taking advice from the CEP as appropriate) considers some of the key recommendations arising under these general themes in more detail, in particular, to consider whether any opportunities exist for the wider dissemination of good practice, or whether the development of further guidance and/or recommendations would be helpful. The key themes and a proposal for how the ATCM might structure such discussions are attached.

The proponents also recommend that enhancements are made to the ATS website (and/or the EIES, as appropriate) to provide a facility to search for Inspection Reports by station or other facilities inspected, and that this search facility also identifies any relevant ATCM papers submitted subsequent to those inspections.

Options and next steps

The proponents look forward to hearing the views of the ATCM on whether the key themes capture the breadth of the general conclusions and recommendations of recent Inspection Reports, and also on how some of the key recommendations identified under each key theme might be now taken forward. Noting the number of recommendations, the proponents suggest that they be discussed one-by-one in the Science and Operations Working Group, and then referred to the CEP and other Working Groups as appropriate. The proponents also look forward to hearing the views of Parties about the proposal to develop a more structured approach to recording Inspection Reports and related papers.

Key Thematic Recommendations from Antarctic Treaty Inspection Reports 2003-2013

Theme 1: Environmental Management

Key Recommendations	Proposal for Next Steps
<p>All station personnel, especially local station managers, should be familiar with the Environmental Protocol, its procedures and domestic implementation.</p>	<p>General recommendation* to all Parties (perhaps to include suggestions on the minimum information to be known by all personnel)?</p>
<p>Environmental Impact Assessments relating to station activities and operations should be available on station (preferably in at least one of the official ATCM languages). Local station managers should be responsible for monitoring and ensuring compliance with approved EIAs.</p>	<p>General recommendation to all parties for relevant EIAs to be retained on stations?</p>
<p>Waste management and disposal facilities and procedures (including storage and removal of old and non-functional items and equipment) should be undertaken in accordance with the Environmental Protocol and COMNAP guidelines.</p>	<p>General recommendation to enhance dissemination of relevant COMNAP guidelines; or encourage new guidelines where gaps exist?</p>
<p>Practical guidelines on waste water disposal should be developed, to help underpin consistency of Articles 2(2) (“to maximum extent practicable”) and 4(2) (“the only practicable option”) of Annex III of the Environmental Protocol.</p>	<p>ATCM to ask COMNAP to review existing guidelines from 2002 at the next COMNAP Wastewater Workshop in August 2014?</p>
<p>Parties should maintain and regularly assess unoccupied facilities, and field huts, to ensure that no harm to the environment occurs because of such facilities.</p>	<p>General recommendation to all Parties?</p>
<p>Parties should prepare station contingency plans, including for oil spill response, if they are yet to do so (in line with Article 15 of the Environmental Protocol and ATCM Resolution 1 (1997) and Resolution 6 (1998)); and ensure that stations are aware, and have copies, of such procedures.</p>	<p>Consolidation and update of existing recommendations to all Parties?</p>

**General recommendations could take the form of Report Language or new/revised Resolutions?*

Theme 2: Logistics & Infrastructure

Key Recommendations	Proposal for Next Steps
Stations in close proximity to each other should consider sharing key logistics and infrastructures such as fuel storage, power generation, vehicles, accommodation and water supplies to maximise efficiencies.	ATCM to discuss how to enhance such dialogue, and possibly identify locations which may benefit from future ASMA development?
More active consideration should be given to promoting the use of renewable energy sources, especially wind and solar power. Stations should share best practices regarding renewable energy sources amongst each other.	ATCM to ask COMNAP to develop a best practice guide on renewable energy use in Antarctica?
Stations with no fire detection and alarm systems in accommodation areas should install them as a matter of urgency.	Invite COMNAP to identify expertise/best practice and/or develop guidance?
Consideration should be given by Parties to pooling investment in bandwidth on Antarctic stations to improve internet connectivity.	ATCM to invite COMNAP to consider options?

Theme 3: Scientific Collaboration

Key Recommendations	Proposal for Next Steps
Scientific collaboration and co-operation between stations in Antarctica, particularly those within close proximity of each other, should be strengthened. The objectives would be to encourage greater joint scientific endeavour, improve data sharing and minimise duplication.	ATCM to invite COMNAP/SCAR to consider how this might be best facilitated? Possible new guidelines on how to consult COMNAP/SCAR on new station proposals?

Theme 4: Tourism

Key Recommendations	Proposal for Next Steps
Visitor Site Guidelines and ASMAs should be used more extensively to help manage tourism. Consideration should be given to determining the maximum visitor capacity for the most popular sites.	CEP be invited to consider whether further sites should have Site Guidelines, and whether the ASMA guidance should be amended to include enhanced tourism management considerations?

<p>Stations and national programmes should have clearly stated policies regarding the level of availability of infrastructure and personnel to cater for tourism activities.</p>	<p>General recommendation to all Parties to develop and circulate such policies?</p>
<p>Parties should consider developing clearer methodologies for determining whether structures and installations within their bases, which are no longer required, should be considered for Historic Site and Monument status (especially where new buildings are planned to replace them).</p>	<p>Invite CEP to consider as part of their deliberations on the designation of HSMs?</p>

Theme 5: Communications

Key Recommendations	Proposal for Next Steps
<p>ATCM should consider means to improve communications: both within Antarctica and between Parties, but also with the wider public about the Antarctic Treaty, Antarctic stations and scientific activities.</p>	<p>ATCM to consider supporting a specific workshop on communications (<i>see also ATCMXXXVII/WP from Brazil/Belgium/Bulgaria/Portugal/UK</i>)</p>

List of Inspections under Article VII of the Antarctic Treaty and Article 14 of the Protocol on Environmental Protection: 2003 – 2013

(Taken from http://www.ats.aq/e/ats_governance_listinspections.htm)

Year	Parties	Inspected Facilities
2012/13	Germany & South Africa	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Princess Elisabeth Station (Belgium) • Troll Station (Norway) • Maitri Station (India) • Halley VI Station (United Kingdom)
2012/13	Netherlands, Spain & United Kingdom	<p>Bases and stations</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Comandante Ferraz Station (Brazil) • Arctowski (Poland) • Presidente Eduardo Frei (Chile) • Great Wall (China) • King Sejong (Republic of Korea) • Bellingshausen (Russia) • Carlini (Argentina) • Artigas (Uruguay) • Palmer (United States) • Gabriel González Videla (Chile) • Esperanza (Argentina) • Arturo Prat (Chile) <p>Unoccupied installations and bases</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Eco-Nelson (Czech Republic) • Refugio Meteorología Cruis (Brazil) • Elichiribehety (Uruguay) <p>Historic sites and monuments</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Whalers Bay • Port Lockroy • Waterboat Point <p>Vessels</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • MV Ocean Diamond (Bahamas) • MV Plancius (Netherlands) • MV Silver Explorer (Bahamas) • MV Corinthian II (Marshall Islands) • SY Paradise (France) • Bahía Paraiso (wreck of Argentine-flagged vessel)
2012/13	Russian Federation & United States	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Maitri Station (India) • Zhongshan Station (China) • Bharati Station (India) • Syowa Station (Japan) • Princess Elisabeth Station (Belgium) • Troll Station (Norway)

2011/12	United States & Russian Federation	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Scott Base (New Zealand) • Concordia (France/Italy) • Mario Zucchelli Station (Italy)
2010/11	Australia	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Gondwana Station (Germany) • Vostok Station (Russian Federation) • Aerial observation of Leningradskaya Station (Russian Federation)
2009/10	Australia	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Syowa Station (Japan) • Druzhnaya IV and Soyuz Stations (Russian Federation) • Mount Harding Antarctic Specially Protected Area (ASPA) 168 • Aerial observation of Molodezhnaya Station (Russian Federation)
2009/10	Japan	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Maitri Station (India) • Neumayer Station III (Germany) • Novolazarevskaya Station (Russian Federation) • Princess Elisabeth Station (Belgium) • SANAE IV Base (South Africa) • Troll Station (Norway)
2008/09	Norway	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Princess Elisabeth Station (Belgium) • Halley V Station (United Kingdom) • Novo Runway and ALCI Airbase (Russia and ALCI)
2006/07	Sweden, France & New Zealand	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Amundsen-Scott South Pole (US) • Concordia (France-Italy)
2006/07	United States	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Rothera Research Station (United Kingdom) • O'Higgins (Chile) • German Receiving Station at O'Higgins (Germany) • Esperanza (Argentina) • Bellingshausen (Russian Federation) • Great Wall (People's Republic of China) • Palmer (United States) • Field camp at Petermann Island (tour operations) <p>The following vessels were also inspected:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • M/S National Geographic Endeavour, • M/S Lyubov Orlova, • M/S Explorer II
2005/06	New Zealand & United Kingdom	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • ASMA 2: McMurdo Dry Valleys • ASPA 116: Cape Bird, New College Valley • ASPA 122: Arrival Heights, Hut Point Peninsula, Ross Island • ASPA 154: Cape Evans • ASPA 157: Cape Royds • ASPA 158: Hut Point
2004/05	Australia, Peru & United Kingdom	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Esperanza (Argentina) • Marambio (Argentina) • San Martín (Argentina) • Decepción (Argentina) • Brown (Argentina) • Petrel (Argentina) • Comandante Ferraz (Brazil) • St. Kliment Ochridski (Bulgaria) • Capitán Arturo Prat (Chile) • Risopatron (Chile) • Yelcho (Chile)

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Gabriel Gonzalez Videla (Chile) • Teniente Luis Carvajal Villaroel (Chile) • Unnamed Czech Station, James Ross Island (Czech Republic) • Pedro Vicente Maldonado (Ecuador) • Great Wall (Peoples Republic of China) • King Sejong (Republic of Korea) • Bellingshausen (Russian Federation) • Gabriel de Castilla (Spain) • Juan Carlos I (Spain) • Akademik Vernadsky (Ukraine) • T/N Ruperto Elichiribehety (Uruguay) • Rothera Research Station (United Kingdom) • Eco-Nelson (Non Governmental) • MV Professor Molchanov (Tourist vessel) <p>The following Historic Sites and Monuments were also inspected:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • HSM 55: Stonington- East Base • HSM 63: ‘Base Y’, Horseshoe Island • HSM 61: ‘Base A’, Port Lockroy • HSM 62: ‘Base F’ (Wordie House) Winter Island • HSM 64: ‘Base E’, Stonington Island
2004/05	Australia	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Mc Murdo Station (United States) • Scott Base (New Zealand) • RV Nathaniel B Palmer (US vessel) <p>The following ASPA and HSM were inspected:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • ASPA 122: Arrival Heights, Hut Point Peninsula, Ross Island • ASPA 158: Hut Point, Ross Island • HSM 18: Hut at Hut Point, Ross Island • HSM 19: Cross at Hut Point, Ross Island • HSM 20: Cross on Observation Hill, Ross Island • HSM 54: Richard E. Byrd Historic Monument, McMurdo Station • HSM 75: The A Hut of Scott Base <p>Tourist activities on Ross Island were also observed.</p>
2003/04	Finland	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Troll (Norway) • SANAE IV (South Africa) • Wasa (Sweden) • Neumayer Station (Germany) • Aboa (Finland)