



Agenda Item: CEP 9c  
Presented by: United Kingdom,  
Argentina,  
Australia,  
United States  
Original: English  
Submitted: 05/04/2013

## **Policy Issues Arising from the 2013 On-Site Review of Guidelines for Visitor Sites in the Antarctic Peninsula**



# Policy Issues Arising from the 2013 On-Site Review of Guidelines for Visitor Sites in the Antarctic Peninsula

***Working Paper submitted by the United Kingdom, Argentina, Australia, and the United States (in conjunction with the International Association of Antarctica Tour Operators)***

## 1. Summary

At the invitation of the United Kingdom a team of representatives from four Parties and the International Association of Antarctica Tour Operators (IAATO) carried out an on-site review of Site Guidelines in January 2013. Noting the desirability of periodic review of Site Guidelines, including site visits, the objectives of the team were to review site conditions and, where appropriate, to suggest amendments to existing Guidelines (see ATCM XXXVI WP20 *On-Site Review of Guidelines for Visitor Sites in the Antarctic Peninsula: summary of programme and suggested amendment of eleven Guidelines*) and to develop Guidelines for two additional sites (see ATCM XXXVI WP16 *Site Guidelines for i) Harbour and ii) Orne Islands*).

The 2013 on-site review followed a similar site visit programme undertaken by the UK, Argentina, Australia, Norway, the United States and IAATO in 2006, after which the ATCM adopted a suite of 12 Site Guidelines. During the 2013 programme a number of policy issues were considered, some of which had been first raised as a result of the 2006 visit (see ATCM XXIX WP2), as well as others which arose in the conduct of this review.

This paper discusses those issues in light of the CEP's recent considerations and the developments in visitor use of sites since 2006. It makes policy recommendations for further consideration by the CEP. In addition to the section on Recommendations below, **Annex A** provides an overview of the key issues arising from the 2013 on-site review; **Annex B** shows visitor usage and trends since 2006 at the sites visited by the team; and **Annex C** shows progress on the recommendations made in ATCM XXIX WP2.

## 2. Recommendations

In completing the on-site review of Site Guidelines for visitors in January 2013, a number of cross-cutting themes and topics relating to the accurate development, effective use and ongoing monitoring of Guidelines were discussed. The United Kingdom, Argentina, Australia and the United States recommend that the CEP consider the following recommendations in taking forward the further development Site Guidelines and related policies:

**Recommendation 1: Parties continue to make efforts to ensure that all visitors to sites covered by ATCM Site Guidelines are aware, and make use of, the Guidelines. This should include recreational visits by National Antarctic Programme (NAP) personnel as well as visitors participating in private or non-commercial activity.**

**Recommendation 2: For the CEP to consider the value of a survey to establish the level of recreational visits from NAP staff to sites with Site Guidelines in place.**

**Recommendation 3: Parties continue to carry out on-site reviews of Site Guidelines, as determined by the individual requirements of the sites.**

**Recommendation 4: Parties work to establish an appropriate site monitoring programme, including a recommended set of criteria for such a programme.**

**Recommendation 5:** In view of the assessment from this year's on-site review programme that there are sites which are particularly sensitive to visitation, the CEP consider whether monitoring for visitor impacts would be useful in these particular locations.

**Recommendation 6:** That any CEP discussion of monitoring sites should include consideration of including non site-specific impacts (for example, litter or other objects).

**Recommendation 7:** Parties should continue to seek input from IAATO and other non-governmental operators as appropriate, when revising or creating new Site Guidelines. Operators should alert Parties to changes at sites that merit review and possible revision of the Site Guidelines.

**Recommendation 8:**

- i) Where possible, illustrated photo-maps should be used to assist in on-site interpretation of the provisions of the Site Guidelines;
- ii) a standardised map format should be developed for use across Site Guidelines;
- iii) that the Site Guidelines should include information on the date of their adoption and any subsequent revision; and
- iv) that the CEP considers the benefit of bringing all the Site Guidelines together with the similarly formatted General Guidelines as part of the practical package of information for visitors to Antarctica.

**Recommendation 9:** That the CEP encourages the development, by IAATO and other non-governmental operators, of best-practice training assessment and/or accreditation schemes for Antarctic guides and expedition leaders, noting the CEP discussions in 2005 and 2006.

**Recommendation 10:** Noting that visible signs of disturbance are important in avoiding disturbance of wildlife, that CEP members give consideration to the production of visitor-focused guidelines detailing such signs.

### **3. Conclusion**

In addition to the primary objective of checking to see whether Site Guidelines required revision, the on-site review provided an opportunity to consider key issues across multiple sites, an assessment of the role of guidelines more generally and an opportunity to consider the practical changes which can assist in reducing possible visitor impact.

Whilst recognising that the on-site review took place at a particular time of the season, the team did not identify any significant visitor impacts on the sites, other than those which have been the subject of previous discussion. Although this was a relatively short, but focused and intensive, series of visits, all the evidence suggests that the Guidelines are successful in directing the way that the vast majority of organised groups of visitors are using the sites to avoid any adverse environmental impacts. At the same time, it was observed that Site Guidelines remain only one of a range of potential visitation management tools.

The United Kingdom, Argentina, Australia, the United States and IAATO considered that the undertaking of regular on-the-ground reviews, with the opportunity for wider discussions, provided a valuable occasion for developing practical Site Guidelines and would strongly encourage that such on-site reviews continue where possible.

## Annex A – Policy issues arising from the 2013 on-site review

This annex provides an overview of some of the key issues arising from the 2013 on-site review. For the sake of completeness it includes each of the recommendations from the Working Paper.

### **A.1 Use of guidelines**

Annual reports to the ATCM from IAATO, and discussion by representatives of Parties with tourism operators they authorise, indicate that commercial tourism operators are using the Guidelines in planning and conducting site visits. Feedback from expedition leaders and guides on-site also indicated that Site Guidelines were known and used in planning and conducting visits, and that their provisions were being implemented. The team noted that the majority of visits to sites covered by Site Guidelines are conducted by commercial tour operators. The degree to which Site Guidelines are being used by other visitor groups, such as non-commercial or private yacht visitors, or national Antarctic program visitors, is not known and was not possible to assess during the review. The team noted that it is desirable that all visitors use the Guidelines when visiting these sites.

**Recommendation 1: Parties continue to make efforts to ensure that all visitors to sites covered by ATCM Site Guidelines are aware, and make use of, the Guidelines. This should include recreational visits by National Antarctic Programme (NAP) personnel as well as visitors participating in private or non-commercial activity.**

**Recommendation 2: For the CEP to consider the value of a survey to establish the level of recreational visits from NAP staff to sites with Site Guidelines in place.**

### **A.2 Review of Site Guidelines**

On-site observation by the team indicates that the Site Guidelines adopted in 2006 appear to be working as intended. Discussions at the sites with operators, expedition leaders and guides demonstrated the extent to which the Guidelines have become accepted and used, benefiting the protection of the sites and ensuring consistency and predictability of operation.

The team concluded that on-site review was a valuable opportunity to ensure that the Site Guidelines remain relevant. Combined with information on site use levels and patterns, on-site review is likely to result in more effective, usable and accurate Site Guidelines. The team noted that the potential for rapid changes in site conditions (e.g. unseasonal snow, heavy ice, localised melting, presence of fresh water), including from climate change, increases the need for the review of Site Guidelines at regular intervals. However, noting the resources required to conduct such reviews, and the need for Site Guidelines to respond rapidly to any changes arising in site conditions or any signs that their provisions are not effective, the team concluded that a formal on-site review was a desirable but not necessarily essential step in maintaining and revising Site Guidelines.

**Recommendation 3: Parties continue to carry out on-site reviews of Site Guidelines, as determined by the individual requirements of the sites.**

### **A.3 Monitoring and evaluation**

Based on the on-site observations and related discussion, the team agreed that establishing an on-site monitoring programme (including assessing the effectiveness of site-specific guidelines and monitoring for impacts), as recommended by CEP XV and endorsed by the ATCM XXXV, would assist in evaluating and improving Site Guidelines. Other sources of information about sites, such as feedback from operators, information from management visits, and other observations will also continue to be important, in addition to advice and information from SCAR and NAPs. The team noted Resolution 11 (2012) on the Checklist for visitors' in-field activities as a possible monitoring tool and thought that it could play a role in assisting future monitoring.

**Recommendation 4: Parties work to establish an appropriate site monitoring programme, including a recommended set of criteria for such a programme.**

#### **A.4 Visitor-specific site sensitivity**

In carrying out the on-site review the team gave consideration to the recommendation of the CEP tourism study that “*An appropriate method of assessing site sensitivity should be developed and a relative sensitivity analysis undertaken for at least the most heavily visited sites in Antarctica*”. Rather than address the concept of sensitivity in its broadest sense, the team’s conclusions related specifically to sensitivity in the context of visitation and the interaction with the Site Guidelines.

The team concluded that, in the context of visitor use, some sites certainly appeared to be more sensitive to visitation than others. In such cases, for example where it is difficult to keep the recommended distance of 5 metres, whilst no direct visitor impacts were noted the team agreed that there was a case for particular caution to be exercised. In such cases specific practices are particularly important at these sites, including: very close supervision; use of guiding techniques focused on avoiding areas where impacts may occur and careful pre-visit assessment to determine site conditions at the time.

**Recommendation 5: In view of the assessment from this year’s on-site review programme that there are sites which are particularly sensitive to visitation, the CEP consider whether monitoring for visitor impacts would be useful in these particular locations.**

#### **A.5 Impacts associated with visitors**

The team did not observe any additional signs of specific or general visitor impacts beyond those identified in the Site Guidelines, or which had previously been reported and discussed in the CEP. The team observed that tracks had formed in some locations that may be attributable to visitors. In most cases these were in unconsolidated rock moraine or volcanic ash. Other possible tracks or pads were in areas also heavily used by wildlife and it was not possible to determine whether these were attributable to visitors, wildlife, or a combination of both.

The team also observed locations where it would require very close supervision to ensure that appropriate separation from wildlife could be maintained and some locations where it simply was not possible to maintain the 5 metre separation specified in the *General Guidelines for Visitors to the Antarctic*. Similarly, the team also observed locations where very close supervision was required to avoid disrupting wildlife traffic. Where appropriate, the team has recommended revisions to the Site Guidelines to identify and provide specific site-specific advice, including in some cases advice to avoid such areas.

One site had lengths of rope frozen into snow banks, in all likelihood from a small vessel mooring over winter. The team noted that leaving material such as ropes was not a site-specific impact (that is, littering or leaving behind objects could occur in any location), and that the General Guidelines provide sufficient advice on this issue. As such the team concluded that the Site Guidelines for that site did not require additional advice in relation to this impact.

**Recommendation 6: That any CEP discussion of monitoring sites should include consideration of including non site-specific impacts (for example, litter or other objects).**

#### **A.6 Feedback from operators**

Noting the value of feedback from industry (both from guides on-site and via the IAATO participant in the team) on the suitability of the Site Guidelines and of specific provisions and arrangements in individual Guidelines, and noting that operators develop knowledge through multiple visits and across multiple seasons, the team saw considerable value in welcoming feedback from operators on site conditions, changes, and any issues with application of the Site Guidelines. The team also saw value in drawing on the presence of operators to support or conduct simple monitoring, for example through programs using fixed photo points for repeated photographic collection in close cooperation with Parties.

**Recommendation 7: Parties should continue to seek input from IAATO and other non-governmental operators as appropriate, when revising or creating new Site Guidelines. Operators should alert Parties to changes at sites that merit review and possible revision of the Site Guidelines.**

### ***A.7 Role of Site Guidelines in limiting numbers of visits or visitors***

The team noted that the value of daily limits in the overall number of visits remained useful, but recognised that it only works across IAATO operators through their scheduling. It was also noted that some limits were set at or above the realistic maximum number of vessels that IAATO would regularly schedule for a site on a specific day. In addition, the team discussed the issue that whilst the Site Guidelines can set daily limits, if levels of visitation were to increase significantly they would not necessarily be effective in limiting numbers over an entire season.

### ***A.8 Format of Site Guidelines***

A consistent message was that the Site Guidelines with annotated photo-maps – specifically those with closed areas, landing sites and walking routes marked – were particularly useful in ensuring appropriate access and consistent use of a site.

The team recommends a number of improvements to the maps included in the Site Guidelines, to aid in site orientation, location of sensitive features, and ready identification of the various zones of a site including closed areas. The future standardisation of mapping would provide benefit.

The team recommends the inclusion of information on the dates of adoption and revision of Site Guidelines, to help ensure that the most up to date versions are in use, and to provide an indication to users of how recently the information was reviewed.

#### **Recommendation 8:**

- i) Where possible, illustrated photo-maps should be used to assist in on-site interpretation of the provisions of the Site Guidelines;**
- ii) a standardised map format should be developed for use across Site Guidelines;**
- iii) that the Site Guidelines should include information on the date of their adoption and any subsequent revision; and**
- iv) that the CEP considers the benefit of bringing all the Site Guidelines together with the similarly formatted General Guidelines as part of the practical package of information for visitors to Antarctica.**

### ***A.9 Good guiding and environmental practices***

The team saw at first hand that the effectiveness of the Site Guidelines requires pre-planning by expedition guides and leaders; assessment prior to landing passengers; and good guiding and supervision during the landings. While not conducting formal inspections or assessments of passenger landings, the team observed six landings and noted that guides were abiding by and ensuring that their passengers abided by both the General Guidelines and the site-specific Guidelines. The team observed the merit and value of various guiding techniques such as on-shore briefings, guiding of small groups, the use of temporary flags to mark routes; placing guides in areas where visitor activity required more careful control such as ‘crossing guards’ or extra supervision at pinch points; and the use of temporary buoys to mark landing places.

The team did not believe that it would be appropriate or proportionate for the individual Site Guidelines to require more specific guiding techniques, particularly given that different guiding approaches may be required at different points in the season and with different numbers of visitors. The team concluded that in most cases the operator is best placed to decide, based on the characteristics of the passenger group, and the characteristics of the site at the time of the visit, on the specific guiding techniques that should be used responsibly in terms of site protection and accident prevention.

Expedition Leaders themselves reinforced the importance of high standards of experience and training of guides. The review team noted that IAATO has developed an assessment scheme for expedition staff, and concluded that further specification and development of ‘best-practice’ Antarctic guiding techniques would be useful.

**Recommendation 9: That the CEP encourages the development, by IAATO and other non-governmental operators, of best-practice training assessment and/or accreditation schemes for Antarctic guides and expedition leaders, noting the CEP discussions in 2005 and 2006.**

#### ***A.10 Relationship between specific Site Guidelines and the General Guidelines***

During the site visits the team discussed the interaction between the individual Site Guidelines and the General Guidelines for visitors to the Antarctic, which were developed by the CEP and adopted in 2011 with the site-specific Guidelines in mind. The team agreed that the Site Guidelines should focus on site-specific information rather than duplicating the General Guidelines on behaviour in Antarctica.

In recommending changes to the Guidelines for the sites visited, it is suggested that advice that is not site-specific be removed. The team also suggests that the Site Guidelines and the General Guidelines for visitors to the Antarctic be presented in such a way as to ensure they are seen as a ‘package’ or linked documents, as visits to sites need to consider the advice in each.

The team considered the interaction between the identification of closed areas in Site Guidelines and the General Guidelines in which there is general advice to avoid entering breeding colonies. The team considered that there was still value in continuing to mark and observe closed areas, but that in many cases on the ground respecting the boundaries of colonies and breeding locations is simpler to interpret.

The General Guidelines specify to maintain a precautionary distance of 5 metres from the wildlife and to increase this distance if a change in behaviour is noted. At some sites, such as Hannah Point, Gentoo colony expansion has meant that it is not possible to keep a 5 metre distance from some nesting birds until the chicks reach creching phase in late January (noting that the site does not open to visitation until mid-January). The team discussed this conflict with what was possible on the ground and what is specified in both the Site Guidelines for Hannah Point and the General Guidelines. The team considered the guidance to increase distance if a change in behaviour is noted to be critically important in these situations. Closer approach distances could be acceptable, if no disturbance is noted. Conversely when sites become so crowded with animals that it is no longer possible to transit the site without causing disturbance the appropriateness of continued visits needs to be re-evaluated. The team noted that each species has unique behaviour patterns to indicate disturbance and that these behaviours are likely to not be well known outside of the biology community.

**Recommendation 10: Noting that visible signs of disturbance are important in avoiding disturbance of wildlife, that CEP members give consideration to the production of visitor-focused guidelines detailing such signs.**

#### ***A.11 Values derived from visits to sites***

Based on discussions with visitors and guides the team noted that visitors appear to obtain real environmental and cultural educational value from experiencing Antarctica, including from viewing wildlife on shore. The team discussed the degree to which the visitor experience should be considered in the management of sites and agreed that there was a good case for its inclusion in the overall perspective. The team noted the value in allowing visitors to experience a site with as little intervention as was needed for its protection. It was noted that cumulative impact from visitation, such as crowding of people, could damage the quality of visitor experience as well as impacting on flora and fauna. The team noted that Measure 15 (2009) can assist with ensuring that the quality of visitor experience remains important.



**Annex B, Table 1: Number of landed visitors and staff at Peninsula sites with existing or proposed Site Guidelines. Ranking of visitation by landings (1-20, with 1 highest) shown in brackets. All information provided by IAATO.**

	2011/12	2010/11	2009/10	2008/09	2007/08	2006/07
<b>Aitcho - Barrientos Island</b>	6393 (9)	6002 (8)	5153 (10)	6710 (10)	7202 (10)	7259 (9)
<b>Ardley Island</b>	412	400	305	251	167	159
<b>Baily Head</b>	1787	1560	2009	1476	1376	2746 (19)
<b>Brown Bluff</b>	5618 (10)	5549 (11)	5292 (13)	6475 (11)	7107 (11)	8264 (10)
<b>Cuverville Island</b>	11196 (4)	11721 (3)	11362 (6)	11694 (4)	13862 (4)	13456 (4)
<b>Damoy Point</b>	3870 (8)	2518 (12)	1917 (12)	2058 (14)	1591 (16)	1738 (17)
<b>Danco Island</b>	4934 (11)	3572 (13)	4380 (11)	2897 (15)	3778 (12)	3874 (14)
<b>Devil Island</b>	1148	1035	2101	2606	932	3051
<b>Goudier Island</b>	16233 (1)	14864 (1)	13604 (1)	15115 (1)	18468 (1)	17044 (1)
<b>Half Moon Island</b>	10914 (7)	7916 (7)	10749 (9)	12182 (6)	18207 (6)	14258 (7)
<b>Hannah Point</b>	2825 (17)	1724	1903	2434 (20)	1994	214 (15)
<b>Jougla Point</b>	8516 (5)	7252 (5)	9339 (5)	8699 (7)	11566 (8)	10016 (6)
<b>Mikkelsen Harbour</b>	2817(15)	1579 (18)	2285 (17)	2078	1532	1723
<b>Neko Harbour</b>	14392 (3)	12189 (4)	13251 (3)	13617 (3)	15867 (3)	14814 (5)
<b>Orne Harbour</b>	2144 (16)	1057	825	548	577	0
<b>Orne Islands</b>	194	46	83	515	365	789
<b>Paulet Island</b>	5662 (13)	3155 (15)	2439	5245 (12)	3526 (15)	5921 (13)
<b>Penguin Island</b>	727	107	1440	1819	2408	1177
<b>Pendulum Cove</b>	786	1323 (19)	1772 (18)	2501 (16)	2239 (17)	4788 (11)
<b>Petermann Island</b>	3136 (14)	7607 (6)	11890 (4)	9934 (5)	13446 (5)	12618 (3)
<b>Pleneau island</b>	961	1130	1725 (14)	2193 (17)	1381	1955
<b>Port Charcot</b>	1338 (20)	2934 (16)	2198 (16)	1039	846	515
<b>Shingle Cove</b>	148	125	559	307	108	1165
<b>Snow Hill</b>	274	545	0	900	372	756
<b>Stonington Island</b>	0	670	1136	1265	511	297
<b>Telefon Bay</b>	3621 (12)	3247 (14)	2272 (15)	3357 (13)	3147 (13)	3564 (16)
<b>Torgersen Island</b>	489	687	863	255	668	680
<b>Turret Point</b>	210	381	112	332	1076	157
<b>Whalers Bay</b>	12125 (2)	11842 (2)	13334 (2)	13682 (2)	16721 (2)	16828 (2)
<b>Wordie</b>	328	528	1065	260	441	270
<b>Yankee Harbour</b>	1194	1880	2074	1607	4316 (18)	3562 (20)

**Annex B, Table 2: Number of landings at Peninsula sites with existing or proposed Site Guidelines, with number of days in the season when maximum daily visit limitation was reached shown in brackets. All information provided by IAATO.**

	2011/12	2010/11	2009/10	2008/09	2007/08	2006/07
<b>Aitcho - Barrientos Island</b>	59 (9)	67 (11)	53 (4)	69 (8)	80 (14)	87 (18)
<b>Ardley Island</b>	4	5	6	8	2	5
<b>Baily Head</b>	19	13	20 (3)	16	17	33
<b>Brown Bluff</b>	52	48	49 (1)	67	61	74
<b>Cuerville Island</b>	109 (1)	114 (5)	104 (3)	128 (8)	142 (6)	135
<b>Damoy Point</b>	63 (11 inc 1 over)	45 (7)	52	42	30	47
<b>Danco Island</b>	52	40 (1)	53	39	48	53
<b>Devil Island</b>	12	12	19 (3)	28	13	31
<b>Goudier Island</b>	166 (18)	144 (9)	146 (13)	165 (15)	173 (14)	179 (15)
<b>Half Moon Island</b>	96 (2)	77	85 (1)	104 (1)	12	112
<b>Hannah Point</b>	27 (27 inc 1 over)	20 (20)	22 (22)	29 (29)	24 (24)	1 (1)
<b>Jougla Point</b>	102 (1)	86	108 (3)	95 (1)	109 (3)	121 (7)
<b>Mikkelsen Harbour</b>	29	25	24	21	19	17
<b>Neko Harbour</b>	126 (5)	111 (3)	127 (5)	138 (6)	148 (7)	133 (6)
<b>Orne Harbour</b>	28	14	7	7	6	0
<b>Orne Islands</b>	2	1	2	8	6	12
<b>Paulet Island</b>	45 (7)	28 (1)	19 (2)	50 (7)	34 (8)	60 (12)
<b>Penguin Island</b>	8 (1)	2	12	17	23 (2)	13
<b>Pendulum Cove</b>	14	24	24	38	30	67
<b>Petermann Island</b>	35 (1)	82	119 (5)	107 (4)	133 (6)	138 (8)
<b>Pleneau island</b>	17	19	31	36	20	32
<b>Port Charcot</b>	21	27	26	20	18	14
<b>Shingle Cove</b>	2	1	5 (1)	6	1	9
<b>Snow Hill</b>	3	5	0	9	4	10
<b>Stonington Island</b>	0	7	9	11	6	4
<b>Telefon Bay</b>	47	40	31	47	47	46
<b>Torgersen Island</b>	8	8 (1)	9	3	8	12
<b>Turret Point</b>	3	4	2	4	11	2
<b>Whalers Bay</b>	130	119	131	146	164	168
<b>Wordie</b>	5	9	12	6	7	6
<b>Yankee Harbour</b>	13	18	19	20	30	32

**Annex C - Action on recommendations from WP2 ATCM XXIX**

At ATCM XXIX, the Parties considered WP2, presented by United Kingdom, Argentina, Australia, Norway and the United States. The paper contained a series of recommendations on policy issues arising from the On-Site Review of Guidelines for Visitor Sites in the Antarctic Peninsula carried out earlier that year. The ATCM endorsed those recommendations and this Annex lists those recommendations and briefly summarises the action taken since 2006.

<b><i>Recommendation</i></b>	<b><i>Progress</i></b>
<p>That the CEP adds Site Guideline issues to its wider consideration of area protection and management and works with SCAR to look at options for further studies on the potential impacts of Antarctic tourism (paragraph 12).</p>	<p>The CEP considers proposals for new and revised site guidelines under its agenda item on area protection. SCAR was requested by the CEP to provide advice on research relating to disturbance of wildlife and reported in WP12 2008 that disturbance effects vary as a function of extrinsic factors such as disturbance type, form and magnitude, and with intrinsic factors such as species, population, colony size, breeding stage, and experience of the individual animals concerned. No one minimum approach distance was agreed upon to apply to all species.</p> <p>The CEP was asked by the ATCM to report on environmental aspects and impacts of tourism, and presented this work to the ATCM at ATCM XXXV.</p>
<p>That the CEP considers options to work with the tourist industry to develop realistic likely future scenarios of Antarctic tourism; and that in the meantime, if there is any significant change in the current level and type of visits to any of the sites, the Site Guidelines should be reviewed (paragraph 13)</p>	<p>IAATO in its capacity as an expert at the ATCM and CEP has reported annually on tourism conducted by its members, and has provided (single season) forecasts.</p> <p>IAATO has hosted a series of ‘roundtable’ discussions amongst its operators, to which ATCM Parties, Observers and Experts, have been invited, to discuss future scenarios for Antarctic tourism. These have been reported to ATCM either through individual papers (e.g. ATCM XXXI IP 19 and ATCM XXXIII IP084) and through IAATO’s subsequent annual reports.</p> <p>The CEP Tourism Study - Tourism and Non-governmental Activities in the Antarctic:</p>

<b>Recommendation</b>	<b>Progress</b>
	<p>Environmental Aspects and Impacts reported on levels of site use, types of visits, and increases in the number of visits and visitors for sites. In response to Recommendation 4 of the study: the ATCM in 2012 agreed to: “Undertake a regular review of trends in tourist and other visitor activity at selected sites, particularly those with high levels of visitation or those considered to be particularly sensitive to impact.”</p>
<p>That the CEP considers establishing a framework for reviewing Site Guidelines. (paragraph 14)</p>	<p>The CEP Tourism Study - Tourism and Non-governmental Activities in the Antarctic: Environmental Aspects and Impacts recommended that “Consideration should be given to the means by which site specific guidelines are reviewed and updated, including the appropriate frequency of review and the information required to support a review.” The ATCM endorsed this recommendation and requested the CEP to undertake this work.</p>
<p>That the CEP considers options for systematic and regular monitoring of the sites. (paragraph 15)</p>	<p>The CEP in its tourism study recommended that “Consideration should be given to establishing an ATCM-approved on-site monitoring programme for the purposes of i) assessing the effectiveness of site-specific guidelines and ii) monitoring for impacts.”. The ATCM requested the CEP, as a matter of priority, to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Consider how to target monitoring efforts (e.g. appropriate frequency, level of effort, and location of monitoring) to inform environmental management; and</li> <li>• Develop a pilot on-site monitoring study to assess potential impacts and the effectiveness of site guidelines at one or more visitor sites. Resolution 11 (2012) Checklist for visitor’s in-field activities was adopted.</li> </ul> <p>IAATO provide information on their operators’ use of a site annually to CEP.</p>
<p>That priority be given to preparing visitor</p>	<p>Site Guidelines for Brown Bluff were adopted in</p>

<b>Recommendation</b>	<b>Progress</b>
Guidelines for Brown Bluff. (paragraph 17)	2007 at ATCM XXX (New Delhi).
<p>CEP Members, Observers and Experts with specific knowledge of visited sites not already covered by visitor guidelines, or other forms of site management, undertake site reviews and draft Site Guidelines, using a consistent format, as appropriate;</p> <p>The CEP establishes a framework for the consideration of all newly proposed Guidelines;</p> <p>The CEP encourages those preparing new management plans (ASMAs) to look at those visitor management issues addressed by the Site Guidelines review ICG. (paragraph 18)</p>	Ongoing – the ATCM has adopted 24 additional Site Guidelines since the recommendation was made. The CEP considers proposals for new Site Guidelines under its agenda item on Area Protection and Management.
That the CEP give further consideration to [the wider implications of Site Guidelines] and consider other options, to ensure effective visitor management at all landing sites in Antarctica. (paragraph 19)	Ongoing. The ATCM adopted Measure 15 (2009) to assist, among other things, in ensuring effective visitor management at landing sites. Resolution 11 (2012) Checklist for visitor’s in-field activities was adopted.
That the CEP work with IAATO (and other interested Observers and Experts) to consider the issue of training for expedition leaders. (paragraph 20)	IAATO has introduced and promotes an online training and assessment package for Antarctic guides and expedition leaders as reported in ATCM XXXIII IP025.
That the effectiveness of the proposed management tools in minimising visitor impacts be further considered by the CEP, potentially in the context of the work of the ICG on monitoring and reporting. (paragraph 21)	The CEP tourism study considered by ATCM XXXV (Hobart 2012) reports on management tools and what is known about visitor impacts.
That future reviews of the Guidelines also consider the appropriateness of camping-related tourism activities and any measures necessary to ensure minimisation of environmental and wildlife impacts. (paragraph 22)	IAATO has produced draft industry guidelines for camping activities which are available to authorising Parties through their Field Operations Manual. Following a proposal by the USA, the ATCM discussed camping activities in the context of the site guidelines. The 2013 review considered issues associated with camping ashore in a site-specific context.

<b><i>Recommendation</i></b>	<b><i>Progress</i></b>
<p>That, in due course, the ATCM consider whether any further guidance/advice should be developed for specific hazards. (paragraph 23)</p>	<p>The 2013 review team noted that the potential for harm resulting from such hazards remained, noted that such hazards are a feature of operating in the Antarctic environment, and noted that the practice to date and the requirements of Measure 4 (2004) presume that those organising and conducting activities bear responsibility for identifying and responding to hazards.</p>