



Agenda Item: ATCM 11

Presented by: IAATO

Original: English

# **Chairman's Report from the Miami Meeting (March 17-19, 2008) on Antarctic Tourism**



# Chairman's Report from the Miami Meeting (March 17-19, 2008) on Antarctic Tourism

by R. Tucker Scully

## 1. Introduction

An informal meeting on “The Future of Antarctic Tourism”, organized by the International Association of Antarctica Tour Operators (IAATO) was held in Miami, Florida (17-19 March 2008).

The meeting was designed to provide an opportunity, outside of the formal Antarctic Treaty Consultative Meeting, to examine the political, environmental and regulatory aspects of Antarctic tourism and also to consider some of the more challenging tourism-related issues currently confronting governments, tour operators (and IAATO), as well as ATCM Observers and Invited Experts.

The participant list and agenda for the meeting is appended to this document (Annex A).

The format of the meeting loosely followed that of the previous IAATO-hosted informal meeting held in Aspen, Colorado, in 2002 (reported as ATCM XXV IP 30 *Chairman's Report from the Aspen Meeting on Antarctic Tourism*).

In Miami, thirty-nine participants attended. These included officials from Antarctic Treaty Consultative Party (ATCP) governments, representatives of the Scientific Committee on Antarctic Research (SCAR), the Antarctic and Southern Ocean Coalition (ASOC), the IAATO Secretariat and representatives from several IAATO Member Companies along with invited experts. Participants took part in their personal capacities and the meeting was held under “Chatham House rules (See Chatham House Rules <http://www.chathamhouse.org.uk/about/chathamhouse/>).

An initial exchange of views was held on the expected overall outcome of the meeting. This coalesced towards two approaches:

- From the industry viewpoint there was a clear interest in the development of a more formal accord or working partnership between the ATCPs and IAATO. It was suggested that this might take the form of a memorandum of understanding;
- More generally, there was a sense that the ATCPs now needed to develop a more strategic approach towards the management and regulation of Antarctic tourism – at least through to the medium term. This would require Treaty Parties to move away from a reactive mode of responding to developments to a more proactive stance. In turn this would involve not only seeking to anticipate changes in Antarctic tourism, but also seeing to influence scope and development.

Each of the above approaches implied the need to articulate a vision of what Antarctic tourism was likely to look like in the future and touched directly on the future relationship between the Antarctic Treaty System and IAATO. In this context, industry representatives emphasized that a longer-term

strategic plan of action for Antarctic tourism would provide tour companies with a clearer picture of the regulatory and management boundaries within which they would be required to operate. In doing so, it would enable them to plan with greater certainty their future activities.

## **2. Scene-setting**

### **2.1 General**

To place the current state of Antarctic tourism in perspective three presentations were provided:

- Denise Landau, the Executive Director of IAATO, reviewed recent trends in Antarctic tourism;
- Dr. Ester Pereira (Florida International University, Tourism Lecturer) assessed the sustainability of tourism in the wider, global context; in particular examining worldwide population growth, accelerating climate change and the escalating carbon footprint of tourism travel;
- Hitesh Mehta (Landscape Architect, Conservationist) presented trends in global land-based tourism with a particular focus on the development of sustainable “eco-lodges” in remote (including polar) areas.

ASOC added to this initial debate by tabling a paper on “A Decade of Antarctic Tourism: Status, Change, and Actions Needed.”

In addition, and taking advantage of his co-incidental presence in Miami, a presentation was arranged for Karl Morten Wiklund, Director of Passenger Ships, Det Norsk Veritas to address the meeting. This presentation provided relevant data on both the contribution of shipping worldwide to atmospheric emissions as well as the impact that climate change would likely have on the shipping industry. Particular emphasis was placed on the rapid changes in sea-ice extent currently taking place in the Polar Regions and the implications that would have for both tourism and other merchant shipping.

## **2.2 Specific**

### **2.2.1 Regulation, Self-regulation and Management**

These three terms have been commonly used (though never defined) in relation to Antarctic tourism activities. In considering their inter-relationships it was felt that greater clarity was needed to distinguish between the regulatory and management roles and responsibilities of the Treaty Parties and the tourism industry. Discussion on this point was assisted by two presentations from Dr. Mike Richardson. The first, on “Regulation, Self-regulation and Management,” provided some pointers towards defining these terms; the second, on “IAATO Self-regulation; Its Benefits and Limitations,” emphasized the point that the self-regulation successfully employed to date by IAATO also had its limitations. In particular, self-regulation by the industry’s Association was not itself necessarily able to prevent or deter the introduction of major new trends or developments in tourism (the advent and increasing deployment of large tourist vessels in Antarctic waters was cited as an example of such a recent trend in industry activities). It was argued that in such circumstances there was a crucial need for self-regulation to take place within an over-arching regulatory regime provided by the Antarctic Treaty System.

To distinguish between the three terms above it was suggested that:

- Regulation involves the establishment of mandatory standards on activity or behaviour in regard to tourism which are binding on all, as a matter of law. Sanctions, also backed by the force of law, for violations of those standards were also an essential prerequisite. Regulation, in this sense, was considered to be the preserve and responsibility of governments either individually or collectively – in this case through measures adopted by the ATCPs;
- Self-regulation involves the establishment of agreed common standards for tourism by industry itself. This approach has been achieved through IAATO's Bylaws, guidelines and operational instructions and procedures. For self-regulation to be effective the standards imposed by a self-defined group must be binding on the members of that group as a condition of their membership. Such standards do not, however, have the force of law. Instead, they must be backed up by strong mechanisms that can ensure due compliance by all members. Appropriate sanctions, such as the loss of benefits of membership, need to be in place, and enforced, if self-regulation is to maintain its effectiveness and credibility. The extent to which IAATO addresses this aspect of compliance was a point raised by some participants;
- Management consists of the overall manner in which tourist activities are planned and then actually carried out in Antarctica. It is not only bounded by applicable regulation and self-regulation but is also governed by other policies, recommendations and objectives that may be determined by both the “regulators” as well as by those who are regulated. Management is undertaken both outside of Antarctica, in terms of pre-planning and post-visit activities, as well as in the Antarctic. It was recognized, however, that most management of tourism actually “in the field” was undertaken largely by the industry itself.

It was apparent however from this rough delineation that there is extensive overlap between the regulation provided through the Antarctic Treaty System and the self-regulation imposed by IAATO. Synergies between the two exist in parallel.

For example, provisions of the Environmental Protocol and measures adopted under the Antarctic Treaty that are applicable to tourism are also reflected in IAATO Bylaws, guidelines and procedures. Correspondingly, the ATCPs are now adopting, into Antarctic Treaty System provisions, IAATO site guidelines including the limits on visitor landings at sites. It was recognized, however, that further review of IAATO standards with their possible incorporation into ATCM instruments may be desirable. The inter-linking of the management and self-regulation procedures of IAATO with the Treaty System was reinforced by the services that IAATO continues to provide to the ATCPs and that constitute essential tools for the management of tourism. The information collated by IAATO from its members, the ship scheduler system and the extensive databases on tourism maintained by IAATO, as well as the analyses of data submitted by IAATO to the ATCM were cited as examples. It was recognized that without these products, the Treaty Parties would have to devote significant resources to stay abreast of the status and trends of tourism in Antarctica.

In looking to the future, it was furthermore recognized that the ATCPs could themselves assume these management functions undertaken to date by IAATO, and indeed would need to do so if IAATO could not, for whatever reason, continue to provide them. The extent of the capacity of the Antarctic Treaty Secretariat to undertake this task, the length of the transition needed to effect the changes, and the additional, and likely considerable, resources that would be needed were felt to be important considerations. Instead, it was felt that a more preferable and efficient way forward would be to clarify and strengthen the synergies between IAATO and the Antarctic

Treaty System. This would need to take place within an examination of the overall regulatory framework for tourism, including all tourism-related matters, such as environmental impact assessment, monitoring and compliance.

### ***2.2.2 The Regulatory Framework***

Under the Antarctic Treaty System there has developed an extensive network of regulation applicable to human activities in Antarctica, including tourism. In addition to his presentations a useful paper was provided to this meeting by Dr. Mike Richardson titled “Regulation, Self-Regulation and Management - A Comment,” which detailed decisions made to date by Antarctic Treaty Parties.

The Treaty itself and the 1991 Environmental Protocol to the Treaty, which codified and extended the environmental protection measures adopted under the Treaty, contain detailed and legally binding provisions that apply to tourist activities. However, there remain perceptions, supported by anecdotal evidence, that there continue to be cases of lack of implementation and of inconsistency of implementation of such provisions by the ATCPs. The first may be due to a failure to provide a sufficient basis, in domestic law, for implementing and/or enforcing all of the relevant provisions, as well as failure to enforce the specific provisions themselves. The second includes cases in which differing interpretations of provisions by ATCP governments result in differing obligations upon tour operators that are carrying out the same activities. Such a situation may lead to confusion and misunderstanding and increases the risk of lack of compliance. It was felt that these issues of implementation and consistency merited specific attention by the ATCPs.

In the period immediately following adoption of the Environmental Protocol in 1991 there had been extensive discussion of tourism at ATCMs XVII and XVIII (1992 and 1994) including the need to supplement the Protocol’s provisions in respect of the regulation of tourism. However, it was quite sometime later that the ATCPs adopted Measure 4 and Resolution 4 (2004) – Insurance and Contingency Planning for Tourism and Non-Governmental Activities in the Antarctic Treaty Area: Resolution 5 (2005) Resolution 2 (2006) and Resolution 1 (2007) – Site Guidelines for Visitors, and Resolution 4 (2007) Ship-based Tourism in the Antarctic Treaty Area. The latter four resolutions, which are recommendatory – incorporate IAATO’s site guidelines and limitations on landing passengers in Antarctica. It was recognized that the effectiveness of the site guidelines and landing limits is linked closely to the ship scheduler system operated by IAATO. It was also recognized that there continue to be non-IAATO tourist vessels operating in Antarctica- and that there may well be more in the future. Such vessels – if flagged to non-Parties to the Treaty - would not fall under IAATO’s self-regulation measures and might fall outside of the regulatory framework of the Antarctic Treaty system. Therefore, to create a more “level playing field”, there were views that the site guidelines for visitors and the landing limitations could be converted into mandatory, legally binding measures. Similarly consideration could be given to adopting a mandatory legally binding measure requiring all ships landing passengers in Antarctica to subscribe to the IAATO ship scheduler system as a means of achieving greater control and integration of such vessels’ activities. It was nevertheless recognized that even the adoption of such a measure would not necessarily create uniformity. But it would provide ATCPs with a greater degree of control over non-IAATO, third-Party-flagged vessels whose operators were either domiciled in, or operated from, their territories.

The conversion of the site guidelines to mandatory measures would raise the issue of how to provide for their efficient updating and revision – as indeed was foreseen in the guidelines

themselves. It was pointed out that the Annexes to the Environmental Protocol include procedures for accelerated amendment.

Ensuring that the Antarctic Treaty's regulatory framework is, and remains, robust was viewed as a prerequisite for moving towards a longer-term strategic approach to tourism in Antarctica.

Other factors that would need to be factored in included recognition of the growing number of other institutional actors involved in the regulation and management of Antarctic tourism. These include at the inter-governmental level the International Maritime Organisation (IMO) for vessels, the International Hydrographic Office (IHO)/Hydrographic Committee on Antarctica (HCA) for charting, and the International Civil Aviation Organisation (ICAO) for aircraft-related tourism. The importance of the participation and effective integration of all relevant stakeholders was also stressed. (The ATCP/NGO collaboration in the Deception Island Management plan group was seen as an example.) Finally, it was felt that any longer-term strategic approach would need to anticipate that the tourism industry would likely undergo dynamic change. Superimposed on this would be the consequences, such as changes to sea-ice extent, and possible increased accessibility to both land and maritime areas, induced by rapidly accelerating climate change.

With these thoughts in mind, the meeting initiated a look ahead at the components of Antarctic tourism.

### **3. Antarctic Tourism Components**

#### **3.1 Ship-borne Tourism**

Ship-borne tourism is responsible for the great majority of tourist visits to Antarctica, with approximately 49,000 passengers anticipated for the 2008-2009 season. About three-fourths of those will be on board vessels that carry out landings. These levels represent continuation of a steady upward trend. In light of this trend, there was a view that it would be valuable for IAATO to report on its perceptions of how the industry will evolve over the next few decades.

In response to questions as to how the ship-borne industry would evolve over the next 10-15 years, some company representatives speculated that as small ships (carrying 50-150 passengers) were phased out they would be replaced by considerably larger vessels – probably in the 500-3,000 passenger range. Such a trend would pose new challenges relating to the ability of such vessels to operate safely in Antarctic conditions. One approach to this issue that showed promise might be the introduction of a zoning system that would link access of a vessel to Antarctic waters to its capability to operate safely in those waters. Specifically, Antarctic waters could be divided into zones, by physical conditions (e.g. ice conditions and navigational hazards) and availability of services (e.g. reliable charts and search and rescue (SAR) resources). Only those vessels with the structural and operational capability to sail safely in those waters would be permitted entry.

A second possible trend was increased numbers of what were termed “mega-yachts”. These differ considerably from the characteristic yachts currently seen in Antarctic waters in that they are large luxury craft catering to very high-end tourist clients. Mega-yachts tend to carry very few passengers but a disproportionate number of crew. Experience, albeit limited, with such “mega-yachts” to date indicates that they are often operated and registered in countries that are not party to the Antarctic Treaty and that their operators show little, or no, inclination to join

IAATO. Additional means to control the activities of these particular vessels might well need to be considered.

There was considerable discussion of issues relating to safety of navigation in Antarctica, spurred in large part by vessel accidents in the 2006-2007 and 2007-2008 seasons – the *Nordkapp* and *Orlova* incidents and the more recent loss of the *Explorer* and the incident involving the *Fram*. The report on the sinking of the *Explorer* had not yet been released so that drawing any overall conclusions would be premature. A preliminary reaction was that the crew of the vessel had performed very well, as had the communications system that facilitated quick reaction and assistance from nearby vessels. IAATO's Emergency Contingency Plan had been implemented effectively. It was recognized that the successful rescue, without any injury, had also been greatly assisted by the benign weather conditions (for Antarctica) at the time. The open lifeboats used to evacuate passengers could have been a major problem had weather conditions been worse and/or the time before rescue significantly longer. It was widely felt that all vessels could be obliged to carry covered lifeboats and that perhaps there was a case for SOLAS provisions to take due account of polar conditions.

It was reported that IAATO's Marine Committee had met in February 2008 to discuss the recent incidents. Among initial lessons learned was the importance of ensuring links to IAATO's ship scheduling system, both prior to and during the operating season, to the vessel database as a source of information on vessels (e.g. the number of passengers, fuel type and quantity, life saving equipment carried) and to a vessel-tracking system in the event of an emergency. In response, it was suggested that an effective tracking system (equivalent to the VMS operated by CCAMLR) be introduced for all vessels operating in Antarctica, including governmental vessels. Collaboration with the Council of Managers of National Antarctic Programs (COMNAP) could facilitate the introduction of such a system. From another perspective, the importance of training crew and expedition staff in safety and emergency procedures was highlighted.

The challenge of ensuring safety of vessel operations in Antarctica highlighted the need for even closer collaboration between the Antarctic Treaty System and the IMO. Many of the maritime safety issues in Antarctica are dealt with through global initiatives and there is ongoing work on adapting the Polar Shipping Code to Antarctic conditions. On the latter point, it was observed that the "wheels" of the IMO turn slowly, and that work on the Polar Code was not likely to be completed in the near future. At the same time it was pointed out that the IMO can, if necessary, move more rapidly and that the ATCPs should co-ordinate their efforts, through the IMO, to achieve more timely progress. With respect to IAATO, there was a suggestion from a number of participants that it might seek observer status to the IMO so further emphasizing Antarctic maritime matters.

A point rose in regard to the discussion of ship-borne tourism – but that could apply also to other categories - related to the transportation of scientists by tour operators. This was recognized as a highly constructive form of co-operation between the operators and National Antarctic Programs. At the same time it was felt that guidelines for such transportation should be elaborated so that the ground rules were clear and consistent.

### **3.2 Land-based Tourism**

The meeting applied a rough definition of land-based tourism as that which relies on the establishment of seasonal or permanent infrastructure in Antarctica. It was recognized however that there is a considerable "grey area" as to what is understood by the term. For example, there



are permanent facilities on land that serve ship-borne visitors. Nevertheless, two general categories of land-based tourism could be discerned:

- The first involves operations which rely on air operations from seasonal facilities established in Antarctica to support activities in remote areas. The primary example of this type of operation is Adventure Network International/Air Logistics and Expeditions (ANI/ALE) that has facilities in the Patriot Hills. ANI/ALE, a Member Company of IAATO, contracts to provide significant logistic support to both national Antarctic programmes as well as supporting adventure tourism, such as camping, climbing and skiing. While ANI/ALE's operations are well-documented, there are two other land-based air operations employing seasonal field facilities about which there has been little reporting. Antarctic Logistics Company International (ALCI), apparently organised in Russia and South Africa, operates in East Antarctica. It provides logistic support to national Antarctic programmes and supports tourist activities (including arrivals at the South Pole Station, but without advance notification). The Antarctic company (TAC), also apparently organised in Russia and South Africa, and operates from the area of the Filchner Ice Shelf. Neither company is a member of IAATO. It was suggested that the respective ATCPs should take action to ensure that their obligations to report, under Article VII (5) of the Antarctic Treaty, on these two operations, as well as other obligations under the Treaty and Protocol, were being met.
- A second category of land-based tourism involves the use of National Antarctic program bases and infrastructure. Aerovias DAP, a Chilean company (and previously a member of IAATO) currently provides flights to Frei Station on King George Island with overnight accommodation at the base and the opportunity to visit neighbouring scientific stations. Several other national Antarctic programs, for example that of Uruguay, are also establishing facilities to house tourists at their scientific stations with the intention of raising funds from tourism to support their scientific activities. Again, it was felt that there is a need to ensure that accurate reporting on this form of State-sponsored tourism is provided.

There was a general sense that there was not a sufficiently clear picture of the current status of land-based tourist activities in Antarctica, much less on how they might in future evolve. There was concern, based on examples from elsewhere in the world, about the possibility of growing pressure for large-scale hotels or other tourist facilities with similar impacts. A counter view was that what was a more likely scenario was growth in tourist facilities at remote field camps or in connection with existing scientific stations. The IAATO Company representatives present at the meeting indicated that they had no intentions of moving in the direction of land-based operations and that their businesses would remain focussed on the ship-cruise element.

It was felt that a first step in anticipating any pressures in relation to land-based tourism was comprehensive and up to date information on the existing land-based activities and ensuring their conformity with the existing measures under the Antarctic Treaty and the Environmental Protocol.

Finally, though not exclusively associated with land-based tourism, the issue of extreme adventure activities in Antarctica was touched upon. Increasingly, tour operators are offering such activities – from ice climbing to heli-skiing. The question was raised as to whether there are extreme adventure activities that should be banned or discouraged as inherently too risky from safety and environmental perspectives.

### **3.3 Air Over-Flights**

There was a brief discussion on an additional category of Antarctic tourism which involves aerial over-flight, without landings. There are currently two such operations – one operated by Croydon Travel out of Australia; the other by LAN Airlines out of Chile. The concern raised with respect to over-flights was that low level operations could breach the obligations of not disturbing wildlife.

It was noted that there have nevertheless been anecdotal reports of helicopter operations, including by both national programmes and non-IAATO tour operators, flying too low over wildlife areas.

### **3.4 Environmental Monitoring**

The issue of environmental monitoring, particularly of cumulative impacts, benefited from a presentation from Dr. Chuck Kennicutt of SCAR. Monitoring is a management tool, whose utility is linked to defining clearly the questions it is to answer, identifying parameters to be monitored that can answer those questions, ensuring standard methodologies and data quality standards and identifying who pays for it.

Monitoring often must operate indirectly, identifying indicators of the change that is to be detected. Monitoring the impacts of tourism in Antarctica poses particular challenges because they are likely to be sub-lethal, chronic and/or cumulative and they must be teased out against a background of extreme and growing variability in environmental conditions. The point was made that monitoring was a potential area for increased collaboration between the ATCPs, SCAR, NGO's and the tourism industry.

## **4. Strategic Approach**

Time constraints limited the ability of the meeting to devise specific conclusions from its deliberations for a longer-term plan or strategic approach to Antarctic tourism. However, there was a valuable initial exchange of views on such an approach. This proceeded from the question of the need to impose overall limits on the level of tourism activities. From one perspective it was felt that there was no need for the imposition of quantitative limits so long as measures – present and future – ensure that tourist activities take place in a manner that is safe and responsible, and without adverse impacts upon scientific research or the Antarctic environment (including its wilderness and aesthetic values). It was considered that the question of quantitative limits might arise as an option if unacceptable impacts were detected from activities that were nonetheless compliant with all such measures.

Another approach to the question of the need to impose quantitative restrictions on the level of tourism rested on the concept of applying precautionary limits. This stemmed from the feeling, in part, that detecting adverse impacts may not be possible until they have already reached unacceptable levels. The rationale for such an approach also lay in the pre-eminence accorded to scientific activities in Antarctica by the Treaty supplemented by priority to environmental protection and wilderness values reflected in the Environmental Protocol. It was noted that any such precautionary levels could, if need be, be set for tourism activities as a whole, or for any particular type of activity.

One approach that might incorporate both of these elements would be to devise thresholds or “trip wires” that would trigger consideration of quantitative limits. One such threshold might be, for example, the point at which a site or sites covered by site guidelines approached maximum “carrying capacity”. Another might be to elaborate the concept of zoning that had been raised in regards to vessels. The concept could be extended to classifying areas of Antarctica not only by their physical conditions and operational service but also by their environmental characteristics and sensitivities and their value to science – and to devise levels of tourism activity in accordance with such factors.

## 5. Next Steps

It was recognized that the discussions in this informal setting had made a modest but useful start towards the goal of developing the vision necessary for a longer-term strategic approach to the management and regulation of Antarctic tourism. There was a feeling, however, that the deliberations on tourism at recent ATCMs had been constrained by their formal setting and lack of time. Discussions of the character undertaken by this informal meeting (or by e.g. another Antarctic Treaty Meeting of Experts under Recommendation IV-24) might offer an alternative and productive way forward to progress this matter.

It was felt important, therefore, to find a way to continue and build upon the dialogue initiated in Miami and that this summary of the tenor of that dialogue should be conveyed to ATCM XXXI in, Kyiv, Ukraine, by means of an Information Paper submitted by IAATO.

## 6. Summary Conclusions/ Recommendations

The following points, raised during the meeting, may warrant further consideration:

1. **Strategic Approach:** The ATCPs should move from a reactive to a proactive approach to the management of Antarctic tourism – seeking to anticipate and influence its future scope and course over the medium to long-term.
  - Seek to clarify and build upon the synergies between regulation (by the ATCPs) and the self-regulation and services provided by IAATO.
  - Ensure the efficacy of the overall regulatory framework, including all tourism-related aspects (e.g., E.I.A. monitoring and compliance).
  - Promote increased dialogue and cooperation between the Antarctic Treaty System and other relevant inter-governmental organizations (e.g., IMO, IHO/HCA and ICAO).
2. **Regulatory Framework:**
  - Extend site guidelines to more sites and consider converting their provisions, along with the general landing restrictions, into mandatory, legally binding measures.
  - Consider adopting a mandatory measure requiring all ships landing passengers in Antarctica to subscribe to the IAATO ship scheduler system.
  - More generally, consider reviewing IAATO’s guidelines, procedures and Bylaws to determine whether any further aspects of them (modified, as appropriate) might usefully be incorporated into the ATS regulatory framework.
3. **Compliance/Implementation:**
  - Continued attention required by the ATCPs to ensure that measures on tourism are being fully observed and implemented in a manner to avoid inconsistencies in the conduct of activities.
4. **Ship-Borne Tourism:**
  - Continued upward trend.

- Predicted increase toward larger tour vessels and mega-yachts will require special attention.
- Need for increased emphasis upon safety illustrated by vessel accidents in past two seasons.
- Need to provide for covered life-boats and to enhance training – initial lessons learned.
- Press for early and practical completion by IMO of the Polar Shipping Code.
- Recognition, more generally, of IMO as the relevant forum for many maritime safety issues.

5. **Land-Based Tourism:**

- Lack of adequate information on air-supported tourist operations to land-based facilities – private or governmental – and need for ATCPs to ensure full reporting as required under the Antarctic Treaty.
- Need to identify nature of any permanent or seasonal land-based facilities and ensure they are operating in accordance with the requirements of the Antarctic Treaty System.
- Need for review of regulation of extreme adventure tourism.

6. **Transport of National Program Scientific Staff:**

- Need for IAATO to develop guidelines to clarify terms for such transport.

*(R. Tucker Scully (retired), U.S. Department of State and Head of the U.S. Delegation at numerous meetings of the Antarctic Treaty Consultative Parties)*

## **ANNEX A: Participants List and Agenda**

## Annex A

<b>IAATO Miami Meeting Participants</b>	
<b>Government Representatives</b>	
Rodolfo Sanchez	Argentina
Máximo Gowland	Argentina
Dr. Phil Tracey	Australia
Caroline Kraka	France
Axel Szelinski	Germany
Heike Herata	Germany
Dr. Kees Bastmeijer	Netherlands
Birgit Njastad	Norway
Dr. Olle Melander	Sweden
Jane Rumble	United Kingdom
Rob Bowman	United Kingdom
Evan Bloom	United States (Department of State)
Pam Toschik	United States (NOAA)
Dr. Polly Penhale	United States, NSF
Aimee Hessert	United States, EPA
LCDR Kevin Ferry	United States Coast Guard
<b>IAATO Company Representatives</b>	
<b>Name</b>	<b>Company</b>
Ute Hohn-Bowen	Antarpply
Emilio Freeman	Residensea
Cees Deelstra	Holland America Line Inc.
Martin Karlsen	Polar Star Expeditions
Mary Filbee	Polar Star Expeditions
Tomas Holik	Hurtigruten ASA
Erica Wikander	Quark Expeditions
Eric Stangeland	Quark Expeditions
Nat Turner	Rannoch Adventures
Steve Wellmeier	Elegant Cruises
Matt Drennan	Lindblad Expeditions
John Frick	Travel Dynamics
Clare Gault	Saga Shipping
<b>IAATO Office</b>	
Denise Landau	Executive Director
Dr. Kim Crosbie	Environmental Operations Manager
<b>Invited Participants</b>	
Tucker Scully	Chairman
Dr. Chuck Kennicutt	Polar Research Board, SCAR
Dr. Mike Richardson	Consultant
Ricardo Roura	Antarctic Southern Ocean Coalition
David Bederman	Antarctic Southern Ocean Coalition
Dr. Ester Pereira	Tourism Trends and Changes
Hitesh Mehta	Ecolodges and Landbased Tourism
Dr. Alain Grenier	Université du Québec A Montréal

## The Future of Antarctic Tourism-March 17-19, 2008

**Contact Information:** Denise Landau, [iaato@iaato.org](mailto:iaato@iaato.org)  
+1 970-704 1047

**Location:** Marriott Biscayne Bay Hotel & Marina  
1633 North Bayshore Drive, Miami, FL 33132 USA  
Phone: (305) 374-3900  
Fax: (305) 536-6411  
Location 7.5 miles from Miami International Airport (taxi accessible)

**Dates and Time:** March 17-19, 2008: 0900-1700 hrs

**Participation:** Please advise Denise ([iaato@iaato.org](mailto:iaato@iaato.org)) of your intent to participate and of arrival and departure times.

**Papers:** A list of useful papers will be circulated or referenced in advance of the meeting. Anyone wishing to submit a paper, formal or informal is most welcome.

**Participants:** IAATO Members, government representatives, observers, experts and the Antarctic Treaty Secretariat and other industry stakeholders have been cordially invited.

**Dress:** Casual—Average daily temperatures are 65-70°F or 19-24°C.

IAATO is pleased to host a special meeting to address the political, environmental and regulatory challenges of Antarctic tourism. Rarely are there opportunities to have a robust discussion outside the realm of the ATCM to consider some of the more challenging issues that confront governments, tour operators and IAATO, observers and experts. We hope this meeting will provide an informative and useful exchange of ideas while allowing all stakeholders to talk freely and without bias toward government or persons attending. (See Chatham House Rules <http://www.chathamhouse.org.uk/about/chathamhouserule/>). We have limited the number of presentations in order to focus on actual issues raised. Noting the continuing growth of tourism and its safety and environmental implications, it is timely to discuss potential options for managing and regulating Antarctic tourism most effectively. As a result of this growth, all forms of human activity including science, tourism and logistics have been affected.

### Day One

**Focus:** “Scene setting”, the growth and development of the tourism industry in Antarctica and future trends, the demographics of change in ecotourism areas elsewhere in the world, political developments since the Environmental Protocol was agreed, implications on science programs, strengths and weaknesses of the authorization and permitting procedures amongst national programs and the effectiveness of those processes in the field. We aim to identify the strengths and weaknesses in the current system, and to assess and consider how to best structure the discussions over the next two days.

### Day Two

**Focus:** Current affairs such as marine safety, risk analysis and mitigation measures, emergency contingency plans, some notable elements in the ICG on Passenger Vessel Safety and current work progressed in this area by IAATO. Potential cumulative impact

concerns, monitoring and environmental protection from both a practical and economical approach, taking into account the papers and workshops that have occurred during the last 10 years.

### **Day Three**

**Focus:** A range of future options and considerations on how to manage and regulate Antarctica by considering effective environmentally sustainable solutions.

IAATO is hopeful that this meeting will encourage robust discussion and entice all participants to “think outside the box.” Over the last few months several participants have forwarded their concerns and comments on possible agenda ideas, and we have aimed to incorporate those suggestions in the following draft agenda. The agenda is deliberately designed to be flexible while still addressing the most frequently voiced concerns.

The objectives of the meeting, which were circulated over the last 3 months to interested participants, include but are not limited to the following:

- Consider the overall growth of tourism and the implications on the industry, government, science and national programs;
- Address relevant marine safety concerns and current gaps;
- Address potential cumulative impacts due to the growth of tourism;
- Review permitting and or authorizing procedures relative to the challenges of actually managing tourism on the ground;
- Review effectiveness of various tourism-related resolutions, recommendations, and measures, and address any relevant gaps;
- Assess how IAATO and the Antarctic Treaty Parties can most effectively work together to ensure coherent management and regulatory strategies for Antarctic tourism.

## **Agenda**

**Monday, March 17, 2008**

**0900: Welcome and Introductions**

**0910: Opening Comments and Scene Setting**

**1730: Meeting finishes**

**Review the agenda and update if appropriate**

***End Product?* Address the type of report to be produced at the conclusion of this meeting: chairman’s report or overall meeting report?**

**Overall Scope of Antarctic Tourism**

- Global increase of tourism in remote areas world wide - an ecotourism perspective
- Growth and diversification of Antarctic tourism trends  
IAATO and Non-IAATO
- Characteristics of sustainable tourism
- Land-based tourism developments - specific areas of growth
- Increase of all human activity in Antarctica
- Potential impacts of tourism on stations and science
- Transport of scientists by tour operators

**Regulatory Mechanisms available under the Antarctic Treaty System**

***Principles***

- Definitions: regulation, self-regulation and management
- Self-regulation: what are its limitations?
- Historical perspective and the Environmental Protocol : its aims

***Processes***

- The Environmental Protocol
- Antarctic Treaty Party Authorization and Permitting Systems - Documentation and Regulatory requirements
- The Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA) process - does the Protocol address all human/environmental activities?
- Liability Annex
- Other

***Mechanisms***

- Current Antarctic Treaty System regulatory mechanisms (e.g, Advance Notification, Post Visit Site Reporting)
- IAATO's Strategic Management and Self-Regulatory Mechanisms
- ATS System of Exchange of Information: How is it used? How can it be made more effective?

***Implementation***

- Implementation of regulations and management systems and identification of possible gaps

**Overall Regulation of Tourism - what might be the options?**

- Identify current legally binding mechanisms
- ASMAS's, ASPA's, Tourist zones within?
- Are the current Antarctic Treaty Party's (ATP's) and IAATO's Management Strategies enough? (Including discussion of the current regulation and management regimes)
- Where are the gaps?
- Accreditation? Effective or Fiction?

**March 18, 2008****0900: Meeting Begins****1730: Meeting finishes****1800: Cocktail Party****Marine Safety, Risk Awareness**

- Brief overview of recent IAATO marine committee meeting
- Brief review of the recent IMO Meeting and discussion on the Polar Shipping Guidelines
- Lessons learned
- IAATO Emergency Contingency Plan update
- ICG on marine safety and discussion of concerns raised
- Foreign flag vessels not party to the Antarctic Treaty System
- Deception Island and other management plans
- Ship Scheduling System: Its inner workings and demonstration
- Staff/Expedition guides, officers, personnel, training and accountability

**Environmental Impacts**

- Environmental risk - are current mitigation measures enough?



- State of the Antarctic reporting
- Site Guidelines - are they effective? Do they need to be improved?
- Monitoring - past, present and future options
  - Tourism database
  - Gaps in data collecting
- Cumulative Impacts - a laudable objective of the Environmental Protocol - does it work in practice?

**March 19, 2008**

**0900: Meeting Begins**

**1700: Meeting Finishes**

**Long Term Strategy, Regulation and Management**

- Consider the dynamic system of management and how that would actually transfer into an effective management system
- Conservation Strategy?
- Tourism Policy?
- Recommendations, Resolutions, Measures, IAATO Guidelines and operating procedures – is it possible to combine into an overall tourism strategy? If so, how?
- Other Options (as a starting point for discussion)
  - The Antarctic Treaty Secretariat (ATSe) takes over the centralized administration of tourism? If so what is the role of the ATSe?
  - IAATO and the Antarctic Treaty System (ATS) look towards a partnership agreement to assure that Antarctic Tourism is managed in the best possible way. How could such a contractual arrangement be instigated?
- What would such options potentially cost?
- How can we ensure that the dialogue on tourism at the ATCM is more effective and productive?
- Role of Experts at the ATCM during relevant discussions in the Committee of Environmental Protection (CEP), Tourism Working Group (WG), Operations, etc.
- Is it possible to set up an effective Working Group on tourism (akin to the WGs of CCAMLR's Scientific Committee) that would report to the CEP/ATCM?
- Futuristic approach - Do we have a realistic vision of what tourism will look like in the Antarctic in 5 years, 10 years, 20 years, 50 years?
  - If so, what is it?
  - How can we best prepare for it? Longer-term strategic approach?
  - Should there be limits? Numbers of vessels aircraft, tourists? If so how?
- **Next steps**