

**Committee on the Peaceful
Uses of Outer Space
Legal Subcommittee**

Unedited transcript

672nd Meeting

Friday, 12 April 2002, 10 a.m.

Vienna

Chairman: Mr. Kopal (Czech Republic)

The meeting was called to order at 10.21 a.m.

The CHAIRMAN: Distinguished delegates, I declare open the 672nd meeting of the Legal Subcommittee of the Committee on the Peaceful Uses of Outer Space.

Adoption of the reports of the Working Groups

Distinguished delegates, I intend shortly to suspend the meeting of the Subcommittee so that each of the Working Groups on Items 4, 6 and 9 can adopt their respective reports. I then intend to re-open this meeting of the Subcommittee so that we can proceed with the adoption of the report of the Subcommittee, paragraph by paragraph, and finally as a whole.

Before suspending the meeting in order to enable the discussion on the reports of the Working Groups, I would like to make an appeal to you to help me in the consideration of the report and also to the Chairmen of the Working Groups, of the respective Working Groups, and to be as concise as possible because it will be my aim to finish the whole business by the end of the morning's session. But, of course, if some longer discussions should emerge, we would need then to continue in the afternoon. But let us try to do it in the morning.

This is all I wanted to tell you. This meeting of the Subcommittee is temporarily suspended and I invite the Chairman of the Working Group on Item 4 to start the consideration of the report.

The meeting was suspended at 10.23 a.m.

The meeting resumed at 11.53 a.m.

The CHAIRMAN: We will now turn to the consideration of the draft report, document L.235, starting by introduction. Document L.235, Introduction, Opening of the Session, paragraph 1.

No comments? *Adopted.*

Paragraph 2. No comments? *Adopted.*

B. Adoption of the agenda, paragraph 3. It is just the agenda that has been agreed. *Adopted.*

C. Attendance, paragraph 4. No countries missing here in this paragraph. Should it be completed here in square brackets or dots? If necessary. *Adopted.*

Paragraph 5. Should it be completed it in dots or will you do it later on? Later on. Five, *adopted.*

Paragraph 6. Greece.

Mr. V. CASSAPOGLOU (Greece) (*interpretation from French*): Thank you Mr. Chairman. Just a correction.

(*Continued in English*) In the second line of the paragraph to add "other international organizations and entities" to avoid every confusion with non-operational organizations. That is the one correction I am proposing please. And also at the end of the enumeration of the international intergovernmental organizations, IMSO, to sit it before EUMETSAT, not to confuse with the other entities. International Mobile Satellite Organization should be put after the Atomic Energy. Thank you Mr. Chairman.

In its resolution 50/27 of 6 December 1995, the General Assembly endorsed the recommendation of the Committee on the Peaceful Uses of Outer Space that, beginning with its thirty-ninth session, the Committee would be provided with unedited transcripts in lieu of verbatim records. This record contains the texts of speeches delivered in English and interpretations of speeches delivered in the other languages as transcribed from taped recordings. The transcripts have not been edited or revised.

Corrections should be submitted to original speeches only. They should be incorporated in a copy of the record and be sent under the signature of a member of the delegation concerned, within one week of the date of publication, to the Chief, Translation and Editorial Service, Room D0708, United Nations Office at Vienna, P.O. Box 500, A-1400, Vienna, Austria. Corrections will be issued in a consolidated corrigendum.

The CHAIRMAN: Distinguished representative of Greece, your first suggestion to include the words "and entities", I do not have any objections. As to your second suggestion, I do not know, perhaps it is in alphabetical order here. And I do not know why the IMSO, though I have full sympathies to this organization, should have any preference before the EUMETSAT. Why?

Mr. V. CASSAPOGLOU (Greece): It is just to precede. This is a global and then there is the regional but if it is with alphabetical order, I have no problem but in any case, this Organization should precede the other non-governmental entities. So we can put it after ESA. I have no problem. Thank you very much.

The CHAIRMAN: But then UNIDROIT is an intergovernmental organization.

Mr. V. CASSAPOGLOU (Greece): It is an association.

The CHAIRMAN: No, it is an intergovernmental organization. Sorry, it is not an association.

Mr. V. CASSAPOGLOU (Greece): OK.

The CHAIRMAN: Yes, the Secretary will clarify it.

Mr. P. LÁLA (Secretary, Office for Outer Space Affairs): Thank you Mr. Chairman. The Secretariat's intention was to put first organizations of the United Nations system and after that other organizations in alphabetical order. We do not have any other preferences or distinctions between other organizations. So this was the intention of the drafters. Thank you Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN: Perhaps the order should be after ESA. No, the International Institute for the Unification of Private Law is not a regional organization, it is a universal organization with, of course, a limited number of Member States but it is an intergovernmental organization and it is an organization aiming to be universal. Yes, please, United Kingdom.

Mr. D. LUSHER (United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland): Thank you Mr. Chairman. Could I suggest that we leave this to the Secretariat to sort out as they usually do and proceed with business. Thank you.

The CHAIRMAN: Thank you very much for your very reasonable suggestion. I believe that, indeed, we could leave it to the Secretariat perhaps who will still consult on this.

It is so adopted.

Paragraph 7. *Adopted.*

Paragraph 8. It means under the scope of D. Organization of Work, paragraph 8. We will proceed subparagraph by subparagraph. First the chapeau of paragraph 8. *Adopted.*

Subparagraph (a). *Adopted.*

Subparagraph (b). *Adopted.*

Subparagraph (c). *Adopted.*

Subparagraph (d). *Adopted.*

As a whole, *adopted.*

Paragraph 9. No objections? *Adopted.*

Paragraph 10. No objections? *Adopted.*

Paragraph 11. About the dates of the next session of the Legal Subcommittee. *Adopted.*

Now E. Adoption of the report of the Legal Subcommittee, paragraph 12. There are here again several dots and the Secretariat will fill it in accordance with the facts. *Adopted.*

Paragraph 13. The same. *Adopted.*

II. General exchange of views, paragraph 14. Is the enumeration of the delegations complete here? *Adopted.*

Paragraph 15. *Adopted.*

Paragraph 16. *Adopted.*

Paragraph 17. The Russian Federation.

Mr. V. Y. TITUSHKIN (interpretation from Russian): Thank you. Yesterday we asked the Secretariat, and for that matter we sent to the Secretariat, this request. It is an issue of specifying in the text so we did send it to the Secretariat so that it could reflect what was said by our delegation. Thank you.

The CHAIRMAN: Distinguished representative of the Russian Federation, could you read this text here in order to inform the delegations?

Mr. V. Y. TITUSHKIN (*interpretation from Russian*): We sent it to the Secretariat.

The CHAIRMAN: We will leave open this paragraph because the Secretariat does not have this text at their disposal. They will bring it and then we will re-open the consideration of this particular paragraph.

Now 18. Yes, the Russian Federation.

Mr. V. Y. TITUSHKIN: To add the paragraph 18 with two more subparagraphs because we think that two ideas contained in our statement should be mentioned in the final report. I can read it in English and then proceed to the Secretariat the text of these two subparagraphs.

18 *bis*. "The view was expressed that the Legal Subcommittee should maintain its reputation as one of the United Nations General Assembly subsidiary bodies most actively contributing to the process of progressive development of international law and its codification is as stipulated by Article XIII of the United Nations Charter."

And paragraph 18 *ter*. "The view was expressed that consideration should be given to the idea to develop a United Nations comprehensive convention on international space law with the aim to produce general acceptable solutions to the problems which still await for consensus, to upgrade certain principles by the United Nations as recommendations to the level of legally binding rules and to elaborate in a more precise way, certain provisions of the basic space treaties". Thank you.

The CHAIRMAN: Thank you Russian Federation. I see the delegation of the United States of America wishes to say something? No. It has been brought to my attention so it was a mistake.

Yes, France.

Mr. C.H. BROSSEAU (France) (*interpretation from French*): Thank you Mr. Chairman. It is not a comment on the statement just made by the Russian delegation. Rather the French delegation had taken the opportunity of the general discussions to express the idea that the deliberations of the Subcommittee should be better adapted to its workload to improve efficiency. This was one of the issues in our statement during the

general discussion and we attach importance to it and so we would like to see it reflected in the Subcommittee's report. So if you agree, Mr. Chairman, I could suggest some wording for a paragraph that would come after paragraph 18.

The CHAIRMAN (*interpretation from French*): This is not for the same paragraph as 18 or are you suggesting a new paragraph on another item?

Mr. C.H. BROSSEAU (France) (*interpretation from French*): No, different item.

The CHAIRMAN (*interpretation from French*): Could you wait please. We need to finish paragraph 18 first and then I will give you the floor. Thank you.

(*Continued in English*) The United States has the floor.

Mr. S. MATHIAS (United States of America): Thank you Mr. Chairman. Mr. Chairman, my delegation intends to suggest some additional text to follow paragraph 18. But, as a preliminary matter, before doing that, I would like to raise a more general question, an issue that we have with respect to the draft report prepared by the Secretariat under the general exchange of views.

It seems to my delegation that, I think more than 20 delegations expressed views in the general exchange of views and those contained a number of important concepts and the report that has been prepared attaches what we view as disproportionate weight to the views of certain delegates which were by no means shared by the vast number of delegations that made interventions during the general exchange of views. And we would like to see a more accurate reflection of the views that were expressed by the delegations during that general exchange. Thank you Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN: Thank you very much distinguished representative of the United States. The Secretary will answer this comment.

Mr. P. LÁLA (Secretary, Office for Outer Space Affairs): Thank you Mr. Chairman. As the delegations are probably aware, the general exchange of views is treated somewhat uniquely in the reports of COPUOS and the Legal Subcommittee. In general, the draft report prepared by the Secretariat in these bodies, the deliberations in the general exchange of views are not reflected in detail. As it is the understanding of the Secretariat and the delegations views such statements

to introduce points, upon which it is intended to elaborate further during the course of the session under specific agenda items to which they refer.

However, in the last few years, in both the Legal Subcommittee and the main Committee, certain delegations have also expressed some policy views which the Secretariat has understood those delegations clearly intended to have reflected in the proceedings of the sessions but that could not be readily included within any of the specific items of the agenda which are dealt with in the report. In such cases, the Secretariat has no other choice than to seek the guidance of the Subcommittee or the Committee in question by preparing draft paragraphs within the introductory sections of the reports and presenting these to the Subcommittee or main Committee for its members to decide whether or not to include them.

This has been the case in the last session of the Legal Subcommittee and the Committee on the Peaceful Uses of Outer Space and has been done again at the current session, to the extent that this practice by the Secretariat will may be deemed inappropriate by the Legal Subcommittee and the Secretariat expresses its sincere apologies. We would be most appreciative to the Subcommittee for a clear indication of how the Subcommittee feels that such matters should be dealt with by the Secretariat in the future. Thank you Mr. Chairman and delegates.

The CHAIRMAN: Thank you Mr. Secretary for your statement on this particular problem.

How shall we now proceed further? We have here a draft amendment of the Russian Federation. You have it already here so perhaps would you read it once again in order to finish it?

Mr. P. LÁLA (Secretary, Office for Outer Space Affairs): Thank you Mr. Chairman. The understanding of the Secretariat was that the Russian Federation wanted just to align the text in the report, the translation of the report, to the Russian text. So I will try to read the text in Russian and depend on interpreters to interpret it into English and other languages.

So it is stated:

(Continued in Russian) All agreements with regard to non-classification of weapons in space and the non-application of force nor threat nor use of force with regard to space objects. This could include the follow elements. First, use of outer space in keeping

with international law in the interests of maintaining peace and security.

Second, obligations to not put in orbit around the Earth, objects which had any weapons aboard, any type of weapon aboard, to not put such weapons on any celestial body and to not place such weapons in outer space in any manner.

Third, obligation to not resort to the use of force nor resort to the threat of using force with regard to objects in space.

Fourth, creation of a monitoring mechanism to monitor the application of agreements and this based on confidence measures in the area of outer space. The first practical measure to this end could thus be accepting a moratorium on the placement of these means in outer space and this in keeping with what has been agreed upon.

Russia is prepared to immediately accept such an obligation if other space-faring nations were willing to adhere to such a moratorium.

The CHAIRMAN (*interpretation from Russian*): Thank you and thank you for reading the text. I would like to know if there any remarks that any delegations would like to make on what just read to you.

(Continued in English) The United States of America.

Mr. S. MATHIAS (United States of America): Thank you Mr. Chairman. It would be preferable to have the proposal in writing. I am not sure that the interpretation was as precise in English. One question that I would raise. In the English interpretation there was reference to a specific delegation, a specific named delegation, which is not the practice as I understand it and is it proposed that that be included?

The CHAIRMAN: Yes, the Secretary.

Mr. P. LÁLA (Secretary, Office for Outer Space Affairs): It may be my mistake because I started reading from the original document and it should start somewhere in the middle and I was not able to fix the beginning so it should be "the view was expressed", so the name of the delegation is not meant to be included. Thank you Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN: Thank you Mr. Secretary. There has been a request from the part of

one delegation to present a written text of this amendment. I believe that it should be done so because, indeed, it is a rather long text and perhaps it may raise some problems so we will again postpone the consideration of this draft amendment to paragraph 18 until we have the text in writing also in English. Do you agree with this proceeding? Yes.

Paragraph 18 has been left open.

We will now continue with VI. Review and possible ... Sorry, I forgot that France wanted to make a presentation and perhaps as the Secretary drew my attention, the United States also submitted a draft amendment or a new text too. Is it to paragraph 18? Perhaps we will first finish paragraph 18 or continue on paragraph 18. Do you wish to read it or will the United States make a presentation of this text?

Mr. S. MATHIAS (United States of America): Mr. Chairman, I will introduce it.

The CHAIRMAN: Very well. You have the floor.

Mr. S. MATHIAS (United States of America): We have given it to the Secretariat and perhaps the Secretariat will be able to distribute it. I would hope so. Three short paragraphs that would follow paragraph 18 which would reflect the intervention of our delegation and we think it would be useful to have these views reflected in the report as well. Thank you.

The CHAIRMAN: Do you wish to read this text or should the Secretary do it?

Mr. S. MATHIAS (United States of America): The first new paragraph would read:

“The view was expressed that much of the recent success of this Subcommittee is attributed to its avoidance of protracted debate on extraneous political issues. That delegation expressed the view that the accomplishments of COPUOS and this Subcommittee with respect to peaceful uses of outer space are attributable to its ability to focus on practical problems and to seek to address any such problems via a consensus-based and results-oriented process.”

Then an additional new paragraph.

“That delegation also expressed the view that the core space law instruments have established a framework within which outer space activities have

flourished and that a single comprehensive treaty in outer space is neither necessary nor feasible.”

And then a third new paragraph.

“That delegation further noted its continued engagement in activities that benefit both non-space-faring and space-faring nations such as routinely providing data from meteorological satellites to users around the globe at no cost and sharing space and Earth science data with the world’s scientific community through cooperative programmes or by making them available in accessible data archives. That delegation also noted that radio navigation satellite services are available for peaceful, civil, commercial and scientific use on a continuous worldwide basis, free of direct user fees.”

It seems to us, Mr. Chairman, that amendments of this sort are necessary to attempt to bring some balance to the reflection of the general exchange of views and I would encourage other delegations to consider whether their views should also be contained in the report under this item. Thank you Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN: Thank you distinguished representative of the United States. While I cannot, of course, stop these suggestions to widen the text of the draft report, I would warn at the same time against the length of these paragraphs. So perhaps the delegations concerned might be willing to consider to shorten these texts in order to keep the balance of the report as a whole, because in this way, we will have a very detailed enumeration of problems and questions and positions and so on, unlike the other paragraphs which are much more general. So please, before continuation of this discussion because I will now suspend further discussion until we have these texts. It means both the Russian text and the United States text in front of us. Please consider also the possibility to leaving out something, some details of these suggestions and to help us to maintain a general balance of the draft report.

I give the floor to the distinguished representative of the United Kingdom.

Mr. D. LUSHER (United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland): Thank you Mr. Chairman. Having listened carefully to what you have said and also the question posed by the Secretariat on how we formulate or how we record the general exchange of views of this Subcommittee and indeed other Subcommittees, I think, whilst we all cherish brevity, accuracy is far more important and I think that

to have a proper read-out of what actually has been said at these meetings, particularly for those interested parties who will read these reports who do not actually attend the meetings. I think it is important to have the broad range of views reflected accurately in the report, particularly when delegations comment on certain issues that really are perhaps outside the agenda of the Subcommittee. So the United Kingdom delegation would prefer to see a more accurate reflection of views expressed in the general exchange in future reports but I take your point and encourage my colleagues in this room to furnish you with their opinion on what they would like to see also. But from the United Kingdom's perspective, we think accuracy is far more important than brevity. Thank you.

The CHAIRMAN: Thank you United Kingdom. Any other view on this? Yes, Colombia.

Mr. C. ARÉVALO YEPES (Colombia) (*interpretation from Spanish*): Thank you very much Mr. Chairman. I share the idea that in reality the methodology of drafting the report is something should take into account specific points and that the general debate should not be reflected as a telegraphic version of what took place. I would like to, therefore, highlight that when opinions are expressed by regional groups, and here I am referring specifically to the statement made during the general debate by GRULAC, which we did not find in the description of the general debate. We did not see a reflection of two or three points that we thought that were important. One, for example, is when speaking of international cooperation, the reference made to events of a regional level which are important.

I would also have a suggestion in that regard and, again, it is in the spirit of keeping things succinct so that it not be an extensive description of the statement but I would have two or three suggestions that I might put forth at some point, perhaps not right now, to the Secretariat since you already have several proposals on the table, but at some point I would like to send them in to the Secretariat. Thank you.

The CHAIRMAN: Thank you distinguished representative of Colombia. Greece has the floor.

Mr. V. CASSAPOGLOU (Greece) (*interpretation from French*): Thank you Mr. Chairman. I ask for the floor for the following reason. I heard the criticism levied at the Secretariat for the preparation of the report and I must first confess that we are paying for the decision for not having a summary record. If we had summary records, as we did a long time ago, then no-one would have any issues

with regard to the publicity being requested now, for example, in the general exchange of views. This morning, I went back to the first summary record of our Subcommittee dating back to July 1962 and I think it is the best way to clearly show and reflect the views that were expressed.

In paragraph 14, there is a reference to verbatim reports, so advertising in the broader sense of the term is here. Why repeat it then? If something did not appear, was not said during the general exchange of views, then OK, but since I have the floor, I would like to further add that I very carefully followed and paid very close attention to the interpretation of the Russian text that the Secretary read to us. But what I understood from the interpretation is that, generally speaking, it repeats paragraph 16 and 17, that is if I am not mistaken in what I have heard, and if the interpretation was as faithful as possible to the Russian.

I really do not see why we are expressing some points of view as reflected in the general statements which are then in the verbatim transcripts as well, 656 to 659, why repeat it. Thank you Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN: Thank you distinguished representative of Greece for your comments.

Ladies and gentlemen, I believe that we should now interrupt consideration of paragraph 18. Yes, I still have Ecuador on my list. I will give you the floor but I would like to suggest not to develop too much a discussion now because we will return to this point, having the written proposals. Otherwise, I fear that we should make arrangements for a night meeting if we continue in this way.

First, Ecuador has the floor.

Mr. P. PALACIOS (Ecuador) (*interpretation from Spanish*): Thank you very much Mr. Chairman. First of all, my delegation is not questioning the Secretariat's capability or commitment to do things in a better way, but views should be reflected in the report in a succinct way as possible. I agree with Colombia, the GRULAC statement should, in summary form, be covered in some of its points so that there is a record in a written document because it might be a reference in the future and many delegates may not have participated at all sessions. Thank you.

The CHAIRMAN: Thank you. Chile has the floor.

Mr. J. M. CONCHA (Chile) (*interpretation from Spanish*): Thank you. My delegation feels that there are some opinions that should be covered here because they are not given later on in the debates in the Subcommittee. Those questions which are elaborated on later do not necessarily have to be fixed here, as is the case of the opinion on the advisability of examining the elaboration of a comprehensive convention. You cannot cover more than 20 debates that there were altogether so you have to make choices.

The CHAIRMAN: Any other delegation. I see none. So we will postpone the discussion on paragraph 18 until all delegations have before them the written text of the suggestions made. And as to the request of the countries of GRULAC, perhaps I might encourage them to prepare, in cooperation with the Secretariat, an amendment to be made or a new paragraph to be included in the text of the report that would reflect the declaration and position that they have taken during the general exchange of views.

But we still have the distinguished representative of France who wanted to suggest a new paragraph, after paragraph 18.

Mr. D. WIBAUX (France) (*interpretation from French*): Thank you Mr. Chairman. Before looking at the proposal for an additional paragraph that I announced earlier, I just wanted to say that the French delegation agrees with the points made by the United States and the United Kingdom as to the manner of reporting in the Subcommittee's report of views expressed during the general debate by different delegations.

On the proposal for the additional paragraph, I would like to read out what we would like to see after paragraph 18 which would say.

"One delegation asked for the opening of a discussion where the Office for Outer Space Affairs could tell the Member States about its expertise on how to rationalize the agenda which could mean a reduction, even if only a couple of days of the duration of the session, which, furthermore, would thus allow greater participation of developing countries."

The CHAIRMAN (*interpretation from French*): I thank you for that proposal and I think we should be able to follow the same procedure as with other proposals and that is have the Secretariat prepare the text, in writing, for consideration.

(*Continued in English*) Ladies and gentlemen, this paragraph 18 and still the new paragraph suggested

by the distinguished representative of France, have remained open for our later consideration.

Ecuador still wants to say something?

Mr. P. PALACIOS (Ecuador) (*interpretation from Spanish*): Thank you Mr. Chairman. I just wanted to say my delegation not only agrees with the concern for such an inclusion but also with the substance of it. In many meetings, we go around and around through the same questions, coming back to them the next day. The sessions could, indeed, be shortened quite a bit.

The CHAIRMAN: Thank you very much distinguished representative of Ecuador. So may I take it that we will now proceed by the present paragraph 19 under VI, Review and Possible Revision of the Principles Relevant to the Use of Nuclear Power Sources in Outer Space, paragraph 19.

France.

Mr. C.H. BROSSEAU (France) (*interpretation from French*): Thank you. Mr. Chairman, in the French version of this draft report that I have before me, it is a question of the title, III is the number there and this is a general remark I would like to make on nuclear power sources in outer space. My comment is an editorial point. In the French, the 's' in "nucléaires" and the adjective should be deleted because it is energy that is nuclear that is qualified and is not in the plural, whereas it is in the plural in French. It should be in the single please. So that is a point that holds in the case of nuclear power sources in French every time it appears in the text. We have left the expression as it is here, in the past, I know, but while in the past, we were negligent regarding French grammar. Now we should make sure that the error is corrected for the future. Thank you.

The CHAIRMAN (*interpretation from French*): That is a question that regards the French text and perhaps you could deal directly with the Secretariat and make sure it is corrected. If I understood you correctly, you drew our attention to ...

(*Continued in English*) Paragraph 19. Is it acceptable? *It is adopted.*

Paragraph 20. No objections? *Adopted.*

Paragraph 21. France.

Mr. D. WIBAUX (France) (*interpretation from French*): Thank you Mr. Chairman. Paragraph

21 in this French version that I have before me, “the Legal Subcommittee agreed that, at present time, revision of the Principles was not warranted.” I think to give a more precise reflection of the views expressed drafting, this part differently. It might be more correct to say “opening a discussion on the revision of the Principles was not warranted”. It is up to the plenary to decide whether or not such a discussion should be initiated on the revision of the Principles of 1992. The way the sentence is drafted in French, it would appear to pre-empt on the decision to be taken by the Committee itself. So I suggest that we say “initiate a discussion on the revision of” instead of just “revision of”. And this section is numbered as III in the French text instead of IV.

The CHAIRMAN (*interpretation from French*): I thank the French delegation but I think the English text should be changed as well because in English it says “revision of the Principles was not warranted”, whereas you thought that it should not say the “revision is not warranted” but rather “the opening of a discussion on revision”.

(*Continued in English*) ... somehow correct it or amalgamate it to correspond with the other. I think in the English text, it would now read as in the French text “opening the discussion on the revision of the Principles was not warranted”. Is it correct? *It is adopted.*

Paragraph 22. Greece.

Mr. V. CASSAPOGLOU (Greece): I ask for the floor because it is a change (*continued in French*) of substance that we heard proposed by France. France changed the substance now of paragraph 21. Yes, actually. I have the English text before me and it is an observation that was made by the Subcommittee, whereas what our colleague from France has just proposed is a different point, a different observation, it is a completely different view on what was agreed in the Subcommittee. It is not an editorial change. That is a substantive change. I do apologize for asking for the floor at this late hour, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN: Well, ladies and gentlemen, what you wish. I, myself, believe that the suggestion made by the distinguished representative of France was quite correct because we should not open the discussion on this issue. I would hesitate to affirm that no revision is necessary now. This should be a conclusion of a detailed analysis of the problems so I believe that what we bear in mind now is not to insist on the opening of the discussion, not stating that no revision of the Principle is not warranted.

Yes, the United Kingdom pleased.

Mr. D. LUSHER (United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland): Thank you Mr. Chairman. I mean I agree that we should not open this up but I think your previous comment about amending the English version for the sake of clarity to reflect what our colleague from France has said, actually fixes this difficulty. I think there is a common understanding that we do not want to open up a discussion on a possible revision of Principles as opposed to opening up an exact revision. I would say that your suggestion that we amend the English text as well as the French and all the other languages, clarifies the position. I do not think there is any confusion here. Thank you.

The CHAIRMAN: I hope that you would agree with the English wording of this text or do you have any improvement, as a master of English, I believe.

Mr. D. LUSHER (United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland): As amended by you, Mr. Chairman, already.

The CHAIRMAN: Thank you very much for your cooperation.

Very well. Paragraph 21 has been adopted, as amended by France.

Paragraph 22. France.

Mr. C.H. BROSSEAU (France) (*interpretation from French*): Thank you Mr. Chairman. Just a correction. There is a typographical error in the French text. “The view that was expressed that States making use of nuclear power sources” and then the verb is in the singular instead of in the plural. It is just a typographical error. It is “devait(?)” singular and it should be “devaient(?)” plural. This is in the French language version.

The CHAIRMAN: Any other opinion on this? *Adopted.* With the change in the French version.

Paragraph 23. Spain has the floor.

Mr. R. A. MORO AGUILAR (Spain) (*interpretation from Spanish*): Thank you Mr. Chairman. For the Spanish language version of paragraph 23, it should be “espacio interplanetario(?)” and not “interstellar”.

The CHAIRMAN: Thank you very much for your bringing to our attention the necessity to adjust the Spanish version of this paragraph.

Any other comment on this paragraph. None.
Paragraph 23 is adopted.

Paragraph 24 now. No comments? *Adopted.*

Paragraph 25. *Adopted.*

Canada has the floor.

Mr. B. LEGENDRE (Canada): Thank you Mr. Chairman. It would seem that in paragraph 25, there is probably a typographical mistake or error that says "the full text of the statement, etc., on agenda item 7". I believe it should be changed to 6 please.

The CHAIRMAN: Thank you very much for your drawing our attention to this typing error or mistake, as you like it. No?

Mr. P. LÁLA (Secretary, Office for Outer Space Affairs): Mr. Chairman, the agenda item number of NPS was indeed 7, so I think it is correct. This is the number of the section in roman numbers. You have numbers of the sections of the report. This does not correspond to numbers of agenda items because we have introduction and some small items so this is correct as it stands now.

The CHAIRMAN: Thank you Mr. Secretary for your helping us to remove this understanding.

Ladies and gentlemen, we have now finished the first part of the draft report, document L.235. My understanding is that we still have some time left and, therefore, let us proceed with document L.235/Addendum.1. It is III, Status and application of the five United Nations treaties on outer space.

Paragraph 1. No comments? *Adopted.*

Paragraph 2. First the chapeau. *Adopted.*

Subparagraph (a). Just the enumeration of the space treaties and the state of ratifications and signatures. *(a) is adopted.*

Subparagraph (b). Please check the numbers if they are correct. It is addressed to the Secretariat. Yes. *Adopted.*

Subparagraph (c). *Adopted.*

Subparagraph (d). *Adopted.*

Subparagraph (e). *Adopted.*

Now the last subparagraph of paragraph 2, in addition one international intergovernmental and so on. No comments? *Adopted.*

Can the whole paragraph 2 be considered as adopted? *It is so decided.*

Paragraph 3. Greece has the floor.

Mr. V. CASSAPOGLOU (Greece): Thank you Mr. Chairman. Probably the Secretariat by great délicatesse forgot to put the satisfaction we expressed for these two documents produced for us concerning the status of the five treaties. I mean the amendments one to the document 722(?), and also the table with, let us say, with the statistical data. So would you please add somewhere in paragraph 3, a mention to these contributions of the Secretariat. Thank you Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN: If it is acceptable for delegations, we will ask the Secretariat to draft such a sentence and include it at an appropriate place in paragraph 3.

With this amendment, *it is adopted.*

Paragraph 4. No objections? *Adopted.*

Paragraph 5. No objections? *Adopted.*

Paragraph 6. No comments? *Adopted.*

Paragraph 7. No comments? *Adopted.*

Paragraph 8. Again, the dots will be filled by the Secretariat. No comments? *Adopted.*

Paragraph 9. It is the usual clause about the verbatim transcriptions. *Adopted.*

Now VIII, Review of the concept of the launching State.

Paragraph 10. No comments? *Adopted.*

Paragraph 11. No comments? *Adopted.*

Paragraph 12. *Adopted.*

Paragraph 13. No comments? *Adopted.*

Paragraph 14. *Adopted.*

Paragraph 15. No comments? *Adopted.*

Paragraph 16. *Adopted.*

Paragraph 17. *Adopted.*

Paragraph 18. No comments? *Adopted.*

Paragraph 19. *Adopted.*

Paragraph 20. No comments. *Adopted.*

Paragraph 21. Again the usual clause.
Adopted.

Shall we still proceed five more minutes perhaps as you wish?

We shall use the remaining time, at least a few minutes, document L.235/Addendum.2, IV, Information on the activities of international organizations relating to space law.

Paragraph 1. No comments? *Adopted.*

Paragraph 2. No comments? *Adopted.*

Paragraph 3. No comments? *Adopted.*

Paragraph 4. Is the enumeration complete? Greece.

Mr. V. CASSAPOGLOU (Greece): Just a clarification because at the very end of paragraph 4, "the Subcommittee was also informed about the activity of the International Space Law Centre". It is a new one or the European Space Law Centre?

The CHAIRMAN: Mr. McDougall has the floor.

Mr. P. R. McDOUGALL (Deputy Secretary, Office for Outer Space Affairs): Thank you Mr. Chairman. Just to clarify. As you will note, the paragraph affects the fact that reports were made by a number of different organizations on their activities. However, in the case of the International Space Law Centre, this is a reflection of a view expressed by a particular delegation and that Centre is a fairly new one which has been established through an agreement between the country that reflected those views and one other country, specifically the Ukraine and, I believe, the Russian Federation. Thank you.

The CHAIRMAN: Yes, and was this information provided by this Centre? Yes, very good. So it is correct, in my opinion.

No other comments? *Accepted.*

Mr. P. R. McDOUGALL (Deputy Secretary, Office for Outer Space Affairs): I would note for the benefit of delegates that there has been a report on this Organization already last year at the Legal Subcommittee so it is not as new perhaps as it might appear. Thank you.

The CHAIRMAN: Thank you.

Distinguished delegates, we will now suspend. Five more minutes? Very good. I welcome this initiative. Thanks to the interpreters, very good.

So we will proceed further.

Paragraph 5. No comments? *Adopted.*

Paragraph 6. *Adopted.*

Paragraph 7. *Adopted.*

Paragraph 8. No comments. *Adopted.*

Paragraph 9. *Adopted.*

Paragraph 10. *Adopted.*

Paragraph 11. No comments? *Adopted.*

Paragraph 12. No comments? *Adopted.*

Paragraph 13. *Adopted.*

Paragraph 14. *Adopted.*

Paragraph 15. No comments? *Adopted.*

Paragraph 16. No comments? *Adopted.*

Paragraph 17. Again, the usual clause.
Adopted.

So now we may suspend further considerations of the draft report and we will meet again in the afternoon at 3.00 p.m. if possible sharp, and we will perhaps first finish the main part of the draft and then to return to the open paragraphs and particularly to the paragraphs of the concerning Working Group on Item 9. And, of course, also on those paragraphs that have been discussed this morning

in the beginning of the main part of the draft report. But I will still give the floor to the Secretary.

Mr. P. LÁLA (Secretary, Office for Outer Space Affairs): Thank you Mr. Chairman. I just wanted to inform delegations that in order to facilitate the adoption of the conclusions of the Working Group on Agenda Item 9, Review of the concept of the launching State, the Secretariat could provide the working copy which is a copy with all amendments in handwriting but this is a clearly readable copy which is usually submitted for typing. So we will provide it in English for all delegations so we can proceed with adoption of these conclusions. Thank you Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN: Thank you very much. Any other suggestion or announcement? None.

The meeting is now adjourned (suspended?).

The meeting closed at 1.05 p.m.