

**Committee on the Peaceful  
Uses of Outer Space***Unedited transcript*549<sup>th</sup> Meeting

Friday, 17 June 2005, 3 p.m.

Vienna

*Chairman:* Mr. A. A. Abiodun (Nigeria)*The meeting was called to order at 3.10 p.m.*

**The CHAIRMAN:** Distinguished delegates, good afternoon, and representatives, and welcome to the last session of the last meeting of the forty-eighth of COPUOS.

This afternoon we will resume our conclude our consideration of agenda item number 13, Other Matters.

I invite delegates to remember, to recollect that when we where discussing agenda item 13, in particular the Chairman's paper on the way forward, we said we are going to prepare a text for you. That text is being prepared now and as soon as it comes into the house, even when you are considering the paper, it will be circulated. And we will then take that paper when we get to the portion where that paper is supposed to go in the report.

Is this agreed? We are not going to debate the paper by itself, but when we get to our report where the paper that has been circulated is supposed to be inserted, then I will introduce it to the floor. OK?

So let us continue where we stopped before lunch and that is on Addendum.1

I believe we start on page 19, paragraph 130, and we are to start on page 21 on paragraph 131, where we are talking about the draft Protocol on the Mobile Equipment. Page 20, sorry not 21, page 20.

Shall we start, distinguished delegates.

I see no objection.

Paragraph 131 please for your adoption.

*Adopted.*

Paragraph 132.

*Adopted.*

Paragraph 133.

Now the only thing I want to say is that 133, you need an appellation before Vladimir. I hope the Office will put it as appropriate.

I have been corrected by the Secretariat. They are right. I am wrong.

Paragraph 133. Can we adopt that as it is?

*Adopted.*

Paragraph 134.

*Adopted.*

Paragraph 135.

*Adopted.*

Paragraph 136.

*Adopted.*

Paragraph 137.

*Adopted.*

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, Conference Management Service, Room D0708, United Nations Office at Vienna, P.O. Box 500, A-1400, Vienna, Austria. Corrections will be issued in a consolidated corrigendum.

Paragraph 138.

Now in this paragraph 138 through 148, these are not the views of the Committee but it is the views of one or more delegation so I would like to take this in clusters if possible so that the delegations affected to pay particular attention to them and look at them.

So I am looking at paragraphs 139 and 140 together.

*Adopted.*

Paragraph 141. It is a long paragraph.

*Adopted.*

Paragraph 142.

*Adopted.*

Paragraph 143.

*Adopted.*

Paragraphs 144 through 146.

*Adopted.*

Paragraphs 147 and 148.

*Adopted.*

Can we go now to Section 6 on page 22, Practice of States and International Organizations in Registering Space Objects.

Paragraphs 149 and 150.

*Adopted.*

Paragraphs 151 and 152.

Paragraph 153.

*Adopted.*

Paragraphs 154 and sub-paragraphs (a), (b), (c) and (d) of that paragraph.

*Adopted.*

Paragraphs 155 and 156.

*Adopted.*

Now we go to page 23, Section 7, Draft Provisional Agenda for the Forty-Fifth Session of the Legal Subcommittee.

Paragraph 157 and paragraph 158.

*Adopted.*

Paragraph 159.

*Adopted.*

Paragraphs 160, 161 and 162.

*Adopted.*

Paragraph 163 and its sub-sections 1, 2, 3 and 4.

*Adopted.*

Sub-section 5 on page 23 and sub-section 6 on page 24.

*Adopted.*

Sub-section 7 on page 24.

*Adopted.*

Sub-section 8 on page 24.

*Adopted.*

Distinguished delegates, I invite you now, and that concludes our section on Sub-Chapter C and D of Chapter II.

Now we go to Spin-off Benefits of Space Technology: Review of Current Status, as shown in Addendum.2.

Can we take paragraphs 1 through 5?

Hungary has the floor.

**Mr. E. BOTH** (Hungary): Thank you Mr. Chairman. Concerning Sections E and F, I will make a proposal because in other sections like C and the following G, the paragraph listing the statements precedes the paragraph listing the technical presentations so I propose to do in these two sections accordingly.

**The CHAIRMAN:** OK, thank you very much Sir. The Secretariat has taken note of your proposal and this, in the hope that there is no objection, will be effected accordingly.

Section E, Spin-off Benefits, 1 through 5.

*Adopted.*

Paragraphs 6 and 7 on page 1.

*Adopted.*

Paragraphs 8, 9 and 10 on page 2.

*Adopted.*

Paragraphs 11, 12 and 13 as well as 14.

*Adopted.*

Now we go to Section F, Space and Society, paragraph 15.

*Adopted.*

Paragraph 16 and its sub-paragraphs (a) through (f).

I give the floor to Japan.

**Mr. M. MIYAKE** (Japan): Thank you Mr. Chairman. Just a minor correction to paragraph 15(d), the name of the presenter \_\_\_\_\_ (*not clear*) Centre should read “\_\_\_\_\_ (*not clear*) Centre. We welcome(?) have the Chiku(?) Centre in the future.

**The CHAIRMAN:** I think we should leave it like that. OK, the Secretariat will take note and correct it accordingly.

I hope we have got what has been proposed. We delete the word “Centre” before “Japan”. “Japan” is the last word in the bracket in sub-section D and before that there is the word “Centre”, after “Chiku”. So we delete the word “Centre”.

Please, the distinguished delegate of France.

**Mr. C. LECLERC** (France) (*interpretation from French*): Thank you Mr. Chairman. I would like to suggest we be a little bit more specific on sub-paragraph (a) for those reading this reading this who were not in attendance at the Committee “presentation by the Youth Organization GAREF Aerospatial”,

otherwise no one will know what GAREF Aerospatial is.

Thank you.

**The CHAIRMAN:** Thank you. The Secretariat has taken note and I thank you very much for that suggestion.

Distinguished delegates, can we then adopt paragraph 16, as modified by both Japan and France?

*Adopted.*

Paragraph 17.

Professor Kopal.

**Mr. V. KOPAL** (Czech Republic): Thank you Mr. Chairman. Mr. Chairman, my colleague, Dr. Petr Lála, drew my attention to the earlier practice that first we always mention the delegations contributed in the discussion and then the presentations so perhaps paragraphs 16 and 17 should be reversed.

**The CHAIRMAN:** Thank you very much Sir. The Secretariat has noted and told me that you are right in your observation and they will effect it accordingly.

Can we then adopt paragraph 17, with the suggestion from Professor Kopal, knowing fully well that this will be reflected and adopted as appropriate?

Wait a minute, I have a paragraph here. Is this circulated? No. Professor Kopal, I call the Secretariat to read. That is 17 *bis* and the Secretariat, I give you the floor please.

**Ms. N. RODRIGUES** (Deputy Secretary, Office for Outer Space Affairs): Thank you Mr. Chairman. There is a proposal for a paragraph 17 *bis*, so following paragraph 17, we would have the following and I will read it fairly slowly:

“The Committee noted that since its previous session, the United Nations Programme on Space Applications, in cooperation with UNESCO, had carried out the following activities:

- (a) The distribution, through UNESCO’s outreach programme of educational materials acquired from NASA on basic space science and technology applications; and

- (b) The holding of a series of space education workshops in Nigeria, from 23 to 27 May 2005, co-organized with the National Space Research and Development Agency of Nigeria.”

I will just repeat that one more time.

“The Committee noted that since its previous session, the United Nations Programme on Space Applications, in cooperation with UNESCO, had carried out the following activities:

- (c) The distribution, through UNESCO’s outreach programme of educational materials acquired from NASA on basic space science and technology applications; and
- (d) The holding of a series of space education workshops in Nigeria, from 23 to 27 May 2005, co-organized with the National Space Research and Development Agency of Nigeria.”

Thank you Mr. Chairman.

**The CHAIRMAN:** I thank you for your introducing that 17 *bis*. Do we agree to that?

Agreed?

*It is so decided.*

Paragraph 18.

Agreed?

*Agreed.*

Paragraph 19.

Agreed?

Paragraph 19 is adopted.

*Adopted.*

Paragraph 20.

*Adopted.*

Paragraph 21.

*Adopted.*

Paragraphs 22 and 23.

France.

**Mr. C. LECLERC** (France) (*interpretation from French*): Thank you Mr. Chairman. I would like to propose adding at the end of the paragraph 22 the following wording, and this is to reflect the French statement on this item of the agenda, “and youth space activities implemented by CNES”.

Thank you.

**The CHAIRMAN:** With that modification, can we adopt paragraphs 22 and 23?

*Adopted.*

On page 4, we have paragraphs 24 through 26.

France, you have the floor.

**Mr. C. LECLERC** (France) (*interpretation from French*): Thank you Mr. Chairman. Again, just to be a little bit more specific, if I may. “Distant diagnostics” is not a medical speciality or a separate speciality, rather it is used at the service of different medical services. So for this remote medical technique, which is not a speciality, in the French it says “the Committee noted there were a number of national education initiatives in rural zones in the area of remote medicine geared to providing services in dermatology, emergency services and tropical diseases”. And my change would start here “..., and using remote diagnostics” instead of “and/or remote”.

Thank you.

**The CHAIRMAN:** The Secretariat has taken note of this. Thank you very much Sir. That has been taken note of.

With that, can we approve paragraphs 24 through 26?

*Adopted.*

Can we adopt the last three paragraphs, 27, 28 and 29?

Japan has the floor.

**Mr. M. MIYAKE** (Japan): Thank you Mr. Chairman. As we expressed under the importance of

the United Nations/IAF Workshop in Kitakyushu(?) in 2005 for the Space Education and Capacity-Building for Sustainable Development in our statement and presentations, so we would like to have the description of the United Nations/IAF Workshop somewhere in this Section F.

Thank you Mr. Chairman.

**The CHAIRMAN:** I give the floor to the Secretariat.

**Ms. N. RODRIGUES** (Deputy Secretary, Office for Outer Space Affairs): Thank you Mr. Chairman. Basically, I think in order to meet the suggestion by the representative of Japan, perhaps we can suggest that the paragraph with the sentence that would be included perhaps as a separate paragraph would be something along these lines and it is not perfect language “the Committee noted that the United Nations/IAF Workshop to be held ...” and we give the proper dates and references “... in Kitakyushu, Japan, would address ...” and I think the theme is on education and that would be full stop after that.

Thank you.

**The CHAIRMAN:** Is that agreeable to Japan? OK. We now accept paragraphs 26, 27 and 28 of Addendum.2.

*Adopted.*

Paragraph 29.

Now distinguished delegates, can I draw your attention to Addendum.3, Section G of Chapter II of the Draft Report, Space and Water, Section G, paragraphs 1 and 2?

Agreed?

*Agreed.*

Paragraph 3 and sub-paragraphs 3(a), (b) and (c).

*Adopted.*

Paragraph 4.

*Adopted.*

Paragraphs 5 and 6.

*Adopted.*

Paragraphs 7 through 9.

*Adopted.*

Paragraphs 10 through 12.

*Adopted.*

Paragraphs 13 and 14.

*Adopted.*

Paragraphs 15 and 16.

*Adopted.*

Paragraph 17.

*Adopted.*

Paragraphs 18 and 19.

*Adopted.*

Paragraphs 20 and 21.

*Adopted.*

Paragraphs 22 through 24.

France.

**Mr. C. LECLERC** (France) (*interpretation from French*): Thank you Mr. Chairman. I might be mistaken, of course, but it seems to me that in French, the word “forestry” does not exist. And I suggest a \_\_\_\_\_ (?) (*French*) be put in instead of “forestry” in the French version, subject to the other French-speaking delegations going along with this change, of course.

**The CHAIRMAN:** Now I understand you just created a linguistic problem for the Committee. Professor Kopal first.

**Mr. V. KOPAL** (Czech Republic): Thank you Mr. Chairman. Mr. Chairman, I would like to return to point 18. Can I do so?

**The CHAIRMAN:** OK, you have the floor Sir.

**Mr. V. KOPAL** (Czech Republic): Yes, in the last line of this, in the fourth line of this paragraph, there is a phrase “recommendations made by various

space- and water-related events". What shall I understand by the word "events"? Because the tsunami was an event, for example.

**The CHAIRMAN:** I know what is meant there but I will leave the Secretariat to correct me, but I thought activities. I think that was what they wanted to say. Is that correct? Yes, it should be activities.

Let us go back to, Composition of the Bureaux right? Wait a minute. Paragraphs 22 to 24, that is right.

Thank you Professor Kopal.

And with that, we adopt paragraph 18.

On 22 to 24, I give the floor to Canada.

**Mr. T. OUATTARA** (Canada) (*interpretation from French*): I thank you Mr. Chairman. Following what our colleague has said, I would like to see that "forestry" actually exists in French and it is not the same thing as "\_\_\_\_\_(?)" (*French*). "\_\_\_\_\_(?)" (*French*) is when forests are being cultivated and "forêts(?) \_\_\_\_\_(?)" (*French*) is the study of forests and these are two very different fields. Someone this morning said that "forêts(?) \_\_\_\_\_(?)" (*French*) actually included "\_\_\_\_\_(?)" (*French*). So I would plead for our retaining the word "forêts(?) \_\_\_\_\_(?)" (*French*), which is more general in its coverage.

Thank you.

**The CHAIRMAN:** Do you agree? I am very happy.

OK, we shall attend to that is in the text.

Paragraphs 22, 23 and 24, can we adopt this as it is?

*Adopted.*

Distinguished delegates, now we go to Section 8, Section H, Composition of the Bureaux of the Committee and its Subsidiary Bodies for the Period 2006-2007.

Paragraphs 25, 26 and 27.

Agreed?

*Agreed.*

The Secretariat has a paragraph 28 to include and so we shall listen to the Secretariat at dictation speed. Or is that circulated? OK, at dictation speed for paragraph 28.

**Ms. N. RODRIGUES** (Deputy Secretary, Office for Outer Space Affairs): Thank you Mr. Chairman. In fact, I have got a paragraph 28 and 28 *bis*. It is to take into account the information the Committee received this morning under agenda item 12 regarding the Bureaux.

Paragraph 28 would read as follows: "The Committee urged the Group of Asian States to reach a consensus on its candidate for Chairman of the Scientific and Technical Subcommittee before the sixtieth session of the General Assembly."

**The CHAIRMAN:** Now we heard our distinguished lady from the Secretariat. Is that your position?

*Adopted.*

Now paragraph 28 *bis*. You have another one? OK, let us go.

**Ms. N. RODRIGUES** (Deputy Secretary, Office for Outer Space Affairs): Thank you Mr. Chairman. Paragraph 28 *bis* would read as follows: "The Committee noted that the Group of Western European and Other States had endorsed the candidature of Filipe Duarte Santos \_\_\_\_\_(? *Complete name not on list of participants*) for the Office of Second Vice-Chairman and Rapporteur of the Committee on the Peaceful Uses of Outer Space for the period 2008 to 2009."

Thank you.

**The CHAIRMAN:** You heard the Secretariat composition of that new paragraph 28 *bis*. Is that agreed?

*Agreed.*

**Mr. V. CASSAPOGLOU** (Greece): We agreed. The only thing is to modify accordingly the heading of H.

Thank you.

**The CHAIRMAN:** The heading will be modified for the periods 2006-2007 and 2007-2008, of 2008-2009. That is all.

Other Matters, page 5, Participation in the Work of the Committee, paragraphs 29 and 30, or actually paragraphs 29, 30 and 31.

Before we adopt the paragraphs in this section, I would like to draw the attention of delegations, or attention of delegations and their delegates, to paragraph 29, as repeated here by the Secretariat. It says “in accordance with paragraph 45 of General Assembly resolution 59/116, the Committee considered ways to improve participation in its works by Member States and its entities with observer status with a view to agreeing at its current session on specific recommendations in that regard.”

Now, when you read paragraphs 30 and 31, they did not address that question. Paragraphs 30 and 31 do not address that question, they address only the role of the agencies. So what is your role?

The Secretariat is advising me that we have passed the stage of a debate on that issue since you said nothing, so they provided nothing. It is as simple as that.

Let us go ahead and adopt the paragraphs 29, 30 and 31. I am just alerting you to the omission that we have created. That is all.

Paragraphs 29, 30 and 31.

*Adopted.*

Now we go to the Symposium. Paragraphs 32 through 34, on page 6.

Japan has the floor please.

**Mr. M. MIYAKE** (Japan): Thank you Mr. Chairman. As I mentioned in the previous chapter on the general exchange of views(?), we would like to have 33 *bis*, just like this, prior to this Symposium, a presentation entitled “Archaeology from Space” by Toshibumi Sakata of Japan, was also made on 10 June 2005 in the context of the theme of the Symposium.

Thank you Mr. Chairman.

**The CHAIRMAN:** Can Japan repeat that at dictation speed please?

**Mr. M. MIYAKE** (Japan): Prior to the Symposium, a presentation entitled “Archaeology from Space” by Toshibumi Sakata of Japan, was also made on 10 June 2005 in the context of the theme of the Symposium.”

This is removed from the previous paragraph, as I mentioned before.

Thank you Mr. Chairman.

**The CHAIRMAN:** With this modification, or with this new 33 *bis*, can we adopt paragraphs 32, 33 and 34 on Addendum.3?

Agreed?

*Adopted.*

Observer Status, paragraphs 35 and 36.

Agreed?

Agreed.

*Adopted.*

Paragraphs 37 and 38. The suggestion of the Chair is those two paragraphs be deleted and I invite the Secretariat to read out what I said, I think you have it already. They do not? It is going to be circulated but there are some modifications we are going to read from the podium. It is being circulated to you now.

Professor Kopal.

**Mr. V. KOPAL** (Czech Republic): Thank you Mr. Chairman. The distribution will take some time but in the meantime I would like to make an observation on paragraph 30. Because, as you may remember, when we were discussing the report of the Legal Subcommittee, paragraph 116, it includes exactly the same idea that is now repeated under Article 30. So perhaps under the circumstances, the paragraph 116 of the part of the report, it means Addendum.1, could be deleted because it is exactly the same.

**The CHAIRMAN:** Professor Kopal, you and the Secretariat are singing the same tune because while you were speaking, they were saying the same thing that it should be deleted. So this is correct. And with the legal mind of Professor Kopal, I know you can trust him on that one.

So agreed.

Thank you very much Sir.

Ukraine has the floor.

**Ms. N. ZUBACH** (Ukraine) (*interpretation from Russian*): Thank you Mr. Chairman. Could I ask us to go back to Add.2, paragraph 22? If we might. Thank you.

The third line from the bottom, in Russian, I do not know how this would work out in English. A change of title would be requested. It is the National Centre for Aerospace Education of Ukraine. That would be the exact title.

And the National Outer Space Legal Centre as well because when we spoke, this was referred to.

**The CHAIRMAN:** Madam, I have been requested by the Secretariat to request you to make your presentation in Russian and leave the interpretation to the interpreters so that they can follow through clearly. So if you give it in Russian, as it is supposed to be, then the interpreters will give it in the United Nations text. The translators. Sorry. Ladies and gentlemen, forgive me. The translators will give it to us in English.

**Ms. N. ZUBACH** (Ukraine) (*interpretation from Russian*): ... *microphone* ... I was not reading the English. I can just give you the Russian. And in the Russian version, there is a mistake and that was what I was referring to. So I just was asking for rectification of that Russian title. If necessary, I will repeat the official title.

**The CHAIRMAN:** Actually I would suggest that you just hand it to the Secretariat and they would take care of it.

Is that agreed?

**Ms. N. ZUBACH** (Ukraine) (*interpretation from Russian*): Of course, I will do so.

**The CHAIRMAN:** Thank you very much.

Now distinguished delegates, by now you should have received the paper that has just been circulated. That is my proposal on the basis of our discussion this morning on the Chairman's proposal in terms of the way forward for this particular Committee, which is a distinguished Committee of the United Nations. And I am sure you think is the most distinguished Committee of the United Nations. There is nothing wrong in thinking that way.

I invite the Secretariat. There are one or two amendments into that text. I invite the Secretariat to present that.

I give the floor to the Director of the Office.

**Mr. S. CAMACHO-LARA** (Director, Office for Outer Space Affairs): Where it says in the first paragraph where it says "the Committee welcomed ..." and then you would add the words "and commend it".

In the third line, before "K. Doetsch", you would insert "in his presentation".

And then replace "made a proposal on" with "suggested". Then it continues with "the way ahead" as it is and then add the words "for the Committee".

**The CHAIRMAN:** I thank the Director.

Professor Kopal?

**Mr. V. KOPAL** (Czech Republic): Yes, Mr. Director, would you kindly repeat your proposal because I will have something to add then.

**Mr. S. CAMACHO-LARA** (Director, Office for Outer Space Affairs): Yes, gladly, only it is not my proposal, it is the Chair's proposal.

"The Committee welcomed" and then it would be "and commended the presentation by Karl Doetsch" as it is "Chairman of the Scientific and Technical Subcommittee from its thirty-eighth to fortieth session of the scientific and technical aspects of the work of the Committee". Then, here comes another change. It would be "in his presentation, K. Doetsch also" and here is another change "made a proposal on". And then insert "suggested the way ahead". And then insert "for the Committee". So it would be "suggested the way ahead for the Committee".

**The CHAIRMAN:** Distinguished delegates, that is my proposal on the basis of our deliberation on this idea for the last two days or three days. The floor is open for your comments.

Greece has the floor.

**Mr. V. CASSAPOGLOU** (Greece): Thank you Mr. Chairman. Mr. Chairman, I would like to point out that we have the paragraph 19 in the document L.259, page 4, in which we say the same thing. It is written also that 536<sup>th</sup> meeting, Karl Doetsch, Canada, Chairman of ... etc. the Committee will \_\_\_\_\_(?). So it is necessary to repeat the same thing.



And the same remark is also valid concerning paragraph 20 where we mention the presentation of Professor Sakata of Japan on "Archaeology from Space".

Just a moment, there are two things, either to delete paragraphs 19 and 20 from E, General Statements, from the L.259, and retain the last text, or the opposite.

I do not see any reason to repeat the same thing two times.

Thank you very much.

**The CHAIRMAN:** I thank the distinguished Professor from Greece.

I give the floor to Canada.

**Mr. D. ALDWORTH** (Canada): Thank you Mr. Chairman. It might help, I do not believe the Greek delegate was present for the entire two weeks of this meeting. And if he had been, he would have heard two separate presentations from Dr. Doetsch. One during the General Statements, at which time paragraph 19 observes on and refers to. And the second time, when I believe he was available for, I guess it was agenda item 13, at which time Dr. Doetsch followed up on his presentation and provided further.

So there were two separate presentations.

Thank you.

**The CHAIRMAN:** Is Greece satisfied with explanation from Canada?

**Mr. V. CASSAPOGLOU** (Greece): Yes, but it should be specified in which meeting Dr. Doetsch made the second intervention to avoid any confusion.

**The CHAIRMAN:** I think the Secretariat will take care of that.

**Mr. V. CASSAPOGLOU** (Greece): But you have also specified the content of this second intervention of Dr. Doetsch because in paragraph 19, it is said "of the scientific and technical aspects of the work of the Committee and the way ahead", which is repeated verbatim in the proposed paragraph.

Thank you very much.

If it was a 100 per cent different intervention, we have mentioned that.

**The CHAIRMAN:** I thank Professor Cassapoglou. In my many years of relationship with this Committee and working with the Secretariat for 23 years, the Secretariat is competent to take care of this so I think you should leave it to the Secretariat and they will make the necessary cross-referencing as appropriate.

Having said that, do you have any comments on the proposal before you?

The United States.

**Mr. K. HODGKINS** (United States of America): Thank you Mr. Chairman and let me commend you and the Secretariat for producing this paper and seeking to bridge the differences that might be here among the delegations on this idea. I have just two things.

First, I would suggest in the second paragraph in the next to last line, after the phrase "long-term plan to enhance", I would insert "international cooperation in". So it would read "a long-term plan to enhance international cooperation in the peaceful uses of outer space".

The second thing is I would like to ask you, Mr. Chairman, based on my earlier intervention this morning, as to the specifics of a working paper prepared by the Office would look like, what exactly are we asking them to prepare? What would be the contents? Is it the substance? Is it the process? Is it an options paper? It is still not entirely clear to me but I think we are probably able to work something out here.

Thank you Mr. Chairman.

**The CHAIRMAN:** I thank you Mr. Hodgkins for your intervention. If I can respond quickly. I have made my proposal to you. Different delegations have given their views. I think right now the Chair is not in a position to interpret the different views of what the Secretariat should or should not do. But I sort of feel that if the Secretariat was strong enough to provide the preparatory papers for the first UNISPACE, for UNISPACE '82 and for UNISPACE III, I think the Secretariat, having listened to us, is quite competent to provide a working paper that this particular Committee can move on.

So this would be my response. Rather than shock the Secretariat or give the Secretariat more than it can chew, the Secretariat knows its limitation and its resources and it has a number of capabilities. It has

also, in addition to capabilities, the Secretariat has other assets, beyond the Secretariat that you can tap on for assistance to do its work, which it has always done. That is why I do not want to, I have given my own views as your Chairman. Those views are being stretched from letter A to letter Z so just let me stop there Sir, if you do not mind.

I give the floor to Greece.

**Mr. V. CASSAPOGLOU** (Greece): Thank you Mr. Chairman. If we finally accept, will accept this formula of report, I would like in the third paragraph, concerning the working paper on the Chairman's proposal, to add "on the basis of contributions made by Member States". That working paper should be prepared on the basis of contributions made by Member States.

Thank you very much.

**The CHAIRMAN:** Thank you very much Professor Cassapoglou.

I give the floor to Austria, Ambassador Helmuth Böck.

**Mr. H. BÖCK** (Austria): Thank you Mr. Chairman. I must admit that my trust and faith in the Secretariat in its capability is very large and almost endless and unlimited, although I am afraid their resources might not always be unlimited. I have to admit that if I look at the text here, I do wonder a bit whether what we will ask the Secretariat to do is a bit vague and what should come and will come out of it. If they should actually present us with a kind of a working paper on the proposals and, as our Greek colleague has pointed out, under his discussions, that is fine, in particular, if the Secretariat feels it has the resources to do that. But I am still not quite clear whether it would make sense to specify it further or we need further discussions for it.

**The CHAIRMAN:** OK. I give the floor to Nigeria. Thank you very much Ambassador Helmuth Böck of Austria.

**Mr. J. CHABO** (Nigeria): Thank you very much Mr. Chairman. I just want to speak along the same line as the distinguished Ambassador of Austria that the proposal by the distinguished Professor from Greece would be an unnecessary addition to this paragraph or necessary(?) details. This aspect of the report will not be ready in isolation by the Secretariat and we have all debated this issue and I believe is \_\_\_\_\_ (*not clear*) by the Secretariat. And, of

course, the Secretariat is unlikely to go ahead to prepare any concept without any due consultations from Member States. So putting it in this aspect of the report, where we are requesting the Secretariat, to me or to my delegation, is an unnecessary addition which we will probably want to leave out of it. We cannot micro-manage the Secretariat. We might as well then go into some other places where we requested the Secretariat and be putting certain details there.

Thank you Mr. Chairman.

**The CHAIRMAN:** I thank the distinguished representative of Nigeria for his comments.

The distinguished representative of Greece.

**Mr. V. CASSAPOGLOU** (Greece): Thank you Mr. Chairman. Because we have not, during this session, any debate or discussion on the substance of the proposal of Professor Doetsch, as well as of other views expressed in here. The only possibility to express our individual, by Member States, views is to send some contributions, otherwise I will be in a very delicate situation not to accept to introduce your proposal and insist to appear in the report the proposed paragraphs 37 and 38, which exactly reflects what we have done today in the room.

Thank you very much.

**The CHAIRMAN:** Professor Cassapoglou, I am sorry, if you listened to Canada carefully, you were not here when Dr. Karl Doetsch made his presentation. You were also not here when this Committee debated Dr. Karl Doetsch's presentation. The only aspect that you know of, and you are contributing to, is the Chairman's paper on Karl Doetsch's presentation which has been fully discussed in two sessions, in two meetings, by this Committee, at this very session, following the presentation. So when you say we have not discussed, that is not an accurate statement. On my own gave this Committee the opportunity to discuss Karl Doetsch's paper. After he finished, and later on we went for lunch and we came back and continue and we spent almost an hour or more on discussion this paper Karl Doetsch presented to us. So we have discussed it.

Now, what we are saying here is that we have noted that, we have noted the Chairman, we have noted the paper, we noted the Chairman's paper and we agreed as a way forward and paragraph 3 is suggesting a process. It is as simple as that.

I give the floor to Nigeria.

**Mr. J. CHABO** (Nigeria): Thank you Mr. Chairman. I apologize for asking for the floor except for the intervention of the distinguished Professor from Greece. I am afraid that we are talking about a working paper here that will be debated, where every delegate and every Member State will be allowed, or will have the opportunity of expressing their views. So I do not see any problem even when certain countries are not consulted in the process of formulating the working paper.

This should present no difficulty for any delegation. It is a working paper that will be democratically debated and discussed at the next session. We cannot micro-manage the Secretariat. I do not think that has been the \_\_\_\_\_(?) in this Committee.

Thank you Mr. Chairman.

**The CHAIRMAN:** I thank the distinguished representative of Nigeria.

Distinguished delegates, are there any more views on this subject?

Cuba. You have the floor Madam.

**Ms. L. PALACIOS** (Cuba) (*interpretation from Spanish*): Thank you Mr. Chairman. I was looking in my papers because I usually take notes. The distinguished representative of Greece was speaking of item 19 referring to Mr. Doetsch's presentation and he says the 536<sup>th</sup> session. I have the presentation of Mr. Karl Doetsch of that day specifically. I do not have two presentations. So I am looking. I cannot find any reference. The distinguished delegate of Canada said something about two presentations. I would like a clarification on this please because I do not see it in my notes. Thank you.

**The CHAIRMAN:** I give the floor to the distinguished representative of Canada.

**Mr. D. ALDWORTH** (Canada): Yes, Dr. Doetsch provide hard copies to everyone of a presentation that he made during the general exchange of views. This presentation was provided at the request of the previous meeting and during the two weeks he was then asked to put a bit more substance to it. And during item 13, yesterday, I believe it was, he provided a subsequent presentation.

So those are the two. The original one during the general exchange of views and then the second

presentation during the session entitled "Other Matters".

**The CHAIRMAN:** I think I can provide an explanation Madam.

Last week, Thursday, during the exchange of views, we listened to Dr. Karl Doetsch's response to our invitation to him last year and he made that presentation. And during that day, and I think Friday also, or maybe that is another meeting, we discussed the paper and we questioned him and so on and so forth. Then yesterday, after I had spoken, after I had introduced the agenda item and brought forth that I have a Chairman's paper, then I invited Dr. Karl Doetsch to help me introduce that paper, that same paper we are discussing now.

So there are two papers. One is his presentation and the second is his introduction of the Chairman's paper. That is what happened.

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

**Mr. K. HODGKINS** (United States of America): Thank you Mr. Chairman. I apologize for taking the floor again but I am still uncomfortable with the mandate that we are giving the Office for Outer Space Affairs because it just does not seem to me to be clear enough. We are asking the Office for Outer Space Affairs to present a working paper on the Chairman's proposal so we are asking the Office to prepare a working paper on a non-paper. But what I am still not clear on is exactly what the content of the Secretariat's paper will be. Will it be a critique of the Chairman's non-paper? Will it be an elaboration of the Chairman's non-paper? I can say I have been here for all of the discussions, last week and this week and I have not come to the conclusion that, for example, we have reached a consensus that we are going to change or modify the mandate of COPUOS, which is one element of the Chairman's non-paper. So that part of it would not be an element for the paper prepared by the Secretariat because it is not clear that the Committee has reached that conclusion.

So, again, I come back to my earlier point. If we are going to ask the Secretariat to produce a product, then it has to be something that is close to what the members here would find acceptable, it seems to me. To ask them to prepare a working paper on the Chairman's non-paper is as vague as you could possibly get. I do not have an objection to the Office doing this, I just want to make sure it is framed properly so that they are not wasting their time and we

are not wasting our time getting a paper that is so off the mark that we cannot make any progress.

Thank you Mr. Chairman.

**The CHAIRMAN:** I thank the distinguished representative of the United States. I think what, as I have said, I propose my paper. There has been a lot of debate on it. There have been all sorts of views on it. I think what is appropriate at this moment, in order not to misrepresent your views, so we said a working paper. I think it is now up to you, the delegates, to limit the Secretariat on what to do or to suggest to the Secretariat on what you want it to do. And I believe the Secretariat is ready to listen.

Colombia has the floor please.

**Mr. C. AREVALO** (Colombia) (*interpretation from Spanish*): Thank you Mr. Chairman. Also in a constructive spirit of finding a way out and moving forward. We do have this mandate which is a mandate that is not defined clearly and it seems to me, and I am just proposing this subject to acceptance by the Secretariat depending on their perception of capacity because, of course, we cannot have a task with a completely diffuse or undefined mandate.

It seems to me what we could do is look at the viability of the proposal based on observations, Mr. Chairman, observations that were made during the discussion as a result of the excellent presentation of Dr. Doetsch. Naturally, it is sort of a record of the positions and a balance that can be struck by the Secretariat. Having said that, I do not think that the Secretariat is in a position to go beyond that and hold consultations with countries because that would be a very complex task and beyond the scope of their capability.

So basically, we could just reflect what happened during the meeting.

Thank you.

**The CHAIRMAN:** Can you summarize that in terms of an action plan for the Secretariat please? Thank you.

**Mr. C. AREVALO** (Colombia) (*interpretation from Spanish*): Yes, well it would be something like this, Mr. Chairman.

(*Continued in English*) "The Office for Outer Space Affairs to present the Committee with a working

paper on the ability of the Chairman's proposal on the basis of observations made by Member States for its consideration at the forty-ninth session of the Committee in 2006."

(*Continued in Spanish*) And, Mr. Chairman, I leave this in your hands as a proposal to your proposal but it might be a way out.

Thank you.

**The CHAIRMAN:** Professor Kopal.

**Mr. V. KOPAL** (Czech Republic): Yes, Mr. Chairman, I believe that the first paragraph is redundant because we can simply re-start with the second paragraph saying "on the basis of the special presentation made by Dr. Karl Doetsch of Canada, as reflected in paragraph 19 of this report. The Chairman of the Committee prepared a proposal for consideration ..." and so on and it remains, except that we will include the additional phrase "to enhance international cooperation in the peaceful uses of outer space", as suggested by the United States.

And then in the third paragraph we might say "the Committee requested the Office for ", first of all, we should mention that the Committee held a preliminary discussion on the Chairman's proposal. Then we will say "the Committee requested the Office for Outer Space Affairs to present the Committee with a working paper on the Chairman's proposal with due regard to the views and suggestions made during this preliminary discussion for its further consideration at the forty-ninth of the Committee in 2006."

That is all.

**The CHAIRMAN:** Professor Kopal, can you read that to us at dictation speed please?

**Mr. V. KOPAL** (Czech Republic): Yes, I will try.

Let us start. The first paragraph will be deleted.

**The CHAIRMAN:** Just read the third paragraph. Everything is taken, just the third paragraph.

**Mr. V. KOPAL** (Czech Republic): The third paragraph?

"The Committee requested the Office for Outer Space Affairs to present it with a working paper

on the Chairman's proposal with due regard to the views and suggestions made during the preliminary discussion on it for its consideration at the forty-ninth session of the Committee in 2006."

But prior to the third paragraph, there should be a sentence about the preliminary discussion of the Chairman's proposal in the Committee at this session.

**The CHAIRMAN:** I thank you Professor Kopal.

Professor Cassapoglou, you still want to speak? OK.

**Mr. V. CASSAPOGLOU** (Greece): Yes, thank you Mr. Chairman. Mr. Chairman, I have a problem concerning the reference to the Chairman's proposal which was not an official document, it was not officious(?) (*French?*). It was not either a CRP or an 'L' document, it was a non-paper. And I do not think that we establish all future steps on the basis of a non-paper. That is, let us say, a little bit scholastic, but in any case, in my view, a very delicate legal problem in relation to this specific matter.

I can accept the last proposal made by Professor Kopal in order to close this question but I am afraid that I do not remember any previous case like this to establish a whole process on the basis of a non-paper. Normally, we have the non-paper, then a CRP paper and then an 'L' paper in order to be a real official document of the Committee. That are my doubts about this reference to a non-paper.

Thank you Mr. Chairman.

**The CHAIRMAN:** I thank Professor Cassapoglou. I have noted what you can live with and what you cannot live with. In terms of what you can live with, you can live with the proposal, as modified by Professor Kopal. I think for the Committee that is good news. That you cannot live with a non-paper becoming a paper of the Committee, I think you have to go back again. If you were in this room in the last two or three days, we have adopted two other non-papers as part of our official work. The paper on GRULAC, U-III/Np/2/Rev.1, we have the original and we have Rev.1. And then there is the non-paper provided by the Office on its Strategy. The Office issued it as a non-paper and you acted on it and it became a legal position of ..., so you have already established precedence. And you lawyers talk about precedence. You have established precedence in accepting those so please let us move forward. That is all I am asking.

Greece has the floor.

**Mr. V. CASSAPOGLOU** (Greece): First of all, I can say one thing, that is a very old Roman action saying that *ex in iurier(?) use(?) non-parator(?)*, so it is not a precedent. But on the substance, dear friend and colleague, I can say that the two other documents to which you already mentioned, we have agreed on the substance of these documents which is a draft part of the report. Now we made a reference to a document without speaking about its content, even the title. So there is a vacuum which should be covered.

Thank you very much.

It is even to protect you.

Thank you.

**The CHAIRMAN:** I give the floor to the distinguished representative of the United States. Thank you very much.

**Mr. K. HODGKINS** (United States of America): Thank you Mr. Chairman. Mr. Chairman, I have a couple of points. I want to make a specific change to the third paragraph, as proposed by the distinguished delegate from the Czech Republic. There is a point to what our distinguished colleague from Greece has said which is that all those papers you cited, in one form or another, they are reflected directly in the final report of the Committee. So when somebody reads our report, they will see a reference to a Chairman's proposal but we do not have even a summary of what that proposal might be in the report. And I am afraid, at 4.30 p.m., it is going to be impossible to draft Committee language in order to reach agreement on that. I see actually a great deal of validity in what our Greek colleague has said.

The second concern I have about our discussion is that in the third paragraph, we make reference to, with due regard to the views and suggestions on it during preliminary discussion of the Chairman's proposal. But, again, we do not have any language in the report reflecting what those views are. Some delegations felt this way, other delegations felt that way. So my delegation's concern is that we need, in some way, to make sure that those views, that we have some way of cross-referencing what those views might be.

And, as I mentioned, it is almost impossible now to draft a new Addendum that would reflect the views that were expressed. So I would suggest that in

the last part of that, the third paragraph, where we say that "with due regard to views and suggestions on it during preliminary discussion of the proposal", I would ask the Secretariat that we add a very specific reference to, we would add "as contained in the unedited verbatim transcripts of the meeting of the Subcommittee" with the specific reference to the particular day that we discussed. So that the reader can at least go back to the unedited verbatim transcripts and see what those views actually were but it has got to be very specific, that is, and I will leave this up to the Secretariat because I know that it is possible to identify the specific days. But if we cannot reflect in the final report what these views are, then we have to have some way of cross-referencing what those views were, as a basis for evaluating the report that the Secretariat would prepare on the basis of those views.

Thank you Mr. Chairman.

**The CHAIRMAN:** I thank the distinguished representative of the United States.

What I understand is that you want the views expressed when the paper was introduced to be reflected in the report. And I think the Secretariat can do this. OK? Wait a minute please, the Secretariat will explain to me.

OK, I understand what has been said by the distinguished delegate of the United States as put(?) by the Secretariat.

Any more comments?

I give the floor to Nigeria.

**Mr. J. CHABO** (Nigeria): Thank you Mr. Chairman. I have listened attentively to the distinguished delegate from the United States, especially when, Mr. Chairman, you mentioned two precedents and here we are told that there are places in your report. And I am just wondering how come the discussion on Mr. Chairman's non-paper has not been reflected in the report itself since it was extensively discussed yesterday. And to that extent, that was probably \_\_\_\_\_(?) taken here of the view expressed by the distinguished delegate from the United States. But apart from that, I did recall that in my intervention yesterday, we did say that the non-paper should have been, the Chairman, read a proposal from the Chairman. And I believe these comments have been recorded. And in any case, if he is to take care of the problem, alleviated by the distinguished delegate from Greece, then may I ask the Secretariat whether the non-paper we have all discussed, because it is not a non-

existent paper, can we still have this paper as a Conference Room Paper, because it is a reality, we discussed it.

Thank you Mr. Chairman.

I will find out from the Secretariat whether we can still have it as a Conference Room Paper.

**Mr. S. CAMACHO** (Director, Office for Outer Space Affairs): Thank you Mr. Chairman. The non-paper is not a document that can be referred to so it does not have any symbol paper. It is used to facilitate discussions. The next hierarchy would be a CRP and on the understanding of feelings, then it is preferred that we put together a document that would be more the basis of a discussion that leads to a text in the report or to agreement. And the next higher level would be if actually a delegation or a group of delegations would want to sponsor or co-sponsor the document, then it would go into a working paper and that, of course, gets translated.

At this point, the Committee can decide to do something else but procedurally what has been done is when it is in the adoption of a report, then the Committee does not go back to discuss substantively. From a technical point of view, it would not be a problem to take non-paper and convert it into a CRP, from a technical point of view. The only question would be whether the Committee would agree then to substantively consider that paper and make views.

Thank you Mr. Chairman.

**The CHAIRMAN:** I thank the distinguished representative of Nigeria and give the floor to the distinguished representative of India.

**Mr. M.Y.S. PRASAD** (India): Mr. Chairman, can we comment on this subject other than proposing on the text? Do we have the permission to comment on this subject in the debate going on our views?

**The CHAIRMAN:** Yes, you can, but I sort of feel the Secretariat has given us a significant information which I want us to address before we go forward please. And that is, I have given you a piece of document which has been issued as a non-paper which the Secretariat tells us can be technically re-issued as a Conference Paper and I want us to agree on that first so that we can have the opportunity to make reference to it.

Professor, please just listen to me, that is OK. I am still in the Chair. I want you to tell us why we cannot because the Office that runs the proceedings says that is technically feasible to issue the document, it is just changing the number, not changing the text, just changing the reference number so as we will be able to reference what we discussed. That is all.

Professor Cassapoglou.

**Mr. V. CASSAPOGLOU** (Greece): Yes, I took the floor for a point of procedure. I agree, first of all, with the explanations given by our Director of the Office, Dr. Camacho, but I have the following. All the Member States, I repeat, all the Member States can introduce proposals for adoption through CRP, through 'L' and then official document, either individually or jointly with other Member States and only when we have some very important institutional, maybe institutional questions, we had some non-papers circulated. You remember some years ago with our Austrian colleague, Ambassador Hollenfeld(?), we prepared the Chairman's proposal but it was in a non-official document exactly to reach an agreement and then have some Member States to present it like us an official document with these three grades of hierarchy. In this specific case, we have not followed this process. Of course, the Chairman's initiative was welcome but if we are not agreed on that unanimously, then it is not possible to transform the proposal into an official proposal by States. That is the procedural, let us say, remark I would like to present you. That is, let us say, the legal approach, vis-à-vis, the problem raised here.

But on the substance, I would like to see the following restructuring of the four future \_\_\_\_\_(?) activities of the Committee put as paragraph 37, the paragraph proposed by Professor Kopal, then in 37 *bis* put the rearranged text of the second paragraph of your last document, unofficial document as 37 *tris*(?) (*ter*?) have the actual 37 of the Addendum.3, 37 *quatum*(?), the existing 38 and then finish by 39 or 38 *bis*, the last sentence as amended by the proposal of our United States colleague.

Thank you Mr. Chairman.

**The CHAIRMAN:** Thank you. Can I ask the Secretariat to read before I invite Nigeria? Nigeria, I am going to invite you but I want the Secretariat to let us hear exactly what Professor Cassapoglou has said, from the Secretariat.

**Mr. J. CHABO** (Nigeria): Mr. Chairman, ... to amend some of the things that the distinguished

Professor had probably said and you want to listen to me before you bring in the Secretariat.

**The CHAIRMAN:** OK, let me hear you.

**Mr. J. CHABO** (Nigeria): Thank you Mr. Chairman. I did mention earlier that the discussion did not take in a vacuum and if you look at the way the distinguished Professor from the Czech Republic had asked us to proceed, we must make reference to the further *bis* that your non-paper was discussed in this forum yesterday. There was a discussion and the discussion did not take place in a vacuum. We want adequate reference to be made to the discussion of the non-paper in the report of this Committee under the present session. Because as presently formulated, this Committee had thought that there would have been a report on the discussion of your non-paper, this on the presentation by Dr. Karl Doetsch. So if we are presented with that, the amendment that is being proposed on this paper, we have a basis to follow. We will not go into any paragraph that is something to make any amendments. We will have been discussing the non-paper presented and we do not need any Conference Room Paper again.

Thank you Mr. Chairman.

**The CHAIRMAN:** Professor Kopal.

**Mr. V. KOPAL** (Czech Republic): Thank you Mr. Chairman. Mr. Chairman, I wanted only to say that I also included a sentence on a preliminary discussion that was held on the basis of your proposal. So perhaps the distinguished representative who spoke before me somehow did not hear it. But I also wanted to say this, perhaps we could substitute for the word "proposal" in the second paragraph the words "informal paper".

**The CHAIRMAN:** I \_\_\_\_\_(?) Professor Kopal for that intervention.

Venezuela.

**Ms. N.ORIHUELA** (Venezuela) (*interpretation from Spanish*): I get the impression that we are going backwards rather than making any progress. I get the impression that in the hour that separates us from the end of the meeting, it is not time to fiddle around with the status of this document. It is true that there was a discussion on this but I do not think it was yesterday that this was turned into a CRP. The proposal of the Czech Republic, which seems to gather support from everyone, so I suggest that we

should discuss that proposal rather than transform this into a document.

Thank you.

**The CHAIRMAN:** I thank the distinguished representative of Venezuela.

I invite Mr. Prasad of India.

**Mr. M.Y.S. PRASAD** (India): Thank you Mr. Chairman. We are not proposing any changes to the text as circulated here but we would like to give the Indian delegation's views on this matter.

Number one is that our Committee always worked with certain unique methods in the times of difficulty and always with the flexibility in the working methods.

Second, the text proposed in the paper does not limit the freedom of delegations to reach a conclusion on the content of this future paper to be presented in the next session either in its contents or its form.

Third, we feel that Secretariat got by now sufficient views of the delegations and the content of the form of the issue which we are discussing.

Fourth, though we do not like to mix the issues with the personalities but in this case the presentation and proposal are done by persons elected by a consensus method to lead us. In view of this, the Indian delegation feels that whatever is the latest status of the modifications proposed by the distinguished delegates this text should be accepted.

Thank you Mr. Chairman.

**The CHAIRMAN:** I thank you Sir. Can we bring to a close and arrive at an agreement on the text that is modified and modified and finally modified by Professor Kopal.

At which time, I now invite the Secretariat, basically what we have is we would delete paragraph 1 and, let me go back to the Secretariat to borrow the modifications we have in paragraph 2.

I will ask the Secretariat to read for us what we now have on the basis of Professor Kopal's modification in paragraph 2.

**Ms. N. RODRIGUES** (Deputy Secretary, Office for Outer Space Affairs): Thank you Mr. Chairman. I will try as much as I will say.

So paragraph 2 of the text as before you, "on the basis of the special presentation made by Dr. Karl Doetsch, as reflected in paragraph 19 of this report", and that goes back to the first section of the report, "the Chairman of the Committee prepared an informal paper for consideration by the Committee on its future role and activities. The Committee agreed that it was important to consider the evolvement of space activities and to consider how the Committee could develop a long-term plan to enhance international cooperation in the peaceful uses of outer space."

That is paragraph 2.

Shall I continue?

**The CHAIRMAN:** I think there is an omission there, it should be on the basis of the presentation and subsequent discussion.

That comes later? OK. Thank you. Go ahead please.

**Ms. N. RODRIGUES** (Deputy Secretary, Office for Outer Space Affairs): The third paragraph, this might be where the tough part comes in. It is an additional sentence in advance of the sentence that are(?) there, "the Committee held a preliminary discussion on the informal paper. The Committee requested the Office for Outer Space Affairs to present it with a working paper on the Chairman's proposal with due regard to the views made by delegation", we may have to clean it up slightly, "with due regard to the views made during the forty-eighth session for its consideration at the forty-ninth session of the Committee in 2006."

**The CHAIRMAN:** Can we accept this please?

The United States. ... it refers to the unedited version you ask for.

**Mr. K. HODGKINS** (United States of America): Thank you Mr. Chairman. I have no objection, ... I would like specific reference to the unedited verbatim records, transcripts.

Thank you Mr. Chairman.

**The CHAIRMAN:** Thank you.



Is that agreed then, paragraphs 2 and 3, as read by the Secretariat with the addition the United States has requested that we provide, we made reference to the verbatim discussion we had on the paper on the Chairman's proposal or whatever.

Greece has the floor.

**Mr. V. CASSAPOGLOU** (Greece): Thank you Mr. Chairman, I am happy with the wording prepared by the Secretariat. The only thing on which I would like to have a reaction is that we will yes or not include in this phrasing the paragraphs in square brackets, 37 and 38, as part of the discussion we had.

**The CHAIRMAN:** The paragraphs themselves, when you put the paragraphs themselves, they will show, rather than say "some delegations", so the paragraphs themselves will give exactly who said what in those texts.

Yes, there is a reference to the actual discussion.

**Mr. V. CASSAPOGLOU** (Greece): I would like to know if we include in the text presented just now by Madam Rodrigues, the two initial proposed paragraphs under square brackets 37 and 38. What was my proposal of compromise? And if they are included, I fully agree with this compiled text.

Thank you.

**The CHAIRMAN:** OK, thank you Greece.

If the delegates agree with you, it will be done. That is in the hands of the delegations, not me.

Austria.

**Mr. H. BÖCK** (Austria): Thank you Mr. Chairman. With regard to what our Greek colleague pointed out, obviously the delegates, as they are contained in here, expressed some views and the views are important for the discussion we had so they should just be included.

The second thing is I still have a feeling that we are asking the Secretariat to do remains vague and will task them to a large degree but I would expect the Secretariat, if all the delegates agree to this particular text, is to have and present us with some food of thought. And it might be that this remains general because as our United States colleague pointed out, a couple of these things contained in the Chairman's paper with regard to the mandate, etc., we did not have

an in-depth discussion and it might be difficult for the Secretariat to, if one takes that point, for example, to come and make such proposals. That is actually up then to the delegates at another meeting when we have some food for thought and a working paper albeit even if they are in a more general sense.

Thank you.

**The CHAIRMAN:** I thank the distinguished delegate of Austria, Ambassador Helmuth Böck, for that input and I am sure the Secretariat has taken this into consideration.

Can we bring this thing to a close?

Professor Kopal.

**Mr. V. KOPAL** (Czech Republic): I only wanted to say that it seems to me that now after an agreement on the text that we have just adopted, the two paragraph 37 and 38 are redundant because it will be included the idea of establishing an ad hoc working group is included in the Chairman's informal paper that was discussed in a preliminary way here and the discussion on it should continue next year. So that it is not necessary to repeat here the suggestion to establish an ad hoc working group because this has been included in your informal document. And then in the following paragraphs to reject it. There has been preliminary discussion and this discussion will continue and then we can resume the outcome of these discussions next year.

**The CHAIRMAN:** I thank Professor Kopal. I understand your frustration. Believe me, I do. I am in the same shoe as you are on that very subject because what we have seemed to have agreed upon are the two paragraphs which have been delicately put together by everybody so to speak, but now we go back and see now to be saying some delegations said this, other delegations said that. What did we say in the first two paragraphs? And I think this is the point you are making.

I invite Nigeria but please I beg you be brief.

**Mr. J. CHABO** (Nigeria): Thank you Mr. Chairman and I apologize for asking for the floor at this eleventh hour. I just wanted to speak along the same lines with the last speaker. When we started this discussion earlier this evening, it was with the understanding that paragraphs 37 and 38 are to be deleted. I stand to be corrected. It was with the understanding, that was why they are in brackets, and we have the replacement for that. If we are going to go

back to them, then we want to re-open the whole debate. If that is the wish of the Committee, we can go on that path. But on the other hand, because some of the contents of this, the contents of these two paragraphs have been adequately taken care of in the delicately packaged agreed text and I believe when the distinguished delegate from the United States mentioned verbatim, he probably had this in mind what he said, I do not have to speak for him, but I believe that takes care of this part of it. So if we are bringing this in, I would probably want to ask the distinguished Professor from Greece, how he intends to incorporate this into what you have just agreed, whether there will be no duplications or overlapping here and there.

But at this late hour, I will probably have to \_\_\_\_\_(?) to him for whatever reasons his objections are, I believe that these two paragraphs have been taken care of. But if he insists on having them, equally some delegations will insist on having them deleted because it will be an unnecessary repetition.

Thank you Mr. Chairman.

**The CHAIRMAN:** I thank you the distinguished delegate of Nigeria.

I do not want to say except the following. I did not expect to see anything in the draft report on this statement, on this subject. I expected to see only the title because when we adjourned, my position on this subject was that when we come back, we have now had this discussion, and I will come back to you after lunch with a text. That is what I said. I said when we get to this section of our report, I will come back to you with a text. The text is what you have modified and modified and modified and we have finally got an agreed text. So if we are going to go back to what I said, and which is supposed to be reflected in the paper appropriately, those two paragraphs should have said "are waiting for submission promised by the Chairman". That is what you should have in there. That is what you should have in there, not some delegates said this. And it is on the basis that some delegates said, some delegates said that, that we came with the conclusion we arrived at. So the Chairman is in the hands of delegations.

But in the meantime, please let us bring this thing to a close, I beg you.

Professor Cassapoglou, that was the position, and I telling you the honest truth, everybody heard me. I said I have no information on this paragraph. Let us come back. When we get to this agenda item, I, as your Chairman, will come up with a proposal. I did

not propose anything before we left for lunch and, therefore, there could not have been this here. So what I am suggesting, as Professor Kopal has eloquently appealed to everybody, let us accept the two paragraphs we agree and move on. Because if we now go back to this, it is counter-productive.

Do you accept that Greece?

**Mr. V. CASSAPOGLOU (Greece):** I have doubts about this redundancy. In any case, if my English-speaking colleagues from the United Kingdom and the United States assure me that the wording of the text proposed by the Secretariat just a few minutes ago is quite enough and in a third level, includes even very vague the substance of these two paragraphs, I can concede.

**The CHAIRMAN:** Thank you very much. Can we take the two paragraphs we have discussed and agree upon the text to replace everything under this agenda item in our report?

*It is so decided.*

Distinguished delegates, we now go to Proposed Programme Budget for the Biennium 2006-2007.

Paragraph 39.

*Agreed.*

*Adopted.*

Paragraph 40.

*Agreed.*

Now we go to sub-section J, Schedule of Work of the Committee and its Subsidiary Bodies. And here we have how we are going to meet next year for the Scientific and Technical Subcommittee, for the Legal Subcommittee as well as the forty-ninth session of COPUOS.

Are we satisfied with those proposals? Those proposals, I am sure, have been delicately put together by the Secretariat on the basis of other meetings that have taken place here at the VIC.

Paragraph 41.

*Agreed?*

*Agreed.*

Distinguished delegates, let us go to our last Addendum, Addendum.4, Implementation of the Recommendations of UNISPACE III.

Paragraph 1.

Paragraph 2.

*Adopted.*

Paragraph 3.

China has the floor.

**Mr. W. SU** (China) (*interpretation from Chinese*): Mr. Chairman, we suggest to add “China” in the first paragraph because we took the floor on this item.

Thank you.

**The CHAIRMAN**: The Secretariat has taken note of China’s correction and I thank the distinguished representative of China.

Paragraph 3.

*Adopted.*

Paragraph 4 with the modification from China. And in paragraph 4 we have (a) through (g) on the second page.

*Adopted.*

Paragraphs 5 through 9.

*Adopted.*

Paragraphs 10 and 11.

*Adopted.*

Paragraph 12.

*Adopted.*

Paragraphs 13 and 14.

*Adopted.*

Paragraphs 17, 18 and 19.

*Adopted.*

Paragraphs 20 through 22.

*Adopted.*

Paragraphs 23 and 24.

Yes, the delegate of Greece.

**Mr. V. CASSAPOGLOU** (Greece): Thank you. In relation with paragraph 23, in my view there is not reflected the view expressed by my delegation concerning the use of United Nations facilities, especially UNOSAT. So I would be grateful if we add a paragraph 23 *bis* saying “the view was expressed that no new entity is necessary to be established as that mission could be entrusted to the already existing United Nations infrastructure as UNOSAT within UNITAR.”

Thank you Mr. Chairman.

May I dictate this.

“The view was expressed that no new entity is necessary to be established as that mission would be entrusted to the already existing United Nations infrastructure as UNOSAT of UNITAR.”

Thank you Mr. Chairman.

**The CHAIRMAN**: I thank you for your input Greece.

Can we adopt then 23 and 24?

*Adopted.*

Paragraphs 25, 26 and 27.

*Adopted.*

Paragraphs 28, 29, 30 and 31.

*Adopted.*

On paragraph 32, I would like to invite the Secretariat to make a contribution.

**Mr. S. CAMACHO-LARA** (Director, Office for Outer Space Affairs): Thank you Mr. Chairman. This is the spot where we need to consider the non-paper, the revision to non-paper, U-III/Np/2/Rev.1, regarding the sentence that had been left pending yesterday afternoon and that was then discussed by GRULAC last night and this morning they provided two pieces of paper. One is the non-paper that I have

just mentioned, the Rev.1 to that paper, and contains two paragraphs in bold.

The other is a piece of paper with no identification and it contains one sentence in bold.

Another, we have the documents. If you look at paragraph 32, this one is with brackets, this is the paragraph that was being discussed last night. And the proposal is that that paragraph should be replaced by the second paragraph in bold in the non-paper. That paragraph reads:

“The Committee also expressed the importance of coordinating activities between the Regional Centres and relevant actors devoted to promoting the peaceful use and exploration of outer space. As regards the Centre for Space Science and Technology Education in Latin America and the Caribbean, CRCTELAC(?), the Committee”, and then here there was a proposal made by the United States this morning, delete “express the relevance” and substitute it for “underscored the importance”. So it would read “the Committee underscored the importance of the coordination between the Centre and the Pro Tempore Secretariat of the Space Conference of the Americas.”

So this paragraph would become paragraph 32.

And the single sentence, which is on the piece of paper without a symbol, would become 32 *bis*.

Thank you Mr. Chairman.

**The CHAIRMAN:** I thank the distinguished Director.

Distinguished delegates, do we accept the revision to, or the substitution in paragraph 32 and the new paragraph 32 *bis* on the same subject indicated in the 32 that has been deleted?

*Agreed.*

Paragraphs 33, 34 and 35.

Nigeria. Where are you Sir? Which one? Paragraph 32? Paragraph 33. OK. You have the floor.

**Mr. J. CHABO** (Nigeria): Thank you Mr. Chairman. This is just a small edit. In view of the extensive information that the report has provided us in paragraphs 23 to 27 of Addendum.1, we believe that this paragraph should be slightly amended to read “the

Committee agreed that the Regional Centres should continue to report”, rather than being invited. Because in those paragraphs, there is an extensive reference to the reports.

Thank you Mr. Chairman.

**The CHAIRMAN:** I thank the distinguished representative of Nigeria. I think your observation is timely and correct because the Centres, maybe not all of them, but some of them, particularly India has been consistent in its annual report on its work. So that is being taken care of by the Secretariat.

Can we approve paragraph 33 then, as well as 34?

*Adopted.*

Paragraph 35.

*Adopted.*

Paragraphs 36 and 37.

Will the Secretariat fill in the blanks as maybe appropriate?

*Adopted.*

Paragraph 38.

*Adopted.*

Paragraphs 39, 40 and 41.

France has the floor.

**Mr. C. LECLERC** (France) (*interpretation from French*): Thank you Mr. Chairman. In the French version, paragraph 39, it says “the Charter was invoked 10 times in the last 10 years”. As it was signed in 2000 and the order of magnitude, I think it is the English version that must be accurate here due to the problem with the order of magnitude.

Thank you Sir.

**The CHAIRMAN:** Thank you very much France. I am told by the Secretariat that they have taken note and that you are correct Sir.

Paragraph 39. Can we adopt that, as modified by France?

*Adopted.* As well as 40 and 41.

Paragraph 42.

*Adopted.*

And the last paragraph is paragraph 43.

*Adopted.*

Distinguished delegates, by our actions with a capital letter 'S', we have now adopted all the five parts of the report of the Committee on the Peaceful Uses of Outer Space at its forty-eighth session to the General Assembly for its consideration at its sixtieth session.

Can we now look at the entire report and can take it that the Committee now adopts the entire report in its entirety? That is the introduction and the four addenda.

I see no objection.

*It is so decided.*

The report of the Committee on the Peaceful Uses of Outer Space is hereby adopted for onward transmission to the General Assembly for its final consideration.

Distinguished delegates, before I bring the 549<sup>th</sup> meeting and the forty-eighth session of COPUOS to a close, I need to just make some brief remarks.

To start with, this has been a very interesting and challenging session. But more importantly, I am very happy to see that we are not going beyond the official time allotted to us. That is in part due to your own efficiency and that of the Secretariat, as well as our support staff, particularly the Office for Outer Space Affairs, the interpreters and the Conference Officers, who have supported us in our work here. Therefore, on your behalf, I want wholeheartedly and sincerely thank the Office, thank the interpreters and the Conference Officers and the engineers and any other person who may, in one way or the other, have facilitated our work, in particular and including, the Conference Management Services.

Distinguished delegates, as we depart this place, let us not forget that we have taken a number of decisions. First is the report of this session which will go to the General Assembly. Most of us here have had General Assembly experience. As a Chairman, I had that same experience last year and my appeal to you is that if you do not want the decisions you made today,

and throughout this past week, to be made a mockery of, and I say that with all sincerity, please be properly represented at the General Assembly. Because delegates at the General Assembly will tell you, I was not there when that was adopted, and they had to come back and tell their delegation. This Committee does not work by voting or anything, it works by consensus. The delegation is a member, in actual fact your delegation contributed to this debate. So that is one point.

The second point, we are still talking about UNISPACE III and implementation of the recommendations. It is not over. We have taken certain steps forward and the ones that are continuing, it is my hope that we will continue to work hard on them. We have taken certain decisions, particularly with reference to the Commission on Sustainable Development. We need to follow-up through on that.

And there is the IADC and there is the disaster subject. We have a lot for the future. In addition, we invited one of us who we have recognized over the years to be a distinguished person with a lot of talent and a lot of credit to his country, that is Karl Doetsch.

The document you accepted, not by consensus, but unanimously, on the High-Level Panel that is coming up, was put together by Karl Doetsch and all of us in the G15 only said yes, yes, yes.

I just want to let you know this. In drafting the Chairman's paper that we have argued over the last two or three days, I have to borrow his talent to put that together because he is the author of the idea.

As your Chairman, I have challenged you. I will not be challenged (*not clear*) by Karl Doetsch, not me alone but 99.9 per cent of you here to look forward to the future.

I listened to the UNESCO representative yesterday talk to us and if you go back to all the artistic work he showed on the screen, those kids are looking towards the future and I have a simple question for you. Are you going to let them down? By your actions today, I cannot say yes or no but I hope when you come back next year, you will be able to say yes.

I thank you for coming. I thank you for your input. I thank you for your support. I felt I had an obligation to get this Committee to respond responsibly to the challenge posed by Karl Doetsch and I am happy I did. I am happy you took your action but I hope you will do a better job when you come next year so that this Committee can look to the future and the world

can look at you and recognize that you are taking care of their interests.

I wish you a safe journey back home.

Thank you very much.

I now declare the forty-eighth session of this meeting closed. Thank you.

*The meeting closed at 5.20 p.m.*