

Committee on the Peaceful Uses of Outer Space

Unedited transcript

565th Meeting

Friday, 16 June 2006, 3 p.m.

Vienna

Chairman: Mr. G. Brachet (France)

The meeting was called to order at 3.35 p.m.

The CHAIRMAN (*interpretation from French*): Distinguished delegates, I would like to call to order the 565th meeting of the Committee on the Peaceful Uses of Outer Space.

This afternoon we will continue and I hope conclude our consideration of agenda item 14. And following that, we will proceed with the adoption of our report of the Committee, agenda item 15, continuing this morning's work.

Other matters (agenda item 14)

Let us start now with our consideration of agenda item 14, Other Matters.

I would like to draw your attention to CRP.18 which was distributed this morning and which contains the texts that could be introduced into the report of the Committee with regard to the inclusion of a new item on the agenda of the Committee. CRP.18, I repeat, as indicated this morning. And this, the drafters sought to draft a text to incorporate the Brazilian proposal as well as comments made by various delegations, in particular the delegation of Canada and the delegation of Indonesia as well.

I believe that all delegations have had enough time to read through CRP.18. In the interim, I have informally consulted with Brazil and Canada and I believe that they have agreed on a small improvement to the document before us. So I am going to be turning to the delegation of Canada and asking that delegation whether they could indicate to us exactly the

amendment, the addition they have coupled(?) together with Brazil.

Canada, you have the floor.

Mr. D. ALDWORTH (Canada): Thank you Mr. Chairman. Mr. Chairman, when we look at the text which the Office for Outer Space Affairs has supplied under CRP.18 to record the contents of yesterday's Committee discussion on the Brazilian proposal to include a new agenda item entitled "International Cooperation in Promoting the Use of Space-Derived Geo-Spatial Data for Sustainable Development", we see that you have tried to take into account some of the considerations which the Canadian delegation has expressed. We are appreciative of this attempt but consider that the references are insufficient.

Canada does not wish to stand in the way of the use by developing countries of any space-derived benefits which would help bring progress and improve living standards in such nations. As you will have noted from the earlier remarks of my distinguished colleague from the Canadian Space Agency, the financial and technical contributions of Canada to this area are many, including substantial programmes directed towards some of the very nations that questioned our commitment to sustainable development in this room yesterday.

Mr. Chairman, Canada has a long and, I believe, unquestionable record of active cooperation with developing nations. I would like to repeat that our nation's interest in promoting the sustainable development of developing countries is genuine and is strong. We have been in discussions with Brazil on this topic previously. We had hoped to reach

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 D0771, United Nations Office at Vienna, P.O. Box 500, A-1400, Vienna, Austria. Corrections will be issued in a consolidated corrigendum.



agreement to refine its contents before it reached the stage of Committee approval but unfortunately the delay that this would entail was not acceptable to the Brazilian delegation. However, cooperation is a two-way street and Canada would hope that the following enhancements, which have been discussed with the Brazilian delegation, have been amended a second time and have been in concurrence, will be acceptable to the remainder of the Committee that had concerns with it expressed yesterday.

But first, on a point of process. We are concerned that the Brazilian proposal's success in being added to the agenda may constitute an unfortunate precedent. It seems to this delegation that on some issues, members of this Plenary are willing to hold up discussion based on one objection, but that on others, such as this one, proposals were approved despite our objections. Therefore, we seek the indulgence of the Committee in the following attempt to provide further clarity to the decision and, as I said, hope, in conjunction with the Brazilian delegation, that others will be able to accept the following amendments to the Office for Outer Space Affairs recommendations.

So the following amendment is suggested and that will be with reference to paragraph 5, starting with "the Committee further agreed that in 2007 the Committee would identify and assess the interfaces amongst international fora where countries undertake discussions regarding the implementation of space-derived geo-spatial data infrastructures in order to avoid duplication of international cooperative efforts."

And then we would add a new sentence, "On the basis of this assessment, the Committee would then take a decision on next steps of the Work Plan, including more closely defining the scope of the agenda item on space-derived geo-spatial information."

Mr. Chairman, we believe this addition will go a long way towards meeting Canadian concerns. We believe that this proposal would not have been so divisive(?) had normal process and proper groundwork been carried out. A turnaround of 48 hours is simply too fast to enable consultation with capitals and this is particularly so with the objectives of the proposal are unclear.

However, we do think that the Office for Outer Space Affairs paper, as modified by you on this point, and with the agreement, the very kind agreement, I might add, of the Brazilian delegation, who we must also add had nothing but the best intentions, we recognize. We do believe that this is on

the right track and we would like to thank the Office for Outer Space Affairs and your able chairmanship for managing this issue to meet our concerns.

Thank you.

The CHAIRMAN (*interpretation from French*): Thank you Canada. I think I am going to ask you to repeat the sentence suggested for the end of paragraph 5 because you zipped through it and I am afraid that delegations might not have scribbled fast enough.

Mr. D. ALDWORTH (Canada): So the sentence would read: "On the basis of this assessment, the Committee would then take a decision on next steps of the Work Plan, including more closely defining the scope of the agenda item on space-derived geo-spatial information."

The CHAIRMAN (*interpretation from French*): Could you also hand this in writing to the Secretariat? Thank you.

Brazil, you have the floor.

Ms. C. L. RIBEIRO MOURA (Brazil): Thank you Mr. Chairman. Well, first of all, I would like to thank the Canadian delegation for their flexibility on this matter. And on the deadline for the consideration of the proposal, I would like just to add that we have tried to conduct informal consultations in the most extensive way and we take note of this observation by Canada, but we made many efforts in order to accommodate concerns.

As to the clarity of the objectives of the proposal, I believe that the Work Plan itself will help to allay concerns on this matter because by evaluating what has been done in different organizations will certainly come to conclusions on the way forward.

I just have a small doubt on the first line of paragraph 5. As the Canadian representative read, the word "existing" was omitted and it is my belief that it should be kept here. So it would read "the Committee further agreed that in 2007, the Committee would identify and assess the interfaces among existing international fora ..." and so on and so forth.

Thank you Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN (*interpretation from French*): I thank you delegation of Brazil. Now on this last point, I had also put a little question mark next

to the word “existing”. We are maintaining that word “existing international ...”.

So distinguished delegates, before us we have a text which has been discussed and handled most constructively by the two delegations mainly concern. We would seek your agreement to the text thus amended and its inclusion into the report of the Committee in the appropriate place, which is under item 14.

Would there be any comments.

It does not seem to be the case.

And so I would like to thank the delegations of Brazil and Canada for the work that they have done this morning, reaching agreement on an acceptable text. This will allow us to examine these issues with the proper professionalism, especially during the first phase of the work as described in the document.

So with your agreement, we have finalized this item and decided that this text can be included in the report of the Committee.

Thank you.

**Report of the Committee to the General Assembly
(agenda item 15)**

Now, I would like to come back to our consideration and approval of the report of the Committee.

This morning we had examined L.266 and its Addenda 1 and 2. We are now going to be taking Addendum 3.

I believe that there is still Add.4 that is outstanding which is going to be distributed shortly. Thank you.

While we wait for Addendum 4, let us go through Add.3.

We are on Chapter II, Part C, Report of the Scientific and Technical Subcommittee on its Forty-Third Session. Paragraph 1.

Comments on paragraph 1?

Apparently not.

Approved.

Paragraph 2. No comments?

Approved.

Paragraph 3. No comments. Thank you.

Paragraph 4. So, of course, the ellipsis in square brackets are going to be filled in by the Secretariat to have a full list of all of the statements.

Paragraph 4 is approved with that comment.

Paragraph 5. No comments?

Approved.

Paragraph 6. No comments.

Approved.

Paragraph 7. No comments on paragraph 7.

Approved.

Paragraph 8. Comments on 8? None.

Approved.

Paragraph 9. No comments?

Approved.

Paragraph 10. No comments?

Approved.

Paragraph 11. Comments on 11? None?

Approved.

Paragraph 12. No comments.

Approved.

Paragraph 13. No comments on 13?

Approved.

Paragraph 14. No comments.

Approved.

Paragraph 15. No comments.

Approved.

Paragraph 16. No comments.

Approved.

Paragraph 17. Paragraph 17 no comments.

Approved.

Paragraph 18.

Approved.

Paragraph 19. No comments?

Approved.

Paragraph 20. No comments.

Approved.

Paragraph 21. No comments?

Approved.

Paragraph 22.

Approved.

Paragraph 23. I see no comments.

Adopted.

Paragraph 24. No comments?

Approved.

Paragraph 25. No comments?

Approved.

Paragraph 26. No comments.

Adopted.

Paragraph 27. No comments.

Adopted.

Paragraph 28. No comments?

Adopted.

Paragraph 29. No comments.

Approved.

Paragraph 30. No comments.

Approved.

Paragraph 31. No comments.

Adopted.

Paragraph 32. I see no comments.

Adopted.

Paragraph 33. No comments?

Adopted.

Paragraph 34. No comments?

Adopted.

Paragraph 35. No comments?

Adopted.

Paragraph 36. No comments?

Adopted.

Paragraph 37. I have left you a little bit more time because it is fairly long. I see no comments.

Adopted.

Paragraph 38. No comments?

Adopted.

Paragraph 39. No comments.

Approved.

Paragraph 40. No comments?

Adopted.

Paragraph 41. No comments.

Adopted.

Paragraph 42. No comments.

Adopted.

Paragraph 43. No comments.

Adopted.

Paragraph 44. No comments?

Adopted.

Paragraph 45.

Adopted.

Paragraph 46. No comments?

Adopted.

Paragraph 47. No comments?

Adopted.

Paragraph 48. Any comments on 48?

Adopted.

Paragraph 49. No comments.

Adopted.

Paragraph 50. No comments?

Adopted.

Paragraph 51. No comments there.

Adopted.

Paragraph 52 now. I do not see any comments here either. So paragraph 52 is adopted.

Paragraph 53. No comments on 53.

Adopted.

Paragraph 54. No comments on 54.

Adopted.

Paragraph 55. No comments here on 55.

Adopted.

Paragraph 56. No comments on 56?

It is adopted.

Paragraph 57. No comments on 57?

It is adopted.

Paragraph 58. The delegation of France.

Mr. F. PELLERIN (France) (*interpretation from French*): Thank you Chairman. I think in the French version, in the fifth line, there is a word that is missing. So there seems to be a word missing but at least this is the version in French, in paragraph 58 right? It is in the fifth line, "the point of view was also expressed that it was probable that ..." and then there is a word missing. It must be "volume 11" or the "population" or something. It has just been forgotten.

The CHAIRMAN (*interpretation from French*): Right, with that change to the French version, 58, can we approve?

I do not see any other requests for the floor. So it is approved.

Paragraph 59 now. No comments on 59.

Approved.

Paragraph 60. No comments.

Adopted.

Paragraph 61. No comments on 61.

Adopted.

Paragraph 62. I see no comments.

Adopted.

Paragraph 63. No comments there.

Approved.

Paragraph 64. No comments on 64.

It is adopted.

Paragraph 65. Paragraph 65 does not seem to provoke any comments. So it is approved.

Paragraph 66. Do I hear any comments? No?

It is adopted.

Paragraph 67. No comments there.

Adopted.

Paragraph 68. Nigeria has the floor.

Mr. A. A. ABIODUN (Nigeria): Thank you very much Mr. Chairman. Paragraph 66 which we have just adopted is the rendition (addition?) by the Secretariat of my delegation's intervention on this subject. However, I had expected that the solution agreed to by the Working Group as a result of this intervention was made would have been reflected in paragraph 68 and it is not. Since the Acting Chairman of the Working Group, who reported on the work of the Working Group itself is not here, my delegation, however, is not insisting that this be done.

Thank you.

The CHAIRMAN (*interpretation from French*): Thank you very much distinguished representative of Nigeria. This means you can, in fact, approve paragraph 68.

You have the floor again Sir.

Mr. A. A. ABIODUN (Nigeria): Thank you Mr. Chairman. We of Nigeria will go along with paragraph 68 but I just want you and the Committee to note that as a result of our intervention, both here and in the Working Group, the Working Group itself has multiplied its schedule of work to show more commitment in terms of how it is going to do its work schedule-wise.

Thank you.

The CHAIRMAN (*interpretation from French*): Thank you very much. I recall your intervention on this matter and the concern that you expressed on the rate of progress of that Working Group. So thank you for accepting the drafting of 68. But, of course, we do recall the insistence of Nigeria that the work of this Working Group should proceed more rapidly.

I come to paragraph 69 now. Paragraph 69 does not seem to cause any questions. So it is approved.

Paragraph 70. No comments on 70.

It is approved.

Paragraph 71 now. I see now comments on 71.

And so 71 is approved.

Paragraph 72. No comments on paragraph 72.

So it is adopted.

Paragraph 73 now. No comments on 73?

So it is approved.

Now the next item relates to DMISCO and we see this in Add.4 which is coming in any moment.

So we move on to paragraph 74. Apparently no remarks so it is approved.

Paragraph 75. Paragraph 75, no comments?

It is adopted.

Paragraph 76. No comments.

It is adopted.

Paragraph 77. No comments on 77.

It is adopted.

Paragraph 78. No comments to 78.

It is adopted.

Paragraph 79. No comments on 79.

So it is approved.

Paragraph 80. paragraph 80, no comments?

Approved.

Paragraph 81. No comments.

Paragraph 81 is approved.

Paragraph 82. No comments on 82.

It is approved.

Paragraph 83. No comments on 83.

It is adopted.

Paragraph 84 now. No comments.

Paragraph 84 is adopted.

Paragraph 85. There are no comments 85.

It is adopted.

Paragraph 86. No comments on 86.

Paragraph 86 has been adopted.

Distinguished delegates, the Director of the Office for Outer Space Affairs suggests to me that in the section of our report, which is in Add.2, which is Space and Water, we could insert a paragraph noting the information supplied to us at the end of the morning by the distinguished delegate of Saudi Arabia. Now the phrase that is suggested is as follows:

(Continued in English) "The Committee noted with appreciation that the Crown Prince of Saudi Arabia had announced five awards for creative, scientific innovations in the area of water resource management. The Committee further noted the invitation of the Government of Saudi Arabia to member States to propose innovative projects in the area of water resource management for the purposes of the afore-mentioned awards."

(Continued in French) So the idea is to put those two sentences into the section Space and Water in our report.

Do delegations agree with this suggestion?

I see no objection.

So that is approved.

Thank you very much.

We have now to look at Addendum 4 of our report. I am told by the Secretariat that this Addendum 4 will not be available before 4.45 p.m. So shall we have a half hour break now and we will pick up our work again at 4.45 p.m., 16.45, we are at 4.00 p.m. So do not go too far and be back at 4.45 p.m.

Break

The CHAIRMAN *(interpretation from French)*: As you will know, the noticing Add.4 of document 166 is being distributed in the various languages, document 266/Add.4 is now being distributed in the various languages.

So we have set up a very fine football team who are going to distribute this document very quickly. At least the football would _____(?) they are distributing.

Now, do delegations have a copy of Addendum 4?

This seems to be so. So I suggest we get on with our work now which was suspended and we will look at this Addendum 4.

Let me take Chapter C, and this is paragraph 7. This is the space-system-based disaster management support, in other words, the first page of the document where we have seen this text already in the form of a working paper that the Secretariat presented to us.

So let us look at paragraph 1. Do I have any comments? No, apparently not.

Paragraph 1 is adopted.

Paragraph 2. No comments on paragraph 2.

So it is adopted.

Paragraph 3. No comments on paragraph 3.

So it is adopted.

Paragraph 4. No comments here. So let us adopt it.

It is adopted.

Paragraph 5. No comments on paragraph 5.

It is adopted.

Paragraph 6. No comments.

Paragraph 6 is adopted.

Paragraph 7. I see no comments on 7.

Paragraph 7 is adopted.

Paragraph 8. Any comments on paragraph 8? No, none to be seen.

Paragraph 8 is adopted.

Paragraph 9. Comments? I do not see any.

Paragraph 9 is adopted.

We come on to the next paragraph now, paragraph 10. I think the brackets at the end of this paragraph should be removed, or the bracket. This is

only the English version. There is a single bracket at the very end.

So can we approve 10? We have the Islamic Republic of Iran who would like to speak. He has the floor.

Mr. M. ASL (Islamic Republic of Iran): Thank you Mr. Chairman. Mr. Chairman, as we proposed in the morning, we want to add another language maybe at the end of the sentence, which could say “the Committee agreed that in the employment of his staff, the Director of OOSA would hold necessary consultations with member States, in particular developing countries, to make sure that these offices represent equitable geographical distribution, taking into account the disaster-stricken countries’ experiences to manage natural disasters and post-crisis efforts.”

These are the exact proposals(?) to be added to paragraph 10 at the end of the sentence. If you wish, I could read it at dictation speed.

“The Committee agreed that in the employment of his staff, the Director of the OOSA would hold necessary consultations with member States, in particular developing countries, to make sure that these offices represent equitable geographical distribution, taking into account the disaster-stricken countries’ experiences to manage natural disasters and post-crisis efforts.”

Thank you.

The CHAIRMAN (*interpretation from French*): I thank the distinguished representative of the Islamic Republic of Iran. Could I ask him to send in the exact text to the Secretariat?

Are there any comments on the phrase, the addition of which is suggested by our distinguished colleague from Iran.

Austria has the floor.

Ms. U. BUTSCHEK (Austria): Thank you Mr. Chairman. While I fully share the idea of our distinguished colleague from the Islamic Republic of Iran, I would like to seek clarification from the Secretariat with regard to the language used in this paragraph because, from my knowledge, the personnel within the United Nations is covered in the omnibus resolution on personnel issues, which also deals in one chapter with the issue of equitable geographical distribution. And here we talk about the personnel of

the entire organization, taking all the major duty stations together and we have keys and certain ranges for each country and so on. So if we use that language, it seems like one unit would have to follow this very range, I think it is called the desired range, that is what it is called, the desired range, and the desirable range should be for the entire organization not just for the Office. You would run into trouble, I think, using that language.

Thank you very much.

The CHAIRMAN (*interpretation from French*): I thank the distinguished representative for that comment.

And I note that India wishes for the floor.

Mr. B. N. SURESH (India): Thank you Mr. Chairman. I think the Iranian delegation has raised a question but in our view, I think, that this has been covered in paragraph 20 which more or less states almost the same thing, “the view was expressed that the proposed programme should give the number of _____ (*not clear*) for member States and ensure that the United Nations rules and regulations regarding geographical representation in the United Nations staff members be enforced.” I think by and large it covers what he has requested.

Thank you Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN (*interpretation from French*): I thank the distinguished delegate of India on this comment.

I give the floor again to the delegate of the Islamic Republic of Iran.

Mr. M. ASL (Islamic Republic of Iran): Thank you very much. _____(?) that paragraph 20? What is very important is that this paragraph should be part of the understanding on the establishment of the proposed offices. We do not want to have on a single view, the view was expressed, it does not have any status. What we want, to have a clear cut understanding that those offices would not only be served for specific staffs to be recruited. However, it is different from, I think, Vienna because in Vienna, most staff or, I could say they are international civil servants. I do not know if it would have the same application to those recruiting in Bonn or Beijing because there would a *sui generis* situation there, to take into account the fact that maybe those host countries were offering generously their own staff. However, while using those staffs, we should keep in

mind that we should not ignore the fact that developing countries' presence in that programme would serve better the idea of having those goals as stipulated in the mandate of those offices.

Thank you.

The CHAIRMAN (*interpretation from French*): I thank the distinguished representative of the Islamic Republic of Iran.

As you will have seen, I have been consulting the Director of the Office to find the best solution, knowing, as was mentioned by the distinguished delegate of India, that we already have a phrase covering this question of the policy of personnel recruitment in paragraph 20.

However, there is a more specific question which has been raised by our distinguished colleague from the Islamic Republic of Iran and it would seem that the best solution would be for this problem, which is a rather complex one really, should be handled, not in this report but in the implementation plan which the Office for Outer Space Affairs has committed itself to pre-setting in the implementation of this network which will be presented to the Committee next year. And it is, in fact, a subject which covers the implementation of the draft we are talking about. So what I would suggest is that we do not add anything to paragraph 10 but that we, of course, ask the Director of the Office for Outer Space Affairs to take account of this comment in preparing the implementation plan.

The delegate of Iran has the floor.

Mr. M. ASL (Islamic Republic of Iran): Mr. Chairman, thank you very much. I think we should be careful about that because any offices we are going to establish, they should have the guidelines. We have, as a part of the understanding of those guidelines. What guidelines _____ (?) is about this, the equipment of the staff? About the financial burdens, we have necessary guidelines which has been given an indication how the Fourth Committee would deal with the issue. On the staff recruitment, as I see it, this is a very complex issue. Without having any guidelines, I am afraid that we will face the situation that maybe after a *fait accompli* (?) situation, which could not serve our purpose. After establishing that, then we decide how we recruit that staff. Let us have the guidelines and then decide. We do not want to face a *fait accompli* situation.

Thank you.

The CHAIRMAN (*interpretation from French*): I would suggest to the distinguished delegate of the Islamic Republic of Iran that for these guidelines be clear, we could agree by strengthening the drafting of paragraph 20 instead of saying a few words "expressed that", which signifies the point of view of one delegation. We could say "the Committee has agreed that" which then becomes a guideline, about which the whole of the Committee has agreed. And it would be much stronger than the present wording of paragraph 20.

The distinguished delegate of Colombia.

Mr. C. ARÉVALO YEPES (Colombia) (*interpretation from Spanish*): I think your proposal is a good one and to be consistent with the concern of the representative of Iran, perhaps we could move 20 and put it immediately after 10 so that we would have consistency with this whole question of staff at the office. That is an alternative.

Thank you Sir.

The CHAIRMAN (*interpretation from French*): I thank the distinguished delegate of Colombia for that suggestion which would consist in bringing this paragraph close to 10.

I believe the United States wishes to take the floor.

Mr. K. HODGKINS (United States of America): Thank you Mr. Chairman. Mr. Chairman, my delegation has no objection to the paragraph as re-drafted. However, I do have a practical question which is, in the plan that has been presented to us, there are only three United Nations staff positions being offered. So in order for paragraph 20, as it is re-drafted, to actually work, then we would have to look at the staff contributions that member States are making. And are we suggesting then that for these offices we are establishing in, say, Bonn and Beijing, that the recruitment for those offices will also have to adhere to the United Nations Staff Regulations? Or are we only talking about the three positions that the United Nations Office for Outer Space Affairs would be seeking. Because there is a big difference, in my delegation's view, and we should be clear because we certainly do not want to be recommending or making a recommendation that we know upfront will be impossible to fulfil.

Thank you Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN (*interpretation from French*): Referring back to the delegate from the United States with his remark. The sentence in 20 seems to be quite clear. The rules concerning geographical distribution directly apply to staff in the United Nations.

There is also a question coming from the Islamic Republic of Iran.

Mr. M. ASL (Islamic Republic of Iran): Mr. Chairman, thank you very much and thank you for the clarification provided by our colleague from Colombia.

However, the point is that it is a matter of, I think, something that needs careful consideration. What we want to say is that, while we have the equitable geographical distribution, we have to have the concept there. It is a fact that we want to be helpful by establishing those offices. To be helpful, does it mean that you have to use the best sources available to you? The best sources and experiences is in the hands of those who have been affected by that, those kind of events, the natural disaster events. So that is the point that we wanted to make sure. That is why. We then think it as a direct language to say that they should be recruited under the understanding that the developing countries have the best experiences. It is just that we have to flag this issue that take into account experiences, disaster-stricken countries' experiences to manage natural disasters and post-crisis efforts.

By having that actually, I got the same point from the word of the distinguished Director of the Office for Outer Space Affairs, which he pointed out in the morning that those stricken countries have the culture, how to deal with the issue.

So that is the point that we wanted to make here. However, we do know the declarations of the recruitment of the staff by the General Assembly is on the equitable geographical distribution, as wide as possible. We do not challenge about that. We could have that concept. However, taking into account the need to give indication that in any kind of staff, priority should be given for that kind of concept which we provided to you.

Thank you Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN (*interpretation from French*): I thank the distinguished delegate of the Islamic Republic of Iran. I wonder whether the solution might be to make this reference to the staffing recruitment in paragraph 13. In paragraph 13, we are looking at exactly the point that you are making, this

delegate, that is the programme must be, should work closely with end-users, particularly in developing countries so as to benefit them to the maximum with acquired experience. So perhaps we could add in that place, in that area, perhaps we could add a few words to encourage regional offices to have a policy of recruiting that takes account of that experience. For instance, at the end of paragraph 13, we could say, this is the suggestion in real-time, (*continued in English*) "the recruiting policy could take account of the available expertise in the various regions or in the various countries involved with natural disasters".

(*Continued in French*) So the idea that you are suggesting, this interesting idea should be and would be picked up in this paragraph 13.

The delegate of the Islamic Republic of Iran.

Mr. M. ASL (Islamic Republic of Iran): Thank you Mr. Chairman. I think the most relevance, just to be frank with you, that we think is in paragraph 10 when we are talking about the staff. I am ready to consider paragraph 20 with some amendments which would give the indication "the Committee agreed" or "endorsed" as such, and then having that language to marry other language which we propose at the end of this sentence. That means we would have that language, which is principle as been highlighted by our distinguished Secretariat staff. And then we would have another one which would say that "take into account the disaster-stricken countries' experiences to manage natural disasters and post-crisis efforts". So that means, while we have that kind of regulations(?) in the United Nations General Assembly, we do not challenge, and we do observe all of them, just adhere to those regulations and we have to keep in mind that everybody should keep to those regulations.

However, it is a *sui generis* situation, as I told you, Mr. Chairman. We should not overlook this fact that those affected countries which all need, they are very experienced in that. At this, for example, I have seen that a number of countries among those who are listed by the General Assembly, there are 10 or 11 countries that have been affected by these disasters. I know that how well they are experienced in this crises and managing these crises. So why we should overlook this fact and why we should not use those experiences as relevant to the offices?

So that is the problem that, by keeping that phase, it gives indications and guidelines to any kind of recruitment that by recruiting those staff, we should look at those experiences which mostly are relevant by

those developing countries affected by disasters and natural disasters.

Thank you.

The CHAIRMAN (*interpretation from French*): I thank the distinguished representative of the Republic of Iran.

The Secretariat is preparing an amended version of paragraph 20 which would take account of the suggestion made by our colleague, the delegate from the Islamic Republic of Iran. So we have a few minutes for the paragraph but whilst waiting for that, let us continue our examination of the other paragraphs and then we will come back with this proposal later, which will, in fact, be strengthening of paragraph 20.

So let us look at paragraph 11. Any comments on 11? I do not see any.

Paragraph 11 is adopted.

Paragraph 12. The distinguished representative of Colombia has the floor.

Mr. C. ARÉVALO YEPES (Colombia) (*interpretation from Spanish*): Paragraph 12. It is an indication of support made by the observer from Switzerland. I do not know whether this quality of(?) observer should be underlined or whether we simply maintain the name Switzerland. It is a question to the Secretariat. What is the tradition in this, do we mention that he is an observer or not? And then it says "due account should be taken of the possibility". That is a very charged sentence, "due consideration would be given" is almost a contradiction with the possibility of suggesting what is usually done, which is the consideration should be. It is in Spanish, the usual wording that we use. So this is really a Spanish language problem.

And then in the last line of this paragraph, there are two words that are in Spanish which are extra. It says "the programme", so there is a Spanish word that has to be taken out to make sense.

So these are two Spanish points.

Thank you.

The CHAIRMAN (*interpretation from French*): I thank the distinguished delegate of Colombia on the question of the status of observer of Switzerland.

Now on the first point, the observation made by Colombia. The custom is to state that the indication of support was made by the observer from Switzerland. So that is the custom. Because Switzerland is not a member of the Committee.

And as regards the question of Spanish words, that will be fixed by the Secretariat.

With modification, can we approve 12?

It is approved.

Paragraph 13. We have a comment from Thailand. The distinguished representative of Thailand.

Mr. K. LOUVIROJANAKUL (Thailand): Sorry Mr. Chairman. Just a little bit of minor correction in paragraph 4. It is said here that "the Committee noted with satisfaction that national early(?) warning system has been set up in Malaysia and that from _____ (*not clear*) we wish to correct. It is the National Disaster Early Warning Centre that has also been set up in Thailand.

Thank you.

The CHAIRMAN (*interpretation from French*): So that clarification on the way in which the Centre is named in paragraph 4 will be taken into account.

So we are on paragraph 13 now. Paragraph 13, no comments?

It is adopted.

Paragraph 14. I think the Committee would agree with what there is in paragraph 14.

Paragraph 14 is adopted.

Paragraph 15. Any comments on paragraph 15? I do not see any.

It is adopted.

Paragraph 16. I see no comments.

It is adopted.

Paragraph 17. The United States has the floor.

Mr. K. HODGKINS (United States of America): Thank you Mr. Chairman. Just a point of clarification or maybe we would need to make a change to paragraph 16. I apologize to coming back to that. But in the last sentence, we are suggesting that the support be provided by the United Nations “the Committee agreed that such resources should be pursued through a rearrangement of priorities within the framework of the United Nations reform process and should not result in the increase in the total budget of the United Nations.” My only suggestion would be that perhaps there are two different thoughts that we should reflect here.

One is a rearrangement of priorities within the overall framework of the United Nations reform process. And if that does not happen, do we want to suggest that the activities also be undertaken through a rearrangement of priorities within the Office for Outer Space Affairs?

I think those are two different notions and do we want to have that contingency in case we are unable to succeed through a rearrangement of priorities at the larger scale?

So my suggestion for the delegations to consider would be to insert the following. After the phrase “within the framework”, I would insert “of the Office for Outer Space Affairs and within the framework of the United Nations reform process”. And then the remainder of that sentence would remain the same.

So that sentence would read “the Committee agreed that such resources should be pursued through a rearrangement of priorities within the Office for Outer Space Affairs and within the framework of the United Nations reform process and should not result in an increase.” Now, I am assuming those are two different ideas that if the proposal I have made is captured by this phrase “the framework of the United Nations reform process” and that would be acceptable to my delegation.

Thank you.

The CHAIRMAN (*interpretation from French*): Distinguished delegate of the United States of America, I have consulted the Director of the Office for Outer Space Affairs and his suggestion is that it might be more appropriate to keep these double ideas you suggest but in an inverse sense. That is to say, the sentence would be “through rearrangement of priorities within the framework of the United Nations reform process” ...

(*Continued in English*) ... “and, if necessary, rearrangement of priorities within the Office for Outer Space Affairs.” So the idea would still be there.

(*Continued in French*) The preference would be that the Committee would prefer the first of these solutions. That would be the clear idea.

Can the Committee agree on that wording? I will read it again.

The distinguished delegate, the representative of the Islamic Republic of Iran.

Mr. M. ASL (Islamic Republic of Iran): Mr. Chairman, just as a point of clarification, could I ask, what does it mean that “the Committee agreed that such resources should be pursued through a rearrangement of priorities within the framework of the United Nations reform process.”? How do we know that all representatives _____ (*not clear*) and to be consistent with our position, everybody should, in the allocation of the resources should pursue is one priority is taken at around the indication would give in this Committee. However, my question is that we do not have control about those priorities which are going to be there within the United Nations system. If we do agree that the, only because, just we are at least a limited number of member States are here and there would be a number of member States in New York who would decide on the priorities to be given to the United Nations system in the allocation of the _____ (?) resources. So we do not have full control of those resources.

Just my clarification just needed maybe. However, I am sure that at least when we agree here, to be consistent, we do our best effort there to make sure that those resources would be available. But just a matter of particular clarification to say that we do not have full control.

Thank you.

The CHAIRMAN (*interpretation from French*): Mr. Camacho?

Mr. S. CAMACHO-LARA (Director, Office for Outer Space Affairs): Thank you Mr. Chairman. In the first instance, I think, the proposal of the United States is a proposal because it does maintain a flexibility there of what happens if we do not get the level of priority that would allow for a moving of released funding from that series of obsolete or low-priority mandates that the General Assembly is

identifying and provides then an option as to how else it might be done.

With regard to what the distinguished representative of the Islamic Republic of Iran has said, I also agree that we do not have that full control. It will be, frankly speaking, it is not going to be so much because space is going to be given a high priority by the Assembly, by the process in the Assembly. It will be because disasters are a high priority. That is why I think that there is a very good opportunity to attempt to receive those funds. And as we have no control, if we adopt this and we agree that this is a good initiative, then there will be the work that I mentioned earlier in my statement and my statements that it will only happen if there is coordination between the representatives of governments of COPUOS and their representatives in New York. And there are two committees that meet to be addressed, the Fourth Committee, but then there is still the Fifth Committee. So it is up to two Committees, two delegates, that have to also be briefed. And that is where we do not have the control.

Thank you Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN (*interpretation from French*): Thank you Mr. Camacho for that clarification. So let me read out the sentence as completed, given the interventions made regarding the complement of support to be provided by the United Nations.

(*Continued in English*) “The Committee agreed that such resources should be pursued through a rearrangement of priorities within the framework of the United Nations reform process and, if necessary, a rearrangement of priorities within the Office for Outer Space Affairs and should not result in an increase of the total regular budget of the United Nations.”

(*Continued in French*) So if there are no further comments on this paragraph, I suggest we adopt it with that amendment.

It is adopted.

Sorry, Austria.

Ms. U. BUTSCHEK (Austria): Thank you Mr. Chairman. Just very briefly. I would like to note for the records that Austria is prepared to agree to this proposal, as you just read out, on the understanding that the Office for Outer Space Affairs will have an essential in the management and functioning of DMISCO and SPIDER and that the foreseen Austrian

contribution will be evaluated in light of this important role.

Thank you Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN (*interpretation from French*): Thank you for that statement, distinguished delegate of Austria. It is a clarification made by Austria concerning its contribution to this project.

With your permission, we will go to 17. It is the one that is going to make the Office for Outer Space Affairs work the hardest because there is still a lot of work to be done to come to the stage of implementing.

So no comments on 17.

It is adopted.

We come to paragraph 18. it is an important paragraph. I see no comments on 18. So we will approve that.

Paragraph 18 approved.

Paragraph 19. This drafting gives the necessary flexibility for the start-up date of this project. Any comments? I do not see any.

Paragraph 19 is approved.

As for paragraph 20, we have an amended draft. I will read this out which covers the suggestion made by the representative of the Islamic Republic of Iran.

(*Continued in English*) “The Committee agreed that the proposed programme should keep the number of staff to a minimum _____ (*not clear*) member States and ensure that United Nations rules and regulation regarding geographical representation of the United Nations staff member be enforced, taking into account the experiences of disaster-stricken developing countries in managing natural disasters and post-crisis efforts.”

(*Continued in French*) This introduces a complementary notion or idea into this paragraph in respect of the policy for recruitment.

I call on the distinguished delegate of Iran.

Mr. M. ASL (Islamic Republic of Iran): Thank you very much. It was the minimum that we expected to be echoed in the report. However, we

could go along with that kind of understanding that this paragraph would be removed to after paragraph 10.

Thank you.

The CHAIRMAN (*interpretation from French*): Yes, that was the suggestion made by the distinguished delegate of Colombia to push this paragraph back up to just after paragraph 10.

The Czech Republic has the floor.

Mr. V. KOPAL (Czech Republic): Thank you Mr. Chairman. Just a minor suggestion concerning the language used, you know. At the end of the original text of paragraph 20, you have the word “enforced”. It is not correct. It should be “applied”.

The CHAIRMAN (*interpretation from French*): Thank you for that excellent comment. We are not a police force nor are we a legal force but we do have to, of course, apply the rules and regulations of the United Nations. We must apply them. So we replace “enforced” by “applied”.

Does the Committee agree that this paragraph should be moved up to find a place just after paragraph 10?

I see no objections. So paragraph 20 will be put between present 10 and 11.

It is so decided.

And we now move on to 21.

The Netherlands.

Mr. A. S. REIJNGOUD (The Netherlands): Thank you Mr. Chairman. Just the second line, it is quoted the “Netherlands”. It is more common to say “The Netherlands”. It has to be adapted throughout the whole document, L.266.

Thank you.

The CHAIRMAN (*interpretation from French*): Thank you Netherlands. This also applies in French because we say “The Netherlands” in plural, Le Pays-Bas.

Any other comments on 21? None, I believe.

Paragraph 21 is adopted.

Let us now take 22.

I think that we can adopt this. No comments.

Adopted.

Let us go on to 23. No comments.

Adopted.

Paragraph 24. No comments.

Adopted.

Paragraph 25. No comments.

Approved.

Paragraph 26.

Approved.

Paragraph 27. No comments on 27.

Adopted.

And paragraph 28. Colombia.

Mr. C. ARÉVALO YEPES (Colombia) (*interpretation from Spanish*): Thank you Chairman. I just wanted to cordially congratulate the Chairman of the Asian Group which very, very rapidly appointed candidates for the post of First Vice-Chairman and what was done during that session was what had been recommended, according to the drafting that we had all adopted. I believe that we should avoid the situation which might well delay a decision on these matters, the candidatures of the Asian Group. I have already mentioned this to the Ambassador of India but I just wanted to cordially congratulate the Asian Group and exhort them to do everything as quickly as possible.

Thank you.

The CHAIRMAN (*interpretation from French*): Thank you Colombia. I believe that this will encourage the Asian Group to indeed act expeditiously.

The Islamic Republic of Iran.

Mr. M. ASL (Islamic Republic of Iran): Thank you very much and thank you for providing this clarification. However, Mr. Chairman, just is as a matter of _____ (*not clear*) about those _____(?). We do not want to give any negative indication that the Asian Group has not been able to nominate its own Vice-Chairman, so by any means I

mean. So could you maybe shorten this sentence to say that the Asian States would nominate its own Vice-Chairman in the near future, instead of giving any indications implicitly that they had not been able to meet during this session. Sorry, we just want to avoid any kind of indications implicitly.

Thank you.

The CHAIRMAN (*interpretation from French*): Thank you. What you are suggesting is that we should make this rather more concise and we could say “would nominate a candidate for ... in the near future”.

I am turning now to the representatives of the member countries of the Asian Group just seeking their approval on this one.

India? India has indicated agreement. I do not know whether any other members of this regional group would like to speak.

If there are no further comments, then we would approve of the sentence thus _____(?) meeting of the Group of Asian States would nominate a candidate for First Vice-Chairman of the Committee, etc., in the near future, would nominate in the near future.

Thank you.

With this clarification and improvement, 28 thus amended is approved.

Paragraph 29 now. Paragraph 29 does not seem to call for any comments.

It is adopted.

Paragraph 30. paragraph 30 does not call for any comments either.

Adopted.

Paragraph 31. Paragraph 31, no comments.

Adopted.

Paragraph 32. The United States.

Mr. K. HODGKINS (United States of America): Thank you Mr. Chairman. Mr. Chairman, I would like to suggest a change to this paragraph reflecting agreement among the members of the Committee and I do so because my delegation had

made this point during our discussion of the future work of the Committee. My delegation feels that this is the point that needs to be reflected as a consensus view because if it is not, then it looks rather odd that there is only one delegation in this Committee that feels that these reports are important to the current future work of the Committee. I say that in addition because when we go down to paragraph 36 and look at the future role of the Committee, the only criteria for the future role of the Committee is taking into account the evolution of space technology and the increased number of stakeholders. And that could be one of many elements but that really does not fit well into what my delegation considers to be a kind of holistic view of what should be happening in the Committee.

So I would suggest the following for paragraph 32.

“The Committee agreed that it should review the work done and achievements made by the Committee as part of consideration of the future role and activities of the Committee.” And then the remainder of paragraph 32 would be the same.

And I would suggest that we move that paragraph down so it is co-located with paragraph 36.

The CHAIRMAN (*interpretation from French*): Could the United States be so kind as to repeat the change that he suggests. I just got the first part down.

Mr. K. HODGKINS (United States of America): Certainly. The first sentence of paragraph 32 would read: “The Committee agreed that it should review the work done and achievements made by the Committee as part of consideration of the future role and activities of the Committee.” Then paragraph 32 would remain the same.

The CHAIRMAN (*interpretation from French*): The suggestion of the United States is to reposition this paragraph and put it right before 36, if I have correctly understood.

Mr. K. HODGKINS (United States of America): Yes, Mr. Chairman. And, Mr. Chairman, I would suggest we adjust paragraph 36, in the last sentence to reflect that there could be elements, taking into account paragraph 35 *bis* and the evolution of space technology and the increased number of stakeholders, just so that we have a full listing of those elements that will be factored into our consideration of the future roles.

The CHAIRMAN (*interpretation from French*): So the members of the Committee can give their agreement of this amendment of the first sentence of paragraph 32? And can they also agree to the repositioning of this shift over right in front of 36?

I see no objections.

Canada is asking for the floor and India. Canada?

Mr. D. ALDWORTH (Canada): Thank you Mr. Chairman. We do not have any great difficulty with the intent of this but I am wondering why the United States is suggesting that the words "long-term planning" be stricken from the sentence.

The CHAIRMAN (*interpretation from French*): India?

Mr. B. N. SURESH (India): We also do not have any great objection but the question we co-address is, should review the _____(?) the work done and achievements made by the Committee that requires a lot of efforts. The question is who will prepare and who will do? Unless we address that, it will just remain as a sentence.

Thank you Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN (*interpretation from French*): This discussion reminds me of a discussion we had yesterday on the self-same topic already and I remember that when I spoke, what I had suggested was that in preparing and thinking through the future work of the Committee, there were two elements. The first was to indeed take stock of the work after UNISPACE III and to see on which points satisfactory achievements had been scored and where progress still remained to be made. This has to do with the review aspect of the work accomplished over the past couple of years.

And then there is the second aspect which is the impact of the development of space activities on the future work of the Committee and subjects that could usefully be broached by the Committee. These two paragraphs, position one next to the other, allow us to present these two aspects.

The United States.

Mr. K. HODGKINS (United States of America): Thank you Mr. Chairman. I fully agree with you and just as a point of clarification and to make things easier. There was no particular reason

why my delegation had deleted the phrase "long-term planning". I would certainly include that in that sentence as opposed to the consideration of any future role and activities of the Committee. I was just using that phraseology from paragraph 36. So if there is a better way of expressing this but have the same idea, I am totally in the Committee's hands or the Secretariat's hand.

The second point is, yes, the distinguished delegate from India has a point. The word "review" probably is not correctly because this is something that we have to do in the process of looking at the future role of the Committee. So I would suggest that we use the words "bear in mind", "the Committee agreed that it should bear in mind the work done and achievements made by the Committee as part of consideration or as part of its long-term planning for its future roles and activities." I think in the interest of time, I would defer it to the Secretariat to do that.

Thank you.

The CHAIRMAN (*interpretation from French*): Thank you for this statement and thank you to Canada and India for their excellent comments and suggestions.

And I think that we can approve 32. The Czech Republic?

Mr. V. KOPAL (Czech Republic): Thank you Mr. Chairman. Mr. Chairman, I wanted to make a small comment on 36. Are we considering 36? No, not yet.

The CHAIRMAN (*interpretation from French*): We are still on 32. We will get there.

So to wrap up 32. The idea is to lodge it straight before 36 and to amend the first sentence.

(*Continued in English*) "The Committee agreed that it should bear in mind the work done and achievements by the Committee as part of consideration of future roles and activities of the Committee or long-term planning of the Committee."

(*Continued in French*) And then the remainder of the paragraph remains.

So can we adopt 32 as amended?

Iran.

Mr. M. ASL (Islamic Republic of Iran): Mr. Chairman, I need time a little bit to think on the implication of that language as provided. I have to think a little bit. Sorry.

The CHAIRMAN (*interpretation from French*): Iran is asking for a little time to mull this one over.

So we will go through 33 through 36 and we will come back to 32.

Paragraph 33. Canada.

Mr. D. ALDWORTH (Canada): Paragraph 33 paraphrases part of the Canadian statement and one sentence which was part of the Canadian statement was deleted which I think sort of follows through in logic. And so at the very end of this paragraph, I would suggest that that sentence be re-inserted and the sentence reads as follows: “Such work would aim to keep the space environment safe and sustainable for civil space assets – especially in an era of expanded satellite traffic.”

Thank you Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN (*interpretation from French*): So this sentence which Canada has referred to would be added at the end of paragraph 33.

Could I ask the distinguished representative of Canada to repeat his sentence because possibly not everyone has had time to take it down.

Mr. D. ALDWORTH (Canada): Absolutely. Thank you for that opportunity Mr. Chairman.

The additional sentence would follow at the very end of paragraph 33 and it relates specifically to the existing last sentence. So the last sentence reads: “It would, therefore, be important to identify and anticipate where activities might benefit from additional guidelines to ensure the safety and common understanding of how space was used for peaceful purposes.” And the sentence that I am suggesting to be added would be: “Such work would aim to keep the space environment safe and sustainable for civil space assets – especially in an era of expanded satellite traffic.”

Thank you Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN (*interpretation from French*): Thank you Canada.

Do we have any comments on paragraph 33 as completed by this very last sentence from Canada?

I see none.

Paragraph 33, as amended, is adopted.

Paragraph 34. Any comments? I do not believe so.

Paragraph 34 is adopted.

Paragraph 35. I see no comments on that.

Adopted.

Paragraph 36. On 36, we have already had a statement from the United States suggesting that 36, in its last sentence, be referred to the preceding paragraph and before reference is made to the development of space technology and the increased number of stakeholders.

Any other comments on the wording of 36? Mr. Kopal of the Czech Republic.

Mr. V. KOPAL (Czech Republic): Thank you very much Mr. Chairman. Again a minor comment concerning the language. The last word of this paragraph is that of “stakeholders”. I do not know if it is an appropriate term because it seems to me that this language is too commercial.

Thank you very much.

The CHAIRMAN (*interpretation from French*): What can I say Mr. Kopal? This is a term that is in the documents of the European Commission. Almost every other word, in French we say “acteur(?)”, but I do not know what one should say in English.

Canada?

Mr. D. ALDWORTH (Canada): Well, a suggestion could be “space actors”.

The CHAIRMAN (*interpretation from French*): Can we say “space actors”?

Colombia.

Mr. C. ARÉVALO YEPES (Colombia) (*interpretation from Spanish*): Thank you. I would like to join Canada but if we say “actore(?) speciale(?)” in Spanish, this is not going to work. It would be pure Hollywood. In Spanish, one says “intercados(?)”, those concerned are interested.

The CHAIRMAN (*interpretation from French*): The Czech Republic.

Mr. V. KOPAL (Czech Republic): What about to say of participants in space activities?

The CHAIRMAN (*interpretation from French*): Nigeria.

Mr. A. A. ABIODUN (Nigeria): Having listened, thank you Mr. Chairman, having listened to everybody, can we just say interested parties?

The CHAIRMAN (*interpretation from French*): I was thinking, I think that the suggestion of the Czech Republic is possibly the best, all things considered. Participants is more active than interested parties, I think. And I think this was in the heads of those drafting, the people actually active. So participants, those participating in space activities.

I have the backing of the Committee on this?

I would also like to check if the Committee can agree on the other change which was suggested about some 10 minutes ago by our distinguished colleagues from the United States delegation who was suggesting that we write, taking into account, in 35 *bis* "and the evolution of space technology and the increased number of participants in space activities."

So I think that the Committee can give its agreement to this wording.

So paragraph 36 is adopted, with these two amendments.

Let us revert to paragraph 32 which has become 35 *bis* actually now and we turn to the distinguished representative of Iran. Can he approve of 32 _____(?)?

Mr. M. ASL (Islamic Republic of Iran): Just a minor quick-fix(?). I hope that I am right on that point because I have myself some doubt but let us try. Because it has a problem, bearing in mind the approach to the whole idea of the Committee's activities. We do _____(?) leave it that by adding the consideration of future roles of the Committee. But it has only highlighted the past work that has been done by the Committee so we should keep in mind that the mandate is also very important, we base on the mandate the future activities of the Committee would be shaped. So maybe bearing in mind the mandate of the Committee and the rest.

Thank you.

The CHAIRMAN (*interpretation from French*): Your suggestion that this be introduced in the first sentence of paragraph 32. So it would be enough to say "the Committee agrees that it should be ..."

(*Continued in English*) "... the work done and achievements made by the Committee and its mandate as part of consideration of the future role and activities of the Committee." OK?

(*Continued in French*) This, it seemed evident to me that the Committee should have its mandate in mind when it is thinking about its future activities. I do not think that this could possibly raise any problems.

So we are approving 32 which is now 35 *bis* with this small extra reference to the mandate.

Thank you.

So we have adopted that paragraph, as amended.

Paragraph 37. On 37, 38, 29, 40, 41 and 42, we have as the text of CRP.18, I think, that we considered at the beginning of the afternoon that we approved the same text. We just have to double check that the extra input of Canada and Brazil has been properly included. And it is useful because that has not been done.

In paragraph 37, the same. Paragraph 38, yes. Paragraph 39, yes. Paragraph 40, no change. Paragraph 41 has to take on board the input of Canada and Brazil. I will re-read it so there is no doubt.

(*Continued in English*) "The Committee further agreed that in 2007 the Committee would identify and assess the interface among existing international fora where countries undertake discussions regarding the implementation of space-derived geo-spatial data infrastructures in order to avoid duplication of international cooperative efforts. On the basis of this assessment, the Committee would then take a decision on next steps of the Work Plan, including more closely defining the scope of the agenda item on space-derived geo-spatial information."

(*Continued in French*) So that is the extra input that was presented at the beginning of the afternoon that was approved, that is going to be included by the Secretariat in paragraph 41.

Then I think that the Work Plan has not been changed.

Canada.

Mr. D. ALDWORTH (Canada): Thank you Mr. Chairman. There was one suggested change that we had for paragraph 38 and it is a clarification rather than any change in intent. The second line, we are suggesting that it read “to develop their own national infrastructure for space-derived geo-spatial data.” This would be more clear and in line with the topic.

The CHAIRMAN (*interpretation from French*): So that is in the second line of paragraph 38 which was the second paragraph of CRP.18.

No objections?

Nigeria.

Mr. A. A. ABIODUN (Nigeria): Thank you very much Mr. Chairman. My comments on paragraph 41. If you have anything before that, I can wait.

The CHAIRMAN (*interpretation from French*): No, OK, paragraph 41, go ahead.

Mr. A. A. ABIODUN (Nigeria): A very simple comment. My delegation is interested in knowing the mechanism or how the Committee will identify and do the assessment next year. What is the mechanism? How?

The CHAIRMAN (*interpretation from French*): I believe, Nigeria, that the answer is right underneath in the description of the Work Plan for 2007. And that is why the delegation of Brazil had tabled the Work Plan that started off with the presentation of all these activities that had taken place at member States, international regional organization and observer-level.

The Czech Republic.

Mr. V. KOPAL (Czech Republic): Mr. Chairman, I apologize, but just again a question of language. Could we not say “the Committee further agrees that in 2007, it would identify ...”?

The CHAIRMAN (*interpretation from French*): Thank you. That does give us a nicer sentence.

For the information of delegates, we only have the interpreters with us for another five minutes

so we have to make speed. We are really close to the end of our work, however.

Paragraph 41 has been approved with the extra bit.

Paragraph 42 with Canada’s amendment.

The other paragraphs have not been amended.

Paragraph 42 has not been changed. That was at the very end of CRP.18.

So no objection to approving 42? Fine.

So paragraphs 37 through 42 is approved.

Paragraph 43. No objection.

Adopted.

Paragraph 44. No objection.

Adopted.

Paragraph 45. No comments.

Paragraph 45 is adopted.

Paragraph 46. Any comments? None.

Paragraph 46 is adopted.

Paragraph 47.

Paragraph 47 is adopted.

Paragraph 48. No comments?

Adopted.

Paragraph 49. You have the floor India.

Mr. B. N. SURESH (India): Thank you Mr. Chairman. Under Space and Forests, there are a couple of presentations and then the Symposium. They are not reflected here. There was one presentation by India.

Thank you very much.

The CHAIRMAN (*interpretation from French*): Mr. Hedman?

Mr. N. HEDMAN (Deputy Secretary, Office for Outer Space Affairs): Thank you Mr. Chairman.

The Secretariat proposes to insert a text as a new paragraph 51 *bis* and I can read it out if you would like Mr. Chairman.

It would read as follows.

“On 12 June 2006, presentations entitled “Space-based Systems for Forest Resources Management: Indian Experience” by D. Radhakrishnan, India, and “Space-based Information to Support Forest Management in Indonesia”, by M. Kartasmita, Indonesia, were made in the context of the Symposium.”

So that would be the proposal in capturing the point raised by India.

The CHAIRMAN (*interpretation from French*): Thank you for your proposal. So that would come in 51 *bis*, as of 51 *bis*.

So we have just approved 49.

Paragraph 50, the list of presentations during the Symposium. I think that is not a problem.

Approved.

Paragraph 51.

Approved.

Paragraph 51 *bis* which has just been read out by Mr. Hedman. I think we can approve.

Adopted.

Paragraph 52. It is on the Symposium for next year.

Adopted.

Paragraph 53 and corresponds to a proposal that I had made, a bit of a correction.

(*Continued in English*) “The Committee agreed ... on space exploration activities, including the participation of the private sector, should be held during the fiftieth session of the Committee.”

(*Continued in French*) France.

Mr. F. PELLERIN (France) (*interpretation from French*): Thank you Chairman. One minor comment on the French version. I would like for the words “_____” (*French – not clear*).

This is just a matter of French drafting because you have to shape this up properly.

The CHAIRMAN (*interpretation from French*): You give this in to the Secretariat just to make sure that it is properly done. That is in paragraph 53.

So 53 has been adopted.

And paragraph 54.

It is adopted.

Thank you very much.

And now we have to come back to 25 of L.266. I will read it out so you do not have to look for it.

“... considering the various items before the Committee at its forty-ninth meeting on 16 June 2007, adopted its report to the General Assembly, containing the recommendations and decisions set out below.

(*Continued in French*) I think that we can adopt our report since we have really sifted it paragraph-by-paragraph all the way through.

So that is paragraph 25 of L.266. This is our last paragraph.

I believe that that is adopted and decided. We have approved our report.

We have a request to speak on behalf of Iran.

Mr. M. ASL (Islamic Republic of Iran): Thank you very much for the excellent work you did since we adopted the whole report. Just I have an intonation. My delegation joined the consensus on the report just adopted. However, I would like to express the reservation(?) of my Government and my delegation on that part of the report contained in document number A/AC.105/L.266, which may be construed as recognition of a result(?).

Thank you.

The CHAIRMAN (*interpretation from French*): The statement of the Islamic Republic of Iran has been duly noted.

I would like to thank the delegates, Secretariat and interpreters and I would like to give the floor very

briefly to the distinguished delegate of Spain, Mr. López-Aguilar.

Mr. J. M. LÓPEZ-AGUILAR (Spain) (*interpretation from Spanish*): Thank you Chairman. I deplore, I am sorry that I have to take the floor at this very late hour. We attach great importance to a matter that was raised yesterday which has to do with the need to update the work programmes and the agendas. As we note, on various points, there are various new elements in the space world. There are new stakeholders, players, actors, there is reference to space tourism and, of course, we would have a launching, for example, of a Russian satellite from Guyana. So we have to revise our strategic principles. I am working within OECD as well and I see that in that Organization, OECD, there is a convergence of interests with regard to the implementation of commercialization of outer space. Of course, I cannot speak about this, given the late hour, but I will be giving these documents into the Secretariat for their consideration.

I note with satisfaction the effort has been made for the next meeting in Valencia, the International Congress of Astronautics, from 2 to 6 October. And we would like to announce the Universal Fair of Sergosa(?), scheduled for 2008, which will be focusing on water. It is a matter which has been considered within OECD and highlighted by the new Director-General.

To conclude, I am very sorry I spoke at this late juncture, but I would like to thank you nonetheless for having guided the work in our Committee so well.

Thank you.

The CHAIRMAN (*interpretation from French*): Thank you very much Mr. López-Aguilar for his statement and for the information he has given us on OECD activities and their preparation of the Valencia Congress on Astronautics at the beginning of October.

And now I would like to thank all delegations having contributed to our work and which allowed us to prepare our report. I would like in particular to thank the Director of the Office for Outer Space Affairs and his whole team who have worked ceaselessly over the last 10 days and up to then. I should say not just days but nights, of course, to be perfectly precise. This has allowed us to adopt our report.

I would like to thank our interpreters, most particularly who have carried us till this late hour, way beyond normal limits. And I would like to thank the Translation and Printing Services as well who have given us documents on time, enabling us to adopt our report. This is quite a sporting feat.

Thank you very much and best wishes for your travel home, no matter how far you have to go.

Thank you very much one and all.

The meeting closed at 6.45 p.m.