

**Committee on the Peaceful  
Uses of Outer Space***Unedited transcript*

580<sup>th</sup> Meeting  
Friday, 15 June 2007, 10 a.m.  
Vienna

---

*Chairman:* Mr. G. Brachet (France)

*The meeting was called to order at 10.15 a.m.*

**The CHAIRMAN** (*interpretation from French*): Good morning, ladies and gentlemen, representatives, delegates. Before we begin with this session of the Committee on the Peaceful Uses of Outer Space, this is the 580th meeting, I would like to congratulate the delegation of Germany for the successful launch this morning of TerraSAR-X from Baikonur which I think took place at 4 a.m. this morning. So, during this fiftieth session of the Committee we have been fortunate in noting the successful launch of two European radar satellites and the American shuttle, which has docked with the International Space Station last week and, as you know, the team on the International Space Station are undertaking a number of repairs, to complete and maintain as well the Space Station, so I offer congratulations for all these fine successful events of the last eight days.

Ladies and gentlemen, we are this morning going to adopt the report to the General Assembly which is agenda item 14. You should have already found the beginning of this report in your pigeon holes and, whilst you are becoming familiar with those, I am going to call on the delegation of Brazil which wants to make a general statement and also our colleague the representative of Spain.

The delegation of Brazil has the floor.

**Mr. L. IANSEN DE SANTANA** (Brazil): First of all, our delegation, in this last session, would like to highlight the commemorative chapter of COPUOS. I would like to thank you and the OOSA

staff for the photo exhibition, especially the inclusion of Mr. \_\_\_\_\_ (*inaudible*) rapporteur of the COPUOS and Mr. \_\_\_\_\_ (*inaudible*), we highly appreciate it. Let me now say a few words in Russian.

*(continued in Russian)*

Mr. Chairman, on behalf of the delegation of the Federal Republic of Brazil on the occasion of the fiftieth session of COPUOS, which coincides with a number of anniversaries, I would like to address my congratulations on the fiftieth anniversary of the launch of the first artificial satellite of the Earth by the Soviet Union and also the fortieth anniversary of the entry into force of the first basic international treaty defining the legal regime for space. The Russian people were pioneers in space research. The launch of the first sputnik opened a new era in the history of mankind. The experience acquired by the Russian Federation in its space research for peaceful purposes is something which is utilized by many countries including Brazil.

At this session, I would like to mention another extremely important date in the history of cosmonauts and that is the centuries since the date of birth of Sergei Korolev who was an outstanding Russian engineer and the creator of Soviet rocket science. Thanks to the innovative ideas of Sergei Korolev it was possible to launch the first artificial sputnik on 4 October 1957 and, of course, the flight of the first cosmonaut in the world, the Soviet citizen Yuri Gagarin, which took place on 12 April 1961. Successful cooperation between Brazil and Russia in space research for peaceful purposes has become very essentially possible thanks to the development of Sergei Korolev's theory.

---

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.



Mr. Chairman, the delegation of Brazil has a very high appreciation for the contribution made by the Russian Federation and the Russian people in space research for peaceful purposes and we do hope that there will be further cooperation, in this very important area, between the two countries. Thank you very much for your attention.

**The CHAIRMAN** (*interpretation from French*): Thank you delegate of Brazil for that statement. I am sure that our colleagues in the Russian delegation will be touched by the congratulations you offered them.

I would now call on the distinguished delegate of Spain for a brief statement.

**Mr. A. ORTIZ-GARCÍA** (Spain) (*interpretation from Spanish*): Thank you very much for giving me the floor. Ladies and gentlemen, good morning. At the beginning of this session, which I hope will be a fruitful one and will show once again the capacities of the Secretariat and the Chair, I would like to make a minor comment.

Mr. Chairman, you have just been talking about events related to space which have taken place during this week, during these last ten days of work. Why do we not have these events shown up more in the Press more often? So I would invite the Secretariat and the Chairman to take steps with the media so that whilst the session is being held, that is the session of this Committee, then the Press should show news on space events. This is not a theoretical exercise, it is a theoretical exercise which has clear practical consequences. Whilst we are talking here and discussing many topics there are new satellites that are up in space, there are space shuttles which are going to work for the benefit of humanity and we all hope that that shuttle will come back safely. This is the suggestion that I would like to put forward for all of you ladies and gentlemen.

Then, in addition to that, I would like to make a few references to Spain. The delegation of Spain has been rather quiet in these public sessions, however, we have had much conversation with other delegates. As Chairman of the Spanish Centre for Space Law, I have had the occasion to have contact with many colleagues, many experts in the area of space law and this is something for which I am very grateful and I am sure will be of great usefulness for us in the future.

Just a couple of references to the two main topics here, that is to say, the Scientific and Technical Subcommittee. Spain has been following with great

interest the question of space law in a world which we all wish to be more just and more peaceful but also much cleaner and much healthier. The approval of guidelines to mitigate space debris is a very important measure so that we use space safely for the benefit for the whole of humanity. We think, therefore, it is appropriate that these guidelines or directives should be the subject of a resolution of the General Assembly.

Secondly, reference to the Legal Subcommittee where we have, with great interest, followed-up what was mentioned about the national registers of satellites. In Spain where we have a growing policy of international cooperation, unfortunately on the bilateral side with many States, not only in priority areas for historical and cultural reasons, that is to say, with Ibero-America but also in other areas too where there is special interest being focused on the setting up of a space system, in other words SPIDER, for dealing with disasters. We use the word catastrophe and not disaster as stated in other languages. Nonetheless the experience of the Secretariat could define what would be the most clear one for this system SPIDER. Perhaps it could be clarified whether this is catastrophes or disasters, perhaps that could be defined.

Then, in a year when we are celebrating events and anniversaries, fifty years is a long time particularly in the lifetime of an organization, we must congratulate everyone, in particular, the Chairman of the Committee, Professor Gérard Brachet, whose skilfulness in resolving problems is something that he has demonstrated most clearly. In my experience, as a multilateral ambassador in many fora, I have seen many chairmen but few have had the capacity or the rapidness with which he solves problems as demonstrated by our Chairman. So, thank you very much and congratulations on your capacity to lead us, not only on space questions but all sorts of questions and, of course, these congratulations are addressed also to the earlier chairpersons of the subcommittees, Dr. Mazlan and my old friend Ambassador Raimundo González-Aninat with whom I have had meetings not only here in this room but in many other places and I do hope I will continue to have personal and professional relations with him in the future. Of course, I cannot forget Dr. Sergio Camacho-Lara, who is concluding a stage in his life. We are not in a situation where we are talking nicely about Dr. Camacho because he has gone, we are talking about him nicely now and we are sure that all the success that he has had in the past will continue in his future work. I would also like to congratulate all the staff in the Secretariat, the conference people, the translators and interpreters who are working away behind the scenes but who are

very multilingual in their work. I would also like to congratulate all the delegates for their enthusiasm.

Finally I would just like to make a very simple general statement. We must never forget that the primordial point of COPUOS is to be of benefit to the whole of humanity, in other words, we must not lose ourselves in minutiae or minor discussions or linguistic facts. We must not lose sight of the wood for the trees or the trees for the wood. The whole point of this Committee of the United Nations is to work so that space technology is applied for the benefit of the whole of humanity. This must be the lighthouse that guides us towards our goal so that we can achieve positive results. Thank you very much to all of you, Mr. Chairman, thank you very much, ladies and gentlemen for your attention.

**The CHAIRMAN** (*interpretation from French*): Thank you Ambassador for your statement and for the very warm congratulations extended to me and to the Director of the Office for Outer Space Affairs and the other members of the team. We are actually blushing but we will endeavour to be worthy of your kind words during our proceedings today which will be devoted mainly to the adoption of the report of the Committee. I do want to come back to item 7 of our agenda so as to conclude our discussion on the SPIDER programme which I hope will be achieved within about an hour's time.

Now, I would like to give the floor to the Vice-Chairman, who is also the rapporteur, who will introduce the report that we have before us.

#### **Report of the Committee to the General Assembly (agenda item 14)**

**Mr. P. TIENDREBEOGO** (Vice-Chairman and Rapporteur) (*interpretation from French*): Distinguished delegates, I would like to introduce the draft report of the Committee on the Peaceful Uses of Outer Space to the General Assembly. This draft report is in five parts which have the symbols, A/AC.105/L.269 and four addenda, Addendum 1, 2, 3 and 4 and 5. I understand that four of the five sections have been distributed and are before the Committee for adoption.

The first part has the symbol A/AC.105/L.269 contains the introduction as well as recommendations and decisions on the following items. Ways and means of maintaining outer space for peaceful purposes and implementation of the recommendations of UNISPACE III.

The second part has the symbol A/AC.105/L.269/Add.1 and it contains the section entitled, report of the Legal Subcommittee on its forty-sixth session.

The third part has the symbol A/AC.105/L.269/Add.2 and it contains the section entitled, report of the Scientific and Technical Subcommittee on its forty-fourth session with the exception of subsection 7, entitled, space system-based disaster management support.

The fourth part of the report with the symbol A/AC.105/L.269/Add.3 contains the sections entitled, spin-off benefits of space technology: a review of current status as well as space and society and space and water.

The fifth part of the report, which will be available this afternoon, has the symbol A/AC.105/L.269/Add.4 contains the section on the use of space-derived geospatial data for sustainable development as well as the section entitled, other matters.

The sixth part of the report, which will also be available this afternoon, has the symbol A/AC.105/L.269/Add.5 and it contains the section on SPIDER.

Distinguished delegates, the draft report of the Committee, as I have just presented it to you, is before you for adoption.

**The CHAIRMAN** (*interpretation from French*): I thank Mr. Tiendrébogo for his presentation of these items of the report which we shall consider, paragraph by paragraph. I would just like to make sure that all of the delegates do have the various documents which have just been presented to you. That would seem to be the case.

I suggest that we begin our consideration of document A/AC.105/L.269, chapter I, introduction, paragraph 1.

Have you any comments on paragraph 1? I see none.

*It stands adopted.*

Paragraph 2. Are there any comments on paragraph 2? I see no comments.

*Paragraph 2 stands adopted.*

Paragraph 3? No comments?

*Paragraph 3 is adopted.*

Paragraph 4? Are there any comments on paragraph 4 which is simply the agenda for the session? I see no comments.

*Paragraph 4 stands adopted.*

Paragraph 5? Paragraph 5 consists of the list of members. I see no comments thereupon.

*Paragraph 5 stands adopted.*

Paragraph 6? Here you have the list of States participating. I suggest that you make sure that your own country is listed.

I give the floor to the delegate of France.

**Mr. F. PELLERIN** (France) (*interpretation from French*): Thank you Mr. Chairman, you have been going so quickly. I would like to revert back to paragraph 4, the agenda. In the French version, item 12, international cooperation in promoting the use of space-derived geospatial data. If I understood the semantic explanation you gave us yesterday and if we take it into account, here I would refer to your skills to elucidate this matter.

**The CHAIRMAN** (*interpretation from French*): I thank the French delegate. In fact the word “geospatial” could also be used in French, however, the information that I conveyed to the Committee yesterday was that, when you talk about geospatial data in fact you are talking about geographic space, that could be a bit confusing. However, geospatial data in French “données géospatiales” is perfectly acceptable and it can be retained as such for the French version.

We were up to paragraph 6, I see no comments. None of the participants seem to have been overlooked.

*Paragraph 6 stands adopted.*

Paragraph 7? Are there any comments regarding paragraph 7? I see none.

*Paragraph 7 stands adopted.*

Paragraph 8? No comments on paragraph 8?

*It is adopted.*

Paragraph 9? In paragraph 9 we have to add the representatives of the Secretariat of GEO, Group on Earth Observation. The Secretariat will insert, in the appropriate place, the representatives of the Secretariat of GEO.

Are there any comments on paragraph 9? Seeing none.

*Paragraph 9 stands adopted.*

We move on to paragraph 10. The final list of representatives has been circulated to you and it is available with the reference symbol that is indicated in paragraph 10.

Any comments regarding paragraph 10? Seeing none.

*Paragraph 10 stands adopted.*

Paragraph 11? In paragraph 11, at the very end of the paragraph, the last line, we should strike out “the ITU”, inasmuch as the representative to ITU made his statement under another item of the agenda. Later on we will insert that and take care of it. The last sentence would read “the National Space Society, the ISPRS” but we would strike out “ITU”.

Any comments on paragraph 11? I see none.

*Paragraph 11 stands adopted.*

Paragraph 12? Are there any comments on paragraph 12? I see none.

*Paragraph 12 is adopted.*

Let us move on to paragraph 13. Are there any comments on paragraph 13? I see none.

*Paragraph 13 is adopted.*

Paragraph 14? Are there any comments on paragraph 14? I see none.

*Paragraph 14 is adopted.*

I give the floor to Colombia.

**Mr. C. ARÉVALO-YEPES** (Colombia) (*interpretation from Spanish*): I am sorry to go back to paragraph 11, the general statements. I think there was an error when Colombia is referred to here because Colombia is not an observer, Colombia made a

comment but it was not as observer so that would have to be corrected. This is in the Spanish version, it only applies to the Spanish version. It was seen that the English version is quite correct. It should just be Colombia.

**The CHAIRMAN** (*interpretation from French*): The French version is quite correct as well. This would appear to refer only to the Spanish version where, in the middle of that paragraph, it does talk in Spanish about the observer for Colombia.

Delegation of Ecuador please.

**Ms. R. VÁSQUEZ DE MESSMER** (Ecuador) (*interpretation from Spanish*): My delegation would also like to make a clarification. It says Colombia made a commemorative statement. I think we should say it was a commemorative statement because that was the nature of the statement.

**The CHAIRMAN** (*interpretation from French*): Where are you referring to this? In paragraph 11? If you would kindly indicate. In the English version that is almost at the top of the page 4, it would read “the representative of Colombia made a commemorative statement on behalf of the States members”.

*With that amendment, paragraph 11 would stand adopted.* We would add that word “commemorative” so it would read “the representative of Colombia made a commemorative statement on behalf of the States members of the United Nations that are members of the Group of Latin America and Caribbean Countries”.

We return now to paragraph 15. In paragraph 15, a slight correction is called for. We are not 50 years old, our Committee, but we are holding our fiftieth session. So that third sentence really must be corrected it should not say “in its 50 years of existence” but rather we should say “since its creation in 1959”. I hope you have all taken note of that factual amendment in paragraph 15.

Does paragraph 15 meet with your approval with that correction regarding the 50 years of existence? I take it that is the case, I see no one asking for the floor.

*Paragraph 15 stands adopted as corrected.*

Paragraph 16? I see no one asking for the floor on paragraph 16.

*Paragraph 16 stands adopted.*

Paragraph 17?

I give the floor to the distinguished delegate of Chile.

**Mr. R. GONZÁLEZ-ANINAT** (Chile) (*interpretation from Spanish*): I think that the many expressions of congratulations to Director Sergio Camacho were not mere formulaic but they were deeply felt. I am not going to make an issue of this but I would think that, in paragraph 17, the way it is formulated it seems not to have enough strength or depth. I would like to have us say something a little bit more wholesome because it does not truly reflect what was both an aspiration for him and a feeling of very deep gratitude and recognition to Mr. Sergio Camacho, the Director.

**The CHAIRMAN** (*interpretation from French*): I thank our distinguished delegate of Chile for his suggestion. I would suggest that we place this paragraph at the end of chapter I, so it would have greater visibility and we would therefore end the chapter with our congratulations and our expression of gratitude to the outgoing Director and our very best wishes to him in his future endeavours. So 17 would become 20 and the other paragraphs would be moved forward. So that, that paragraph 17 would be the concluding paragraph.

Can you agree with that suggestion? It would seem that the Committee members can accede to that and I would like to thank Mr. Raimundo González for that suggestion.

*This paragraph stands adopted* but we have changed the order. It will be the last paragraph in that section.

Let us now move on to paragraph 18, which would become new paragraph 17. Any comments? Have you any remarks on paragraph 18? I see none.

*Paragraph 18 stands adopted.*

Paragraph 19? I see no comments.

*It stands adopted.*

Paragraph 20?

Paragraph 20, I give the floor to our distinguished colleague from the Russian Federation.

**Ms. O. MOZOLINA** (Russian Federation) (*interpretation from Russian*): I have just a small remark. In this draft reference is made to the Director, Sergio Camacho who should be referred to as, the Head, in English.

**The CHAIRMAN** (*interpretation from French*): I believe that Dr. Camacho's official title is Director, even in English. The Director of the Office for Outer Space Affairs. I give you the floor once again.

**Ms. O. MOZOLINA** (Russian Federation) (*interpretation from Russian*): I am referring to the Director of the Federal Space Agency.

**The CHAIRMAN** (*interpretation from French*): What is the exact title. Director is the official title. In the English version you would like to have the word "Head" replace the word "Director". Is that correct? Well, that just demonstrates that one learns something every day. I had always thought that Director in French would correspond to Director but we will certainly replace that with "Head". With that clarification I think we can adopt paragraph 20.

*Paragraph 20 stands adopted.*

We will rearrange those paragraphs. Old 20 will become 19 and former paragraph 17 will become paragraph 20.

Let us now move on to paragraph 21 which will reflect the outcome of the day's proceedings, so I think we can adopt it, on a provisional basis, with the understanding that it will not be finalized until we have completed our consideration of the entire report.

*Paragraph 21 is provisionally adopted.* I hope we will not have to revert back to it later in the day.

Let us move on now to chapter II, paragraph 22. Have you any comments or remarks on paragraph 22? I see none.

*Paragraph 22 stands adopted.*

Paragraph 23. No remarks on paragraph 23?

*It stands approved.*

Paragraph 24. Have you any remarks on paragraph 24? Seeing none.

*Paragraph 24 stands adopted.*

Paragraph 25? I see no requests for comments on paragraph 25.

*It stands adopted.*

We move on to paragraph 26. Have you any remarks with regard to paragraph 26? Seeing none.

*Paragraph 26 stands adopted.*

Paragraph 27 next. No comments?

*Paragraph 27 stands adopted.*

We move on to paragraph 28 and I give the floor to the representative of Ecuador.

**Ms. R. VÁSQUEZ DE MESSMER** (Ecuador) (*interpretation from Spanish*): In the fourth line of paragraph 28, we would like to change this. It says "it was also noted that the pro temporary secretariat would be assisted by the Government of Colombia". We would like it to say "will continue to be assisted" or "is being assisted by the Government of Colombia".

**The CHAIRMAN** (*interpretation from French*): Thank you. The delegate of Chile, Mr. González.

**Mr. R. GONZÁLEZ-ANINAT** (Chile) (*interpretation from Spanish*): Mr. Chairman, I have no objection to the amendment proposed by Ecuador but I think there is one aspect which is lacking. After we say "is being assisted by the Government of Colombia" "as well as" we would add "as well as, the international group of experts," and then the paragraph would continue unchanged.

**The CHAIRMAN** (*interpretation from French*): Thank you for that suggestion, Ambassador of Chile. So, after "the Government of Colombia, as well as the international group of experts,"

Colombia you have the floor.

**Mr. C. ARÉVALO-YEPES** (Colombia) (*interpretation from Spanish*): I would like to thank those who have proposed these two amendments which we approve, as suggested by the delegations of

Ecuador and Chile but, in the logical order of this sentence I think it would be more appropriate to say that “the pro temporary Secretariat is being assisted by the Government of Colombia which had been the host of the fourth Space Conference of the Americas” and after that, we would add those two other suggestions “as well as, the international group of experts,”

**The CHAIRMAN** (*interpretation from French*): I thank our distinguished colleague, the representative of Colombia for the logical sequence. I think it should be inserted there where he has suggested and I am wondering whether we should not also say in the future “the Government of Colombia which will be the host of the sixth Space Conference” in other words in the future not “which would be the host” but rather “which will be the host of the sixth Space Conference of the Americas in 2009” if I could venture to make that suggestion, “which will be the host” that is the very last line of paragraph 28. So, we would insert those amendments to paragraph 28.

Any further comments thereupon? I see none.

*Paragraph 28 stands adopted.*

Delegation of Ecuador do you wish to address paragraph 28 still?

*Paragraph 28 stands adopted as amended.*

Paragraph 29, Ecuador is asking for the floor.

**Ms. R. VÁSQUEZ DE MESSMER** (Ecuador) (*interpretation from Spanish*): I just want to recall that, at the beginning of this session, I asked for a specific paragraph but, since it has not been included, I would like to read it out at dictation speed and we would like to see it become 28*bis*.

The paragraph would start as follows “the Committee noted that both the international group of experts, as well as the pro temporary Secretariat of the Space Conference as the regional forum responsible for promoting knowledge and application of space science and technologies in favour of security, development and well-being of the States of the region, requires international support and cooperation for the carrying out of the mandate set forth at the fifth Space Conference of the Americas”. Thank you very much.

**The CHAIRMAN** (*interpretation from French*): I will ask our distinguished colleague of Ecuador to kindly hand in the text which she has just read out. Are there any objections to the proposal

which has just been read out by the delegate of Ecuador, which, for the time being, is 28*bis* and would become paragraph 29 perhaps, but this remains to be seen.

I give the floor to Hungary.

**Mr. F. HORVAL** (Hungary): I would like to refer to paragraph 26. I think the last line in the English version the website of the Office is not correct, we should write instead of “uncosa” “unoosa”.

**The CHAIRMAN** (*interpretation from French*): I apologize for having to say to the distinguished delegate that he is wrong. The website is “uncosa” it is, in fact, on that site that you find the list which is quoted. There is no typing error here in fact. So we maintain it as “uncosa”.

Let us move on to paragraph 29. I see South Africa wishes to speak. I presume this is on paragraph 29?

**Ms. J. SCHNEEBERGER** (South Africa): It is true that we did initially say that the African Leadership Conference would be held from 26-29 August, however, subsequently, there has been consultations on the margin of this meeting and it has been decided to put that conference back a little bit, probably at the end of September but the dates have not yet been determined. We would like to suggest then from the third line to say “to be held in Pretoria later in 2007”.

**The CHAIRMAN** (*interpretation from French*): Thank you for that clarification. So we will say “to be held in Pretoria in the second half of 2007” or in English “later in 2007”.

Delegation of Chile and then Algeria.

**Mr. R. GONZÁLEZ-ANINAT** (Chile) (*interpretation from Spanish*): I do not have a problem on this paragraph. I think, given the contents of the paragraphs we are looking at, perhaps we could pick out something which stands out and that is, the Fifth CEA as an essential element and, within that, it is the promotion of an interregional dialogue among the different continents which have held conferences of that type. I do not want to turn this into a topic for discussion but, through you, I would like to invite the Secretariat to find somewhere to put this idea that one of the objectives of the conference is to find ways and means of having interregional dialogue in a more systematic way on space applications. Thank you.

**The CHAIRMAN** (*interpretation from French*): I thank our distinguished colleague from Chile for that suggestion. We will have to look at how this can be introduced but, in the meantime, I call on the representative of Algeria.

**Mr. A. OUSSEDIK** (Algeria) (*interpretation from French*): Along the same lines, in the second line which says "to host the second African Leadership Conference ... [speaker breaks off]

**The CHAIRMAN** (*interpretation from French*): It is the French version that is involved here, it is nothing to do with the English version because the English version puts it in a different way, it is just the word "?" in French.

Now to come back to the suggestion made by our colleague from Chile. We are looking to see where we could refer to this idea of facilitating and encouraging interregional discussions.

I now call on South Africa again.

**Ms. J. SCHNEEBERGER** (South Africa): In relation to that, I wonder if we could not then perhaps more accurately refer to the theme of the conference which is building African partnerships in space and we could do that by, in the fourth line saying, "the theme of the conference would be building African partnerships in space and the conference would inter alia" and it continues as it is, so we just insert that phrase in the fourth line.

**The CHAIRMAN** (*interpretation from French*): I thank our colleague, the representative of South Africa, for that suggestion which makes clearer the theme of the conference. I think this can be put in without any problems in the place that you suggested.

Could you give the Secretariat the exact words that you are offering so that it is properly introduced?

Let us continue then and then we will come back to this question of interregionality to see how we can put it in the best possible and logical place.

We are on paragraph 30. No comments?

*It is approved.*

Paragraph 31? No comments on 31?

*It is approved.*

Paragraph 32? Delegation of Cuba.

**Mr. D. CODORNIU-PUJALS** (Cuba) (*interpretation from Spanish*): 32 refers to an idea my delegation expressed in the general discussion but in the reflecting of this in the report it has come out that it has slightly lost the original idea which we tried to express. So, might I propose, for that reason, a change to the language so that we can get back to the original idea and I am going to make the proposal in Spanish. We would begin the paragraph with the phrase "in respect of the need to preserve outer space for peaceful purposes,". Then it would continue, the text would continue as it stands until you come to line 2 where, after the word "decisive" we would put in "through" and then continue "a decisive role through" and then the text would continue. Then in the third line, after the comma, it would come to the word "outer space" and then we would put "así, tambien". In English you would have to change the verb "us" - give the Secretariat the text in Spanish. Thank you.

**The CHAIRMAN** (*interpretation from French*): I thank the delegation of Cuba. Well, the Secretariat will pick up this reformulated text and we will perhaps read it out again, once we have got the text, so that the Committee can approve it whilst having the whole of the text before it.

We will come back to 32 when we have got the text. Now let us move on to 33.

Canada has the floor.

**Ms. A-M. Lan PHAN** (Canada) (*interpretation from French*): Mr. Chairman, perhaps a semantic point here but between 33 and 42 in the French version. In the English version, reference is made to "the view was expressed". In French it is stated "le point de vue" for some paragraphs and then in other paragraphs "it was considered" or "it was thought". So, there seems to be a distinction being introduced here. I think there should be conformity with the expression "the view was expressed". So we want not to have this difference in the French between two kinds of introductory phrase.

**The CHAIRMAN** (*interpretation from French*): I thank our distinguished colleague from Canada. I had myself made the same observation. We must be strict about having correspondence between the English and French versions.

I wonder if there is a problem with the Spanish version?



Anyway, I think you are right. Consequently, paragraph 33 should, in the French version, begin by “the point of view was expressed” or “the view was expressed”.

This means that we have to amend 33 but only in the French version not in the English version. Having made that comment, Paragraph 33 is approved. So, 33 with the amendment which we mentioned.

*33 is adopted.*

Then we have the same comment about the French text for 34 “the view was expressed”. It will be properly phrased in French.

So we are on paragraph 34. Any comments on 34? No comments.

*Paragraph 34 is approved with that French amendment.*

Paragraph 35. Same French amendment must be introduced. No, no, here it is OK. The French is OK here. So, paragraph 35, no comments?

*35 is approved.*

Paragraph 36? Canada?

**Ms. A-M. Lan PHAN** (Canada) (*interpretation from French*): I do not recall which delegation made this comment but I would suggest that we complete this sentence “the view was expressed that the militarization of outer space would undermine the concept of sustainable development, for peaceful purposes”. Just complete the sentence with that “for peaceful purposes” because in many paragraphs we refer to the peaceful uses of space, so I think it is important to make it clear here, if no one objects of course.

**The CHAIRMAN** (*interpretation from French*): I thank the delegation of Canada but let us be strict and put in what was stated and not what we can agree on now but I will call on Chile now.

**Mr. R. GONZÁLEZ-ANINAT** (Chile) (*interpretation from Spanish*): I think it is a good contribution from the distinguished delegate of Canada to be more precise. The heading, however, of this paragraph should be “by some delegations” or “some delegations” or “several delegations” and my delegation was one of them. So, “the view was expressed by some delegations”.

**The CHAIRMAN** (*interpretation from French*): Now the sentence with that proposal from our distinguished colleague from Chile would read as follows “the view was expressed by certain delegations that the militarization of outer space would undermine the concept of sustainable development, for peaceful purposes”.

Can the Committee now approve paragraph 36?

I call on the representative of the United States.

**Mr. K. HODGKINS** (United States of America): I just have two questions on the formulation of this paragraph. The term “certain delegations” I am not quite sure. That was the translation I received. I am not quite sure if that is consistent with our normal practice. It should be “the view was expressed” or “some delegations” as opposed to “certain delegations”.

My other question is “for peaceful purposes”. Is that referring to sustainable development or is it referring to the use of outer space? I am not sure if there is non-peaceful purposes dealing with sustainable development as opposed to peaceful purposes.

**The CHAIRMAN** (*interpretation from French*): Thank you Mr. Hodgkins for that comment. On his first point, he is quite right. The normal term is “some” delegations, in English that is. As for his second comment, it is more a question of clarifying this phrase.

May I propose the following, the concept of the use of space for sustainable development, let me re-read that sentence. So “some delegations expressed the view that the militarization of outer space would undermine the concept of the peaceful uses of space in the service of sustainable development” or “for sustainable development”.

Would that wording satisfy delegations? This seems to be the case. I will just check that the Secretariat has been able to note it down. So we can approve the paragraph worded in that way.

*Paragraph 36 as corrected is approved.*

37. No comments on 37? No comments

*Paragraph 37 approved.*

Paragraph 38. Do I hear any comments on 38?  
No.

*It is approved.*

Paragraph 39. Now, in the French version the paragraph needs to be corrected along the lines suggested by Canada to say “the point of view was expressed” etc. That is a French correction.

Having made that correction in the French version, is 39 approved?

*Paragraph 39 is approved.*

Paragraph 40. Same amendment to be made to the French version.

Delegation of France.

**Mr. F. PELLERIN** (France) (*interpretation from French*): It is the French version in 39. I have just compared the two texts, that is, the French and the English and I think that, in French, it would be better to put “the introduction of weapons and arms race in outer space” otherwise the way it is written in French there would be an ambiguity. So it would be “the introduction of weapons and so an arms race in outer space”. This is a French problem, it is a correction to be made to the French text.

**The CHAIRMAN** (*interpretation from French*): If the Committee has no objection to that French amendment on 39.

*So, 39 is approved with that correction in the French version.*

So, we are back now to 40 and the French version has the appropriate introductory phrase. Any comments on paragraph 40? No.

*It is approved.*

41. Well, it is the same thing again in French. We have to start “le point de vue” and so on. So there is a correction in French.

I hear no comments on 41.

The Czech Republic.

**Mr. V. KOPAL** (Czech Republic): I have some doubts about the end of this particular paragraph “with explicit respect to the safety and security of

space assets”. Frankly speaking, I do not understand what is the safety of space assets and what is the security of space assets. Perhaps the author of this view could explain it a little bit.

**The CHAIRMAN** (*interpretation from French*): Thank you Mr. Kopal for your question. I do not know who can reply to your question. I can talk about the French version but I am not sure I could give you a correct explanation for the English to the extent that the equivalence between safety and security in French. In English and French it is not easy to make sure they are absolutely equivalent. To be convinced there are equivalent safety and security in both languages.

I will come back to the question put by the distinguished delegate of the Czech Republic.

The best I think would be for us to verify the exact terms used by the delegation that spoke on this item so that the point of view expressed by that delegation can be well reflected in this paragraph and of course we have to be faithful to that.

Colombia has the floor.

**Mr. C. ARÉVALO-YEPES** (Colombia) (*interpretation from Spanish*): When one talks about explicit respect in Spanish at least, it is difficult to understand explicit respect because by definition, respect is respect, explicit respect does not seem to mean much. So perhaps it is “strict respect” would be a better word at least in Spanish “strict respect” rather than “explicit”. That is my suggestion, Mr. Chairman, but at least that is the case in Spanish.

**The CHAIRMAN** (*interpretation from French*): I would like to thank the distinguished delegate of Colombia for his comment because I see, when I compare the French and English versions of this paragraph 41, I see that this notion of explicit or not respect does not even appear in the French version, it is just not there. So, there is not even a correspondence between the English and French versions. The English version goes “was to strengthen international cooperation with explicit respect to the safety and security of space assets” and the French simply talks about, in particular in the sphere of safety and security of space assets. So, there is a discrepancy between the two versions, the French and the English. Now, since this is a reference to a statement made by a delegation which, I believe spoke in English, I think we should first check the English version to make sure that that reflects what was said and then see to it that the translations into Spanish and French will be

accurate. We will call on the Secretariat to go through those two statements. Firstly, to check out what was actually said in English to see to it that paragraph 41 reflects the views of the delegate referred to and then we will make sure that the paragraph translated into the other languages, not only those two but all of them, is aligned with the original \_\_\_\_\_ (*inaudible*). So we will not, for the time being, adopt paragraph 41, we will hold it in abeyance for the moment and we shall revert back thereto at some later stage.

Paragraph 42. In the beginning of paragraph 42, in the French version, we have to make the correction already pointed out by the distinguished delegate from Canada, in other words, "the view was expressed that" should be properly translated into French.

Have you any comments on paragraph 42?

Algeria has the floor.

**Mr. A. OUSSEDIK** (Algeria) (*interpretation from French*): In the third line in English, it talks about "shared equitably", I would prefer to say "should be used equitably" rather than "shared" "used".

**The CHAIRMAN** (*interpretation from French*): Yes, but in the English version it does talk about "shared equitably among countries".

Well, we have just checked out the Spanish and the English versions, they are identical and they both talk about "shared" should be "shared equitably" so that does correspond to what was said in the other languages.

[the Algerian delegate's microphone is unfortunately not turned on]

[interpreter] Well, the interpreter heard properly on the basis of the end of his statement, he would prefer to say "should be used equitably".

**The CHAIRMAN** (*interpretation from French*): I would propose a minor change to the French version which I think would meet the concern of our colleague from Algeria but this would only apply to the French version. It would say "the limited resources of outer space". No, "the limited resources of outer space such as geostationary orbital positions should be shared equitably among countries". So it is a matter of bringing the French version into line with the English. That is a little bit better I hope.

**Mr. A. OUSSEDIK** (Algeria) (*interpretation from French*): The idea is not to share the resources but use the resources equitably amongst countries.

**The CHAIRMAN** (*interpretation from French*): Well, once again, we have to be faithful to the original and the original statement used the word "shared".

Nigeria you have the floor.

**Mr. A. ABIODUN** (Nigeria): I think my delegation agrees with you, Mr. Chairman. Not only that, as we all know the distribution of the resources of the geostationary orbit is the responsibility of ITU and, once that is done, I do not think anybody can go ahead and tell each country how to use these resources. You can appeal to them but you cannot be making the statement here on that subject. I do not believe so, "share" is the appropriate word rather than "use".

**The CHAIRMAN** (*interpretation from French*): Thank you very much for that statement, Sir. We will simply adjust the French version to make it fully consistent with the English version of paragraph 42. [interpreter: The Chair is reading out the amended version but it only pertains to the French] and we shall retain of course the word should be "shared equitably among countries".

With that amendment which only concerns the French version. Are there any further comments? If not, we can adopt paragraph 42.

*It stands adopted as amended in the French version.*

Moving on now to paragraph 43. I do not think this will give rise to any comments.

*Paragraph 43 stands adopted.*

Well, we shall carry on with paragraph 44 and we are under chapter B, implementation of the recommendations of the Third United Nations Conference on the Exploration and Peaceful Uses of Outer Space.

Paragraph 44? No comments?

*It stands adopted.*

Paragraph 45. No comments on paragraph 45?

*Paragraph 45 is adopted.*

I refer you to paragraph 46. No remarks?

*Paragraph 46 is approved.*

Paragraph 47? No comments?

*It stands adopted.*

Paragraph 48? No comments thereon?

*Paragraph 48 is adopted.*

We move to paragraph 49. No comments on paragraph 49?

*It stands adopted.*

Paragraph 50. No comments on paragraph 50?

*It stands adopted.*

Next. Paragraph 51. No comments on paragraph 51?

*It is adopted.*

Paragraph 52 next. Any comments?

The delegation of Algeria, you have the floor.

**Mr. A. OUSSEDIK** (Algeria) (*interpretation from French*): The next to last line in the French version “would enable it” “agreed that that flexible approach would enable it to address a wide range of important and related issues” rather than “enabled it” rather “would enable it”.

**The CHAIRMAN** (*interpretation from French*): Well, the English version, which is the original, is “enabled it” so that corresponds to what you have in the French version “permettre” but we will polish up the French version and rather than saying “permettre” in French we would simply say “lui ??” which would bring it into line with the English version “enabled it to address a wide range of important and related issues”.

With that amendment can we then adopt paragraph 52?

Burkina Faso you have the floor.

**Mr. R. FORO** (Burkina Faso) (*interpretation from French*): On this selfsame paragraph, I think we should say, this is only with reference to the French

version, we should say “Le Comité à convenue” for “the Committee agreed”.

**The CHAIRMAN** (*interpretation from French*): It does not change the English at all. It is just a matter of French grammar. In fact, it is a controversial issue amongst grammarians by the way, you could say either “Le Comité à convenue” or “est convenu” so we will check with the outstanding experts amongst the grammarians but I know the two are possibilities at any rate and we will certainly ascertain which would be the most correct.

Let us move on to paragraph 53. Here, the French version should be brought into line with the English to reflect “the view was expressed that”. It is just something that has already been seen in the French version and we will make that correction.

Are there any comments on paragraph 53? Any remarks? Seeing none.

*Paragraph 53 stands adopted with that minor correction at the beginning of the French version alone.*

Paragraph 54. Have you any comments regarding paragraph 54? I see no remarks.

*Paragraph 54 stands adopted.*

Paragraph 55. I see no remarks, no requests for the floor.

*Paragraph 55 stands adopted.*

Paragraph 56. Are there any remarks on paragraph 56? I see none.

*Paragraph 56 stands adopted.*

I refer you now to paragraph 57.

I give the floor to Mr. Suresh, the delegate of India.

**Mr. B. SURESH** (India): It is essentially to make the second sentence for better reading. It can read “the Committee noted that ICG had held its first meeting in Vienna on 1-2 November 2006 and further held a meeting on 5 June 2007 as preparatory for its second meeting to be held in Bangalore, India, from 4-7” etc. etc.

**The CHAIRMAN** (*interpretation from French*): Thank you Mr. Suresh for that suggestion in order to facilitate the reading of that sentence.

We would move the word “further” slightly forward as you suggested in that sentence.

I now give the floor to the French delegation.

**Mr. F. PELLERIN** (France) (*interpretation from French*): In paragraph 56, I just want to make sure that we will bring the beginning of that sentence into alignment with what we have decided earlier, in other words, the opening words would read in French “the view was expressed that” in other words there is that minor correction to be made.

**The CHAIRMAN** (*interpretation from French*): Thank you. Yes, indeed, that has been noted and for paragraph 57 we have just made the amendment suggested by the delegate of India.

Are there any further comments on paragraph 57?

*Paragraph 57 stands adopted.*

We proceed to paragraph 58. Are there any comments thereupon? I see none.

*Paragraph 58 stands adopted.*

Paragraph 59. Are there any remarks? Any comments on paragraph 59? Seeing none.

*Paragraph 59 stands adopted.*

Paragraph 60. Are there any comments on this paragraph? I see no comments.

*Paragraph 60 is also adopted.*

We continue on to paragraph 61. I see no one wishing to comment on paragraph 61.

*It stands adopted.*

Let us move to paragraph 62. No comments on paragraph 62?

*It stands adopted.*

Paragraph 63. No comments on paragraph 63?

*It stands adopted.*

Paragraph 64. No remarks or comments on paragraph 64?

*Adopted.*

Nigeria you have the floor. I give the floor to the delegation of Nigeria.

**Mr. A. ABIODUN** (Nigeria): My observation is not a major problem. I think some of us are aware of what WSWA is but that acronym should have been defined in paragraph 63.

**The CHAIRMAN** (*interpretation from French*): The meaning of WSWA actually is spelled out in paragraph 9, the World Space Week Association.

**Mr. A. ABIODUN** (Nigeria): I fully agree but that paragraph 9 is so far away from paragraph 63 that a repetition may be in order.

**The CHAIRMAN** (*interpretation from French*): Thank you Sir for that suggestion. So we will spell out the full title of what is now the acronym WSWA and that is all the more cogent because WSWA appears twice in paragraphs 63 and 64, so we will certainly spell it out.

*With that amendment, paragraphs 63 and 64 now stand adopted.*

I will now, with your permission, ask Dr. Camacho to read out the paragraph that was left pending, paragraph 32, for which the Cuban delegation suggested a different wording and I will give the floor to Dr. Camacho.

**Mr. S. CAMACHO-LARA** (OOSA): Paragraph 32 would read as follows “in connection with the need to preserve outer space for peaceful activities the view was expressed that the Committee should play a key role through dissemination and promotion of the peaceful uses of outer space as well as through the contributions that it had made and should continue to make with a view towards consolidating and perfecting the ethical principles and legal instruments that could guarantee the non-discriminatory use of outer space exclusively for peaceful purposes”. Thank you.

**The CHAIRMAN** (*interpretation from French*): Thank you Dr. Camacho for reading out the Cuban proposal for an amendment to paragraph 32. Has everyone been able to take this down? It is actually just a reformulation of the previous version.

Can we now adopt paragraph 32 in its revamped version? Excellent.

*It stands adopted as amended with the new wording.*

Now, unless I am mistaken, that completes our consideration of the first part of the draft report L.269 but I would remind you that the Secretariat will be checking out where it would be most appropriate to insert a reference to interregional cooperation following on the suggestion made by the distinguished delegate of Chile. So we are still simply exploring where the most appropriate place would be to insert that reference to interregional cooperation.

I would like to suggest that we now move on to document L.269/Add.1. I do apologize, I am going to step backwards and suggest that we now proceed to final consideration of agenda item 7 on SPIDER because we will have to insert the conclusions of the Committee on SPIDER into the report and there is some lead time that is required so that we really must complete this item in the course of this morning. So we will temporarily suspend our consideration of the draft report and we shall return to item 7 of our agenda and specifically the topic of SPIDER contained therein.

The Secretariat is in the process of circulating to you a revised version of the non-paper which was, in fact, distributed and discussed yesterday. So you now are in the process of receiving a non-paper entitled Non-paper Rev.1.

Well, ladies and gentlemen, I think you have had a few minutes to look at this non-paper Rev.1. I will call on the Director of Outer Space Affairs to tell you something about the changes in the paper which we discussed yesterday.

**Mr. S. CAMACHO-LARA** (OOSA): The paper that we have circulated right now is a revised version of the non-paper that we circulated yesterday. In this, we have incorporated the comments that were made by delegations yesterday and we have included three paragraphs, covered yesterday.

We had paragraph 9 with brackets and a phrase saying the text to be added. The text that has been added is text that we took from the statement that was sent by the Division for Programme Planning and Budget.

The second paragraph that has been added which is the immediate paragraph following, that is

paragraph 10, is the paragraph from the resolution that established SPIDER.

The last paragraph is a proposal, that is 13, that in order to be able to keep a United Nations recognition when the term SPIDER is used in a non-United Nations document, that we could refer to it as UN SPIDER and not be limited to only SPIDER as it appears in the resolution that established SPIDER, that is in 61/110. Thank you.

**The CHAIRMAN** (*interpretation from French*): Thank you Mr. Camacho for introducing this document. Do delegations have questions or comments they would like to make on this document?

United States.

**Mr. K. HODGKINS** (United States of America): I would like to express our appreciation to the Office of Outer Space Affairs and the Secretariat for revising the non-paper, I think that it is headed in the right direction.

A couple of observations and if I am incorrect then I would stand to be corrected. In reviewing the documents from the Scientific and Technical Subcommittee meeting it was not clear to me if we, in fact, had discussed the need for these three programme officers that are indicated in paragraph 8. My impression is, this is something that is new to the process, I mean new as of just a week ago, as opposed to being part of the overall planning. So I still remain concerned about the fact that now we discover an order to implement the programme or an order to implement the programme as we have envisaged, we are going to have to ask for three new permanent slots for the Office for Outer Space Affairs.

The second observation I would like to make is concerning a contingency fund and going there for these three positions. My impression is that the contingency fund is there to fund contingencies not to fund long-term resource requirements, that is, you may get money for one year for one or more of these posts but what happens in the subsequent years. So again, I would like to reiterate my concern that depending on this exercise dealing with the contingency fund does not strike us as being a successful strategy. Here again I will stand to be corrected but, even if we were to get resources through the contingency fund, my impression is that would be just for a limited period and it would not solve the problem of having three new permanent posts for OOSA.

Finally, in paragraph 9, I think this is a good paragraph but it still begs the question of what happens if the review of the programme budget implications indicates that there are no resources available in relationship to paragraph 8. How do we resolve that the discrepancy between the approval of the work plan today that contemplates the need for three additional slots and then, arriving at the General Assembly, to learn that those positions are not available yet we are going to ask on \_\_\_\_\_ (*inaudible*) resolution that the work plan for 2008-2009 be approved. That is, we are going to have what we call an unfunded mandate in relationship to the work plan. So we have to have some plan to account for that and I am not sure what that would be but we certainly cannot resolve the question of scaling back the work plan during the General Assembly. Thank you.

**The CHAIRMAN** (*interpretation from French*): Thank you Mr. Hodgkins for that statement, the questions that you asked. I am going to perhaps see whether there are other questions before I give the floor back to Dr. Camacho.

Are there other questions on this revised document that we have here? Apparently not. I call on Dr. Camacho.

**Mr. S. CAMACHO-LARA** (OOSA): I will take the questions I think in slightly different order from how they came.

Regarding the question of whether this is a new element that we would need staff. My impression is no, this would not be a new element because we had the report of the experts. It is true that we did not get into the report of the Scientific and Technical Subcommittee text that included the need for additional staff. We did make reference to the report of the ad hoc expert group so, through the report of the ad hoc expert group, there was an estimate from the group of experts that, if you would recall, the cost to run a programme such as this would be in the range of 1.3 million and that the United Nations should contribute, through the regular budget, with about one-third. That is the number that we had been using last year. When we were talking we did not have a \_\_\_\_\_ (*inaudible*) statement but when we were discussing this at COPUOS last year it was in the range of 450 and that 450 just came from taking one-third of that 1.3. At the time then, it was not specified when we were discussing would this be all staff resources or would this be a distribution for other costs that needed to be covered.

With respect to the cost itself and this part is not related to the question but I want to take this opportunity. When we look at running any programme there needs to be an investment if you are going to be able to get a benefit. One of the ideas that came from the group of experts, when we were looking at the resources and where they might come from, was that, it was important if it was going to be a United Nations programme that the United Nations make a commitment to that programme and, that commitment, would then be through a regular budget so that the programme had then a guaranteed stability because the contributions from donors are not necessarily predictable, they are not guaranteed, they fluctuate and, in planning for a work programme having a minimum number of staff that could be guaranteed would provide more stability to the programme than if all the staff could be not there the following year. This was not part of the answer to the question, I wanted to give a little bit of context of the rationale of what the group of experts was discussing.

With respect to what happens if we do not get the posts. The plan B would need to be that we would have to work with the resources that we currently have. Which means that, from the side of the Office we would have either one half-time professional working on it, perhaps full time. We did do a rearrangement of priorities in our budget proposal so we have requested, I think I mentioned this yesterday, to include a P-3 post that I am quite hopeful that we will get because, to get that post, we are moving resources from other categories that we have in our budget and we are within the ceiling. So, I am confident that that post we may get, which means then, to maintain what I mentioned yesterday, that we are rearranging things so that we do not negatively impact the work programme of the Office. We would be able then, if we have one extra post, to give back that half-time that we are taking right now and not impact at all the Office or it could fluctuate. At most, we are talking of one person that will be working on this, that is a United Nations person. Everything else then would be voluntary contributions. However the programme exists \_\_\_\_\_ (*inaudible*) so now we have, as office, we now have a responsibility, we have to produce something and it is not just because we need to produce something I believe that the resources that are being put forward non-UN resources that are being put forward are really quite significant. We have not only what has been stated as far as direct contributions both the ones that have already been specified and the ones that have been indicated as intentions of commitment to be defined when the work plan is in place.

If you think of the resources that countries like China and like Germany have behind that offer. They are going to dedicate SPIDER an amount of financial resources and in-kind resources but these are institutions that have been doing a lot of work in the area of space science and technology. So they have places where they can draw resources, expertise that comes into SPIDER and they have a network of people that can work. The Chinese, the same, and the Office the same. We have a big network of experts, people that we know. So the resources that are being put forward that, right now are estimated at about 1.7, are actually acting as a leverage to much more resources that are there directly available and, if you think of the resources that come through the Office of the some of the other countries, that multiplies even more. But you need to have a minimum amount of resources to act as glue to bring these parts together.

If you allow me, Mr. Chairman, to give one example. In the report of the Committee you will see, under the section of space applications, an example of how we might be working with regional offices. That one in particular is a course, that is going on right now as we speak, in Argentina, that is a result of working through three events. There is a six-week course going on in Córdoba. Six weeks for 20 specialists from Latin America training on landscape epidemiology, where CONAE is paying the six weeks of their living expenses, providing the computer equipment, the data and the instructors and the Office is providing \$10,000 to make possible the participation of 20 people. Now, had we not had those \$10,000, we would not have been able to take advantage of the offer from Argentina. When in our text we had yesterday that we needed to have these resources to take advantage of what is being contributed, this is what we meant. So we have corrected this because the representative of the US said very well it looked a little contradictory that you need resources \_\_\_\_\_ (*inaudible*) at resources. So I just wanted to mention that.

With respect to the contingency fund. I am not an expert but I do know that, in the case of an increase in the budget of this Office, our Office, it went through the contingency fund and I think what made it be was the language that was in the resolution because UNISPACE III said that the Office should be strengthened to be able to carry x number of things. I am not an expert on contingency funds so it could be that it is, in most of the cases, a short-term bridge that is the way it happened in our case. The other part that I thought, as I was listening to the proposal, is that even if it is that it is not a bad thing to have because that would give SPIDER a chance to get into the budget process for the 2010-2011. Right now there is no way

to get into the normal process so this would be a bridge for the contingency. One of the things that would have to happen and, to me it makes sense that, the word contingency means for something that is needed now, I think this could fall maybe under that description of contingency and to provide time then for two things. One for SPIDER so that it is providing benefits and, if SPIDER provides benefits, I am sure there would be strong support from governments. The only way that the United Nations Secretariat is going to allow this Office, or any office, to go above the ceiling that they set is if there is direct pressure from member States because otherwise their instructions are from member States as well. No ceiling goes up, so, unless for the 2010-2011 process there was strong support and the Secretariat is also informed of this maybe through a General Assembly resolution or maybe a report of the Committee but the message has to get there, 2010-2011 would be the same as what happened when we tried in this budget costs. Thank you Mr. Chairman.

**The CHAIRMAN** (*interpretation from French*): Thank you, Mr. Camacho, for the information that you have been giving us particularly in reply to the comments and questions from the United States delegation.

Do any other delegations wish to intervene at this point? I see the United States delegate wishes to speak again, Mr. Hodgkins.

**Mr. K. HODGKINS** (United States of America): I would like to express my thanks to the Director of the Office for Outer Space Affairs for some of the remarks and clarifications. I still have a couple of other questions on how this process is going to work.

Going back to the contingency fund, just so we understand. Where does that take place and when does that take place? That is to say, does OOSA submit an application to this contingency fund and then there is a group of member States that decides? Or, does it happen through the Fifth Committee during the General Assembly? I ask that because if we know this summer, for example, that the contingency fund option is not going to work then that obviously will make a difference in terms of how we prepare for the General Assembly and how we prepare the resolution. If it does not happen until we get to New York during the Fourth Committee then we are still in this quandary as to what the work programme will look like. We have approved the work programme here that requires three additional permanent staff yet, if we get to the General Assembly, we cannot approve that work plan if we know that we will not have those three additional staff. So, perhaps



in the non-paper that you have here we should have some language reflecting that possibility so then we can understand what we are agreeing to in the omnibus resolution as it relates to the work plan for SPIDER.

The other point is again on the contingency fund. I am not an expert but I would find it hard to believe that that fund is used to provide resources on a permanent basis for operational purposes. So, even if you were to get some money from this contingency fund you would not have the permanent posts that you are looking for, so we are still going to come back to this problem. Again, if I am mistaken I am more than happy to be corrected but I just want to make sure that we all understand how this process will work and what realistically we should expect. Thank you.

**The CHAIRMAN** (*interpretation from French*): Thank you, Mr. Hodgkins, for your questions and for your remarks. On the first question raised by the distinguished representative of the United States, namely, when and through what procedure can the Office have access to these funds or at least we hope it will. Mr. Camacho could you reply to that first question.

**Mr. S. CAMACHO-LARA** (OOSA): The procedure happens in New York and it will happen in the Fifth Committee, it is the only body with the prerogative to make decisions. So, as far as the timing of when a programme budget implication document will come out, it would mean coming backwards then, it is in the Fourth Committee, so that means in October but the programme budget implication document needs to be prepared which means we need to start preparing the document practically in July. So, when it is finished in a hypothetical case then the Secretariat would need to start working, which we actually have initiated since last November when we tried to get into the process with the Programme Planning and Budget Division, developing what is referred to as a thorough analysis, in the memorandum that I circulated yesterday, developing the link between the work to be carried out and the type of resources and the amount of resources. When I say type, in this case since we are talking of pre-budget say qualifications, when it says there three programme officers, right now there is not a level assigned to it, that has to still be done, so the process would begin now. One of the things that I do not know is, does the programme budget division, and it could be that they could provide us information, have information on other PBIs that are in preparation. Just as we would be doing that, other offices would be doing the same but, it is the same budget division that is doing it. It could be, as was suggested by the representative of the United States, that we could have

that information in advance of likelihood that we would be able to find resources, when I say find, I mean there would be resources available, I do not mean that we find them and that it was already guaranteed, so that it was worthwhile then to go through the exercise of presenting it to the Fourth Committee, not the budget it would be a paragraph that would have a programme budget implication and then after that, it would go to the Fifth Committee and, I do not know the timing, that could be November it could December that I do not know. I think it might be possible to have that information from the Budget Division, this is something that we should find out, how it takes place, essentially when I mentioned yesterday, I can say it much faster today and that is that, when COPUOS endorses or approves a document like this then New York gets notified that there would be a Programme Budget Implication document coming up. They would let us know what that budget implication document will say so we would have that document to work with. That document would indicate the exact costs right now we do not know what the exact costs would be. It occurs to me also that this is something that we could be working informally with interested delegations to see, since we do not have another meeting of the Committee before we get there, that we could do maybe some informal work so that we could start determining, are we going to have opportunities or are we not going to have opportunities. The text in the resolution would trigger a PBI, that is the Programme Budget Implication document and, then the Fourth Committee makes a decision on programme only, not on budget, but is informed of the exact costs. So the Fourth Committee would know the exact costs before agreeing and then only if they agree it goes to the Fifth Committee. Then the Fifth Committee it has to be a balance of priorities because there will be other Programme Budget Implication documents and there is a finite amount of money so there is no guaranteeing that the money would be available. So then it will be which are the items that member States in the Fourth Committee believe are the priority items.

I think that it would be a very good idea if we could develop a paragraph, could have language that would indicate what happens if there are no additional posts because we do not want to have SPIDER committed to doing much more than what it would be able to do because then the reporting process is not going to look good. It is not a plan B it would be a safety net. Because plan B we actually do have already in all the meetings that we have had discussing and planning we have, of course, thought what happens if we do not get any posts. We know where it is going to have to scale down with the zero experience that we have of being fully operational but we do know where

the work has to go in to get us to be fully operational. Thank you.

**The CHAIRMAN** (*interpretation from French*): Thank you, Mr. Camacho. If I have understood you correctly and what you are suggesting, you are suggesting that we introduce, in the appropriate space in the document we are looking at, a paragraph the gist of which would be that if the additional budget resources which you are seeking were not obtained and we would not know this until fairly late in the day, then you would probably be submitting to the Scientific and Technical Subcommittee a scaled-down version of the programme for the forthcoming period 2009. I think that that inserted paragraph would be a reply to the United States delegation who said, well what happens if the funds are not forthcoming and, as I listened to you, it seemed to me that what you were saying was that if there is no funding for the three programme officers then the programme would have to be scaled-down somewhat and it would have to be worked out differently as concerns the link up with the voluntary contributions.

Let me turn to Mr. Hodgkins and ask whether that new paragraph I am suggesting would meet your concerns.

**Mr. K. HODGKINS** (United States of America): Thank you, Mr. Chairman and again thank you to the Director for the Office for Outer Space Affairs. Having that paragraph I think would be useful and would provide a clear picture of what the way forward will be in the event that we are unable to cover the three new posts. That would be entirely acceptable to me. Thank you.

**The CHAIRMAN** (*interpretation from French*): Thank you very much, Mr. Hodgkins. I give the floor to Mr. Suresh, delegate of India.

**Mr. B. SURESH** (India): Getting the SPIDER programme approved and getting the General Assembly approval is itself a very major milestone as far as SPIDER is concerned and all of us know that this is one of the very important initiatives which is needed for all developing countries.

What is needed is having got the approval, the work plan has been very well devised, we have discussed in the Scientific and Technical Subcommittee and in this Committee. What is more important is it is well-structured in order to carry out this kind of task, a critical mass is very important without which the programme will not progress. In the light of that the three programme officers have been

asked and I also see that, while the commitments made by the three countries, China, Germany and Switzerland, they also have mentioned and in the offer they have provided, that they include the professional staff. Until we get the approval or whatever difficulties we face it is possible for the professional staff available to carry on these tasks, maybe under the United Nations umbrella, we may have to give it some kind of temporary approval to enable them to carry on the task. At the same time the General Assembly, while giving the approval it says very clearly, would be supported through voluntary contributions and through \_\_\_\_\_ (*inaudible*) priorities within the framework of the United Nations reform process. What is important here is that an activity which is approved if there is a need for the critical mass, I think it is for us to take it forward and to convince the appropriate authorities. In paragraph 9 which is stated here, very clearly states that the Secretariat would carry a thorough review of the implications of paragraph 8, namely, having the three programme officers and a written statement containing the programme budget implications that paragraph would be submitted to the Fourth Committee. I think that that covers well the background behind that.

It is important for this Committee, particularly COPUOS, to look at this particular aspect very carefully and move forward and see that the basic minimum critical mass is provided for a programme of this nature without which just saying we have a UN SPIDER and then reporting year after year in this forum would not take us any forward. We have discussed enough in this forum that if there is a disaster in any of the countries the amount in \_\_\_\_\_ (*inaudible*) is millions and billions of dollars whereas we are discussing the funding for the three programme officers. I think we should be looking in the light of that and it is possible to put forward our views and take it forward and get the needed approval. I am also very certain that once it picks up, it grows, the voluntary contributions will automatically increase because people would be benefited by this programme. Today it is in the beginning, any transition period we have this kind of difficulty so I think we must see how to nourish this programme right in the beginning and see that it moves forward. Unless we do that, just discussing that we do not have budget, we will not be able to progress I think only programme \_\_\_\_\_ (*inaudible*) I think that is not the right spirit Mr. Chairman. In the light of that, I feel whatever is given here it covers the \_\_\_\_\_ (*inaudible*) requirements of how to progress with respect to UN SPIDER for which we have the approval and I think let us move forward. If there are any difficulties maybe in the next Scientific and

Technical Committee and next year in COPUOS we can discuss and apply the corrections. Thank you.

**The CHAIRMAN** (*interpretation from French*): Thank you, Mr. Suresh, for that contribution and also for reminding us of the magnitude of the priorities for this programme. I had noted that Nigeria also wished to take the floor.

**Mr. A. ABIODUN** (Nigeria): My delegation shares the views already expressed by India. Now, I think it was yesterday when we were debating this subject, Brazil wanted to have a better definition of disaster and Dr. Camacho responded by giving us the true definition of disaster. Now, disaster knows no status, geographical or political boundaries. It can hit anybody, anywhere, any time, and this Committee has devoted its attention to this particular programme for the last three years or more. A lot of effort has gone into it, the question we have addressed here is this, is this a priority item? It is our response to that question that has necessitated our arriving at the conclusion of forwarding this proposal to the General Assembly for approval. The General Assembly has approved it so why can we not then move forward and see how we can translate what we have asked the General Assembly to approve, which it has done, why can we not take the necessary risk to implement it. The Director has told us, given all the needs that should be put in place for this particular programme, we can do (a) if this is possible we can do this, we can do that, why do we not allow the Office, I do not believe this Committee is capable of looking at the nuts and bolts of implementing SPIDER in this room.

Now, Mr. Suresh referred to the United Nations reform process. That is an internal process of the United Nations Secretariat and in that process Mr. Sergio has told us that there is a possibility of getting part of the contingency fund. If our mind is in this situation then it is our own obligation to ensure that SPIDER gets that contingency fund. It will be a tragedy for this Committee and for the global community if we fall back on our commitment to implement SPIDER and so 100 per cent support work \_\_\_\_\_ (*inaudible*).

**The CHAIRMAN** (*interpretation from French*): Thank you, delegate of Nigeria, for your statement. I see that the distinguished delegate of Algeria has asked for the floor.

**Mr. A. OUSSEDIK** (Algeria) (*interpretation from French*): Mr. Chairman, in reading the report what emerges for my delegation is that the main concern is the setting up of the central coordination

body with its operating methodology, its budget and the coordination amongst the three offices in the three countries this is certainly a concern and we share this. However, listening to the statement by Mr. David Stevens and Mr. Sergio Camacho we have been referring to the regional offices although they have not yet been identified they will have to work efficiently as well and we consider that these regional offices are a linchpin for the regional arrangements and we would like to see this put in place. This is only confined, in fact, to paragraph 12, there is a very laconic reference talking about commitment for the regional support offices network. We would like to see more clearly reflected the importance of these regional support offices and there has to be a genuine global dissemination of this too, so that there will be a capacity to deal with these natural disasters. So, perhaps, we need to have a sort of re-balancing or perhaps paragraph 12 could be divided into two parts so as to better flag this whole issue of the network of regional support offices because as we listened to Dr. Camacho and Mr. Stevens and all the other speakers that this was an important component and should not be given short shrift. Thank you.

**The CHAIRMAN** (*interpretation from French*): Thank you for that statement I think the Secretariat will have a look at how your concern can be duly taken on board so that the reference to that network of regional support offices will become more visible. I also noted that Austria has asked to take the floor.

**Mr. H. BÖCK** (Austria): Picking up on my remarks yesterday, let me just point out that with regard to the budget procedure that Dr. Camacho outlined. He is correct in having described it. First of all with regard to the contingency fund. In my experience and I have seen a couple of requests for contingency funding, totally legitimate, if one is faced with a situation of having a programme, which is, admittedly, an important programme, in this case within the Office for Outer Space Affairs with international support, i.e. quite extensive voluntary or extrabudgetary contributions coming in from various member States to put it on a safer financial footing to go in this case through the contingency fund even if that is only a short-term measure. But even a short-term measure sends out signals, on the one hand, to those member States who have basically pledged financial and other resources to the programme, that there is also an understanding that this is a UN programme, in particular when we talk now about UN SPIDER, which I think makes it also very clear as a UN programme to be put on a financial footing by the

international community as also by the UN *per se* of which we are all members.

The second point is, with regard to decisions on financing as Dr. Camacho has pointed out, whenever there is a PBI obviously any expenditures are analysed. I looked against the respective programme which has, or should, be implemented, the respective need for the resources and checked and counter-checked and, when it then comes to the decision making body in the United Nations i.e. the Fifth Committee, as I pointed out yesterday, what we will have there are our respective colleagues, member State representatives, who will have on the one hand also the information from all the specialists gathered within COPUOS as well as whatever is contained in the PBI. So again and that is my appeal to member States, if COPUOS regards SPIDER and, I would actually take that as a given taking the amount of time we have spent from the origin of SPIDER, the expert reports on our deliberations, if we take SPIDER as an important programme which should be implemented, then the assistance of all member States with regard to a decision of the Fifth Committee is needed.

The other point I wanted to make was about the rearrangement of priorities. Looking at the last couple of months we have appreciated the work which was done, in particular by the Director of OOSA and particularly Mr. Stevens, a rearrangement of priorities is possible in a way if one opts for a way to do it half-heartedly or in order to muddle through. I am not saying that was done, it was done with a lot of enthusiasm but it was done by colleagues and members of OOSA who actually have other tasks to fulfil too and would like to do is to also protect on a clearer basis. With regard to three programme officers my experience with contingency plan being other requests is not allowed and again should be checked by the respective tasks those programme officers have to fulfil.

Finally, coming back again to the larger process. If one goes through \_\_\_\_\_ (*inaudible*) i.e. through the contingency funding and, if one foresees that this is a process which will last a couple of months too, then it is all the more important and that is my understanding in particular from the willingness of the respective member States who have pledged support to SPIDER, to get SPIDER even more on track. The work which has been done within the Office for Outer Space Affairs is an excellent basis and which now in front of the Committee is an excellent case is to continue and widen that particular approach. When at a time when, for example, the Fifth Committee or a financial decision is being taken on the programme, what assists

us is also that the programme at that time is already underway and has something to show for it. Thank you.

**The CHAIRMAN** (*interpretation from French*): Thank you, Mr. Böck, for your support and for the light that you have just shed on this on the basis of your experience regarding the decision-making processes and the budgetary implications within the UN system.

I see that Brazil has asked for the floor.

**Mr. G. CAMARA** (Brazil): I would like to comment on the viability of obtaining additional funds as was expressed by Dr. Camacho on the ongoing discussions on the United Nations to obtain funds for SPIDER. It has been pointed out, yesterday by Brazil and pointed out today by Nigeria, that the adoption of an agenda that defines SPIDER more on disaster on a general basis and less on emergency response might be more appropriate, including not only for the technical needs of developing nations but also from the point of view of obtaining funding for the targets of the programme. Again, I would stress that from some of us the document that was prepared by the Scientific and Technical Subcommittee on SPIDER it does not reflect, in our view, this more general need that such a programme would have to have in order to appeal to a broader audience not only for the member States of COPUOS but also from the UN as a whole. So I would encourage, if SPIDER is to become a fully-funded supported programme, that the Subcommittee report be revised as possible without taking the spirit out of report, to take into account the more broader needs of all nations in the world in terms of what I meant by disasters. It would make it, I would think, more likely to be supported and more likely to succeed in the long-term as the contribution of the countries involved in outer space to the prevention of disasters in the world.

**The CHAIRMAN** (*interpretation from French*): Thank you, Mr. Camara, for that statement for your contribution to the discussion. I see that time does march on, quickly in fact. It seems to me that we have heard a number of statements which, on the one hand, advocate forward movement and strong as possible support for the SPIDER initiative and support for the Director of OOSA so as to enable him to secure the additional resources which will enable him to implement the programme but, as you are aware, it is up to us, the member States, in the last analysis to take the decision. In particular at the Fourth Committee for the programme implications and the Fifth Committee for the financial and budget implications. So it behoves

each of us to take the requisite steps to see to it that the outcome will be a positive one.

It is now time to conclude on this revised non-paper and what I have noted, by way of conclusion, is that this document should be acceptable to you but there should have been an additional very short paragraph which would indicate that, in the unfortunate event and let us hope this will not occur, the supplementary financing for the three posts were not obtained then the Director would present the consequences to the Scientific and Technical Subcommittee and a possible modification of the work plan so as to take into account what would necessarily be a scaled-down version. There would be, therefore, a revised version of the non-paper that will be drawn up by the Secretariat including that additional paragraph and we shall also take on board the Algerian comment advocating clearer pinpointing of the importance of the network of regional support offices and I think this request could be catered for by simply dividing paragraph 12 into two separate paragraphs.

Ladies and gentlemen, the representative of the Secretariat has told us that we can go on for 15 minutes more. I suggest we take advantage of these 15 minutes to look at the continuation of the draft report L.269/Add.1, so I suggest that we try to approve as much as we can in these 15 extra minutes.

So, L.269/Add.1, draft report, chapter II, report of the Legal Subcommittee on its forty-sixth session.

Paragraph 1. Any comments on paragraph 1?

I have taken the precaution of checking with Ambassador González who has left us but there are no comments on the report of the Legal Subcommittee so we are not running the risk of approving a text which could, in fact, be a problem for the Chairman of the Legal Subcommittee.

*So, we have approved paragraph 1.*

Paragraph 2. I think we can approve that?

*Paragraph 2 approved.*

Paragraph 3.

*Approved.*

Paragraph 4. Any comments? I do not see any.

*Paragraph 4 approved.*

Paragraph 5. No comments?

*Approved.*

Paragraph 6. No comments?

*Approved*

Paragraph 7. I see no comments.

*Paragraph 7 is approved.*

Paragraph 8. No comments on paragraph 8?

*It is approved.*

Paragraph 9. No comments?

*Approved.*

Paragraph 10. No comments?

*Paragraph 10 is approved.*

Paragraph 11. No comments?

*Approved.*

Paragraph 12. I call on the distinguished representative of China.

**Mr. W. ZHANG** (China) (*interpretation from Chinese*): With respect to paragraph 12, when I look back on the discussion itself, our delegation feels that drawing up a comprehensive convention is based on two considerations and, in paragraph 12, only one consideration is being given here, that is to say, commercialization as well as the involvement of the product sector. I also remember that some delegations say that, in order to prevent the militarization of outer space, we should also consider, through appropriate means, to consider drawing up a new comprehensive convention in order to deal with this, the second consideration. I have not yet specific wording to propose but perhaps I think that both considerations should be reflected here. Thank you.

**The CHAIRMAN** (*interpretation from French*): Thank you, delegation of China.

Delegation of Cuba.

**Mr. D. CODORNIU-PUJALS** (Cuba) (*interpretation from Spanish*): I was one of the delegations which talked about this topic and so I support what was said by China, so that we reflect what was in fact talked about.

**The CHAIRMAN** (*interpretation from French*): Thank you very much. I will ask the Secretariat to see what kind of formulation can be put into this paragraph 12. Well, we will work on the text and come back to this. So we are not approving paragraph 12 for the time being, we are putting it to one side and we will come back to it.

Paragraph 13. I do not think there is a problem with paragraph 13.

*It is approved.*

Paragraph 14. So, paragraph 14 seems not to raise any questions.

*It is approved.*

Paragraph 15. I see no comments.

*Paragraph 15 is approved.*

Paragraph 16. No questions, comments, on this paragraph 16?

*It is approved.*

Paragraph 17. Are there any questions, comments? No.

*It is approved.*

Paragraph 18. Questions, comments on 18? No, I see none.

*It is approved.*

Paragraph 19.

Delegation of Canada.

**Ms. A-M. Lan PHAN** (Canada) (*interpretation from French*): Mr. Chairman, in the French version we have to use the expression “le point de vue” to correspond with the English “the view was expressed” we should put it in French properly.

**The CHAIRMAN** (*interpretation from French*): I thank the delegation of Canada for that

comment. It is a problem that has come up in many paragraphs and only concerns the French version. I will ask the Secretariat to check that, throughout all the papers, there is correspondence with the language.

So with that French correction, paragraph 19 can it be approved? Yes.

*Paragraph 19 approved with that correction.*

Paragraph 20.

Delegation of Spain.

**Mr. A. ORTIZ-GARCÍA** (Spain) (*interpretation from Spanish*): I am sorry you did not see my name, I am referring to 19 not 20. In the Spanish version it states that “use of the geostationary orbit which was a limited natural resources should” I do not understand why the past is being referred to here “which was” it says, it should be put in the present case, so could the Secretariat clarify that and, if there is an error, it should be corrected. This should be put in the present case.

**The CHAIRMAN** (*interpretation from French*): The Secretariat has told me that, in fact, it is linked up to the fact that we are looking at a point of view that is expressed in recent days. My knowledge of Spanish grammar is very limited so I would ask Mr. Camacho perhaps to complement my response here.

**Mr. S. CAMACHO-LARA** (OOSA): That is, the Spanish part here gives the same sensation that, if we put it in the present, the rules lay down that we are, in fact, doing reporting speech here. I do not know how that is translated into Spanish but it is a type of grammatical, syntactical usage which applies within the whole editorial approach and rules of the United Nations.

**The CHAIRMAN** (*interpretation from French*): The delegation of Spain has the floor.

**Mr. A. ORTIZ-GARCÍA** (Spain) (*interpretation from Spanish*): Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman and I thank Mr. Camacho. I do not want to make things longer here but I think I could put in a very simple proposal. We could take out the word “?” in Spanish and, of course, if all my Spanish speakers agree, who after all they have the right to correct things just as I have because after all this language belongs to more than 20 countries, so this is a language which belongs to all Spanish speaking countries. So, what we

could say was “the geostationary orbit, a limited natural resource” and this avoids using the past so we just take out “which was” and say “a limited natural resource”.

**The CHAIRMAN** (*interpretation from French*): I thank you Mr. Ambassador for your suggestion and I note that our distinguished colleague from Colombia is going to give us some additional clarification.

**Mr. C. ARÉVALO-YEPES** (Colombia) (*interpretation from Spanish*): It would be difficult to do this because the person who spoke before me is, after all, a most excellent speaker of Spanish but perhaps the French version could also have said, because the French version says “the geostationary orbit being a limited natural resource” so that is better way of avoiding the past. However, I think the solution proposed by the Ambassador of Spain is the most appropriate one, to leave out “which was” and say “a limited natural resource”.

**The CHAIRMAN** (*interpretation from French*): I thank our distinguished colleague from Colombia. Ecuador has asked for the floor.

**Mr. B. MOREJÓN-ALMEIDA** (Ecuador) (*interpretation from Spanish*): In fact I think this is now something we have dealt with because I wanted to say what the Ambassador of Spain and Colombia have said, so I think that is the most obvious and logical way in the language to deal with this matter as suggested by them.

**The CHAIRMAN** (*interpretation from French*): Well, I think we are going to settle this question of the term used in Spain on the basis of the suggestion made by our distinguished colleague and Ambassador representing Spain in article 19.

I see the delegation of Greece wants to speak but this is the last statement because we have already reached 1.15 p.m.

**Mr. V. CASSAPOGLOU** (Greece) (*interpretation from French*): As a fully fledged member of the francophone community, this problem came up three or four years ago. I brought it up myself and it was said that we had to express ourselves in the past in a draft but when I read this paragraph 19, sorry when I read paragraph 20, paragraph 20 of the report, it says “some delegations were of the opinion that the geostationary was” so this is the distant past “some delegations expressed the view that the geostationary

orbit was a limited natural resource” so I associate myself with the Spanish speakers here.

**The CHAIRMAN** (*interpretation from French*): We have not actually reached paragraph 20. So, we have to stop here and we will pick up with paragraph 20 at 3 p.m. and we hope to finish examination of the report.

*The meeting closed at 1.17 p.m.*