

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

581st Meeting
Friday, 15 June 2007, 3 p.m.
Vienna

Chairman: Mr. G. Brachet (France)

The meeting was called to order at 3.08 p.m.

The CHAIRMAN (*interpretation from French*): Distinguished delegates, please be seated. We continue our consideration of agenda item 14, adoption of the report of the Committee. When we adjourned this morning we were in the process of adopting, paragraph by paragraph, document L.269/Add.1 and we had done paragraph 19.

In paragraph 19, English language version, last line, we should read “procedures of ITU” instead of “process”. Furthermore, in the French language version, as pointed out this morning, the sentence starts by “le point” and so on and so forth “the view was expressed”.

With these amendments can we now adopt paragraph 19?

Paragraph 19, thus amended, is adopted.

Paragraph 20. Here you have discussions on, I would like to call on the distinguished representative of Spain, the ambassador.

Mr. J. ROSELLÓ-SERRA (Spain) (*interpretation from Spanish*): Very briefly. I would like to speak on paragraph 20 where I would make the same comment as would apply to 19. That is avoid the use of the past tense bringing it closer to French “being a limited natural resource”. “Some delegations expressed the view that the geostationary orbit was a limited natural resource”. I am in fact proposing, which would improve clarity in French, to put in a comma after geostationary “as a limited natural

resource,” that is much clearer in Spanish. I think that quite a few of my Spanish-speaking colleagues went along with my comments in 19 and paragraph 20 would also be thus amended in Spanish.

The CHAIRMAN (*interpretation from French*): Thank you distinguished representative of Spain. Do our Spanish-speaking colleagues confirm their agreement for that amendment?

Very well. Which means that we have amended 20 and 19, “was a limited natural resource”.

No additional comments in 20?

Our distinguished colleague, the representative of Greece, had decided to speak on 20, I think.

Mr. V. CASSPOGLOU (Greece) (*interpretation from French*): Actually, I think you have taken care of that.

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

We now adopt 20.

We take 21 next.

Paragraph 21, Russian Federation please.

Mr. Y. SHEVKO (Russian Federation) (*interpretation from Russian*): We would like to correct, or rather replace, a word in the Russian language version. “The view was expressed that the

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.



geostationary orbit was an integral part of outer space and that its use should be governed by the provisions” it is that word that you have to correct, you have to insert it in the Russian language version, if you please.

The CHAIRMAN (*interpretation from French*): I thank the distinguished representative of the Russian Federation for that. It would appear that the English and French language versions are correct but that “provisions” needs to be inserted in Russian.

Additional comments please on 21? I see none. Having corrected the Russian language version.

21 is now adopted.

22 please. Greece please.

Mr. V. CASSAPOGLOU (Greece) (*interpretation from French*): It is a comment that has to do with the substance. Towards the end “should be carried out in an equitable manner and in conformity with” I think we should say “the ITU constitution and radio regulations” because the institutional basic provision is found in the Convention, article 44, paragraph 2. Thank you.

The CHAIRMAN (*interpretation from French*): Thank you, Mr. Cassapoglou, it is “convention” is it not? “Constitution”?

Mr. V. CASSAPOGLOU (Greece) (*interpretation from French*): Well, it is the “Constitution”. A special feature of ITU. It is the “Constitution” but that is a long story. So “the ITU Constitution and Radio Regulations”.

The CHAIRMAN (*interpretation from French*): Do we have agreement to insert, in the very last part of 22, “and in conformity with the ITU Constitution and Radio Regulations”. Can that be acceptable? I see no objections.

Paragraph 22 is adopted with that amendment.

Paragraph 23? I see no comments.

Paragraph 23 is adopted.

Paragraph 24. Comments please on 24? I see none.

Paragraph 24 is adopted.

Paragraph 25. Comments please? I see none.

Paragraph 25 is adopted.

Paragraph 26. I have no comments. I would like to point out that here, in French, we would also have to amend the text in keeping with the earlier comment.

Paragraph 26 is adopted.

Paragraph 27. I have no comments.

Paragraph 27 is adopted.

Paragraph 28. No comments on 28?

Thus adopted.

Paragraph 29. I see no comments on 29.

Paragraph 29 is adopted.

Paragraph 30. I have no comments on 30.

It is so decided.

Paragraph 31. On 31 I have no comments.

Adopted.

Paragraph 32. I have no comments on 32.

Paragraph 32 is adopted.

Paragraph 33. No comments on 33.

Adopted.

Paragraph 34. I have no comments on 34.

Adopted.

Paragraph 35. No comments on 35.

Adopted.

Paragraph 36. No comments?

Adopted.

Paragraph 37. No comments?

Adopted.

Paragraph 38.

Distinguished representative of Greece.

Mr. V. CASSAPOGLOU (Greece) (*interpretation from French*): On 37 please, “and requested the Secretariat to prepare a draft resolution for submission to the General Assembly at its sixty-second session in 2007”. Practice is such, Mr. Chairman, that the Chairman of our Committee proposes and sends everything to the Fourth Committee and subsequently goes to the plenary of the General Assembly. So what we should do, is be in line with 37, we have to conform to the procedure. France will be, this year, responsible for this exercise, responsible for the preparation I say, it is also my experience that we have to have an agreement within the community, within the European Union because all efforts in the Fourth Committee and the General Assembly will be carried by the Presidency, Portugal.

The CHAIRMAN (*interpretation from French*): Thank you, Mr. Cassapoglou, for reminding us. Yes, I confirm that the French delegation will be putting this resolution to the Fourth Committee which was done last October with the two resolution texts that were tabled. In practice, you are right of course, I will have to be preparing the work for the French mission in New York.

Mr. V. KOPAL (Czech Republic): I do not see any disharmony with this procedure and with the present text of article 37 because the Secretariat is just requested to prepare a draft resolution and the submission, of course, will be done by the respective delegation.

The CHAIRMAN (*interpretation from French*): Thank you, Mr. Kopal, for pointing that out. That is indeed what occurs, the preparation of the draft is done in the Secretariat. Last year’s experience confirms that, then we discuss this and the French delegation tables, since I am presiding over the Committee, this in the Fourth Committee. So, the draft resolution is submitted by France to the General Assembly, if you want to spell it out in the text, there is no problem there. We should not forget to change the sentence, next year, the following year because instead of that it would be Colombia.

We will adopt 37 and we will insert “by France” “for submission by France to the General Assembly”.

Paragraph 38. I think there is no problem there we can adopt this.

Paragraph 39. I have no comments.

Adopted.

Paragraph 40.

Mr. V. KOPAL (Czech Republic): I fully agree with the text of paragraph 36 up to 39 that we have just approved. I would suggest to change the order of these paragraphs. It means to transfer the last two paragraphs 38 and 39 before paragraph 36 and 37.

The CHAIRMAN (*interpretation from French*): Well, it is true, and thank you for that suggestion. It is better logic that we first thank the working group and express satisfaction with the conclusions and then to point out that we have approved and endorsed the content.

So 38 and 39 will appear prior to 36 and 37.

No objections from the Committee in respect of this amendment? I see none.

This is adopted.

Thank you Mr. Kopal, excellent suggestion.

Paragraph 40. I have no comments.

Adopted.

Paragraph 41. Any comments on 41?

Adopted.

Paragraph 42. I have no comments on 42.

Adopted.

Paragraph 43. No comments on 43?

Adopted.

Paragraph 44. Any comments on 44? I see none.

Adopted.

Paragraph 45.

Russian Federation please.

Mr. E. ZAGAYNOV (Russian Federation) (*interpretation from Russian*): A minor editorial

comment just pertaining to the Russian text. This paragraph under item 10, “general exchange of national legislation”. Missing the word “information” so it should read “general exchange of information on national legislation”. Again it is just a comment pertaining to the Russian version.

The CHAIRMAN (*interpretation from French*): This is a comment that has to do with the Russian text under 10. The agenda of the future meeting of the Legal Subcommittee in paragraph 45.

Mr. E. ZAGAYNOV (Russian Federation) (*interpretation from Russian*): Basically there is a bit missing from paragraph 45.

The CHAIRMAN (*interpretation from French*): Thank you the representative of the Russian Federation. So we are talking about words missing from the Russian version and that will be taken care of.

Any further comments on paragraph 45? No further comments.

Paragraph 45 is adopted with the correction to be made to the Russian version, brought to our attention by a colleague from the delegation of the Russian Federation.

Paragraph 46.

Delegation of France.

Mr. F. PELLERIN (France) (*interpretation from French*): 45 is indeed the agenda I take it? In the French version there is a problem with the translation of 6, you have single issue items for discussion. The French translation of this is completely wrong. “Single” means an item for a single year and certainly it does not mean a fully-fledged item which is what the French text currently says with the term “?”. This is not an appropriate translation of “single” and I would like that to be taken account of.

The CHAIRMAN (*interpretation from French*): Thank you for that correction. Indeed, it is an item or issue for discussion for just one year which is intended.

So we are on 46. I see no comments on 46.

Adopted.

Paragraph 47. No comments?

Adopted.

Still on L.269/Add.1, I would like to revert backwards to article 12 which we had left pending after what China had said. I should like to read to you what is proposed to take account of the comment from the delegation of China.

The proposal is to include in line 3 “of the private sector” this is paragraph 12 “and in order to prevent the militarization of outer space,” then the sentence continues as it stands, “there was a need to consider” and so on.

So that is an addition to paragraph 12, which would cater for the concern expressed by China this morning. Could the Committee extend its agreement to this minor correction?

Paragraph 12, as supplemented, is thus approved.

Then I think there was a request for the floor from our distinguished colleague from Colombia.

Mr. C. ARÉVALO-YEPES (Colombia) (*interpretation from Spanish*): I apologize if I take you back to one of the paragraphs which had already been dealt with, that is paragraph 21, which says “the view was expressed that the geostationary orbit was an integral part of outer space and that its use should be governed by the provisions of the United Nations treaties on outer space”. As you recall the delegation of Colombia made a point on this issue referring to the history of this situation with a proposal made by several delegations and I would like that to be covered in a sentence which would come just after this phrase “on outer space”. We would say “the view was also expressed that the geostationary orbit which has *sui generis* characteristics is an integral part of outer space”. Thank you.

The CHAIRMAN (*interpretation from French*): I turn back to the distinguished colleague from Colombia. I have the impression that it is almost a verbatim replication of the first sentence. The only difference is this reference to *sui generis* characteristics. So can we not just incorporate this into the first sentence?

Mr. C. ARÉVALO-YEPES (Colombia) (*interpretation from Spanish*): “The view was expressed that the geostationary orbit which has *sui*

generis characteristics was an integral part of outer space". I entirely agree, the rest of the text can stand as it is. I wholeheartedly agree with your suggestion.

The CHAIRMAN (*interpretation from French*): Thank you for your agreement. That avoids virtual repetition of two very similar sentences.

Delegation of Greece.

Mr. V. CASSPOGLOU (Greece) (*interpretation from French*): First of all, I have to wonder why we have to compile two different views. There is one view which is already expressed here, then there is another view from Colombia. As you see in paragraph 20, there is already reference to the fact that the geostationary orbit has *sui generis* characteristics. Any sovereign State can state its position but I do not think we need to confuse different views expressed. This is a view expressed by one State. We could have a *21bis* saying another view was expressed and that would then reflect what our distinguished colleague from Colombia said. I do not think we should compile within the same paragraph, the same sentences, lump them together, so to speak.

The CHAIRMAN (*interpretation from French*): Distinguished representative of Greece we have just decided not to have a second sentence. The delegate of Colombia has extended his agreement to our keeping a single sentence for paragraph 21 but we would add in that sentence, after the words "geostationary orbit", "which has *sui generis* characteristics, was an integral part".

Mr. V. CASSPOGLOU (Greece) (*interpretation from French*): That is exactly why I objected. Not to tamper with paragraph 21 at all. If my distinguished friend from Colombia wanted to have an opinion, which repeats part of paragraph 21, then I do not have a problem with that but we should not tamper with the view which was expressed in 21 because that was how it happened.

The CHAIRMAN (*interpretation from French*): I think I understand what you are driving at. The view which is expressed in 21 is one thing and then there is another opinion which was that adduced in the sentence suggested by the distinguished colleague from Colombia. Is that indeed the case, Colombia? I give you the floor.

Mr. C. ARÉVALO-YEPES (Colombia) (*interpretation from Spanish*): I wholeheartedly agree. I wanted to point out that we are talking about two substantially different views which were expressed at

that is why the delegate of Greece is absolutely right. That is why my proposal was to say something different. When you have made your proposal I could not object to the fact that what we wanted said was included in your proposal but I think the delegate of Greece is quite right in reflecting what actually happened. That, I think, would be the best way of reflecting what was actually said.

The CHAIRMAN (*interpretation from French*): Thank you Mr. Arévalo for that confirmation. So the confusion means that the delegate of Greece was right, we do need two separate paragraphs. We have a 21 and a *21bis* reflecting what were two different views, *21bis* would of course contain the sentence which was suggested by the distinguished delegate of Colombia.

Is the Committee agreeable to this solution? In other words, we would keep paragraph 21 as it stands. We would add a paragraph *21bis* which would read as follows "The view was expressed that the geostationary orbit which has *sui generis* characteristics was part of outer space".

Ecuador?

Ms. R. VÁSQUEZ DE MESSMER (Ecuador) (*interpretation from Spanish*): I think we should talk about more than just one delegation because my delegation certainly endorsed what Colombia said. Thank you.

The CHAIRMAN (*interpretation from French*): I would like to thank Ecuador for that clarification. So we will say "some delegations expressed the view" "some delegations" I think is the right way to say it.

So that there is no ambiguity about what we have concluded on this point, I would like to check with you. Paragraph 21 as it stands is unamended. I will re-read it "the view was expressed that the geostationary orbit was an integral part of outer space and that its use should be governed by the provisions of the United Nations treaties on outer space".

Then we would have *21bis* likewise or, we will say "some delegations expressed the view that the geostationary orbit which has *sui generis* characteristics was part of outer space." Is that where the sentence stops?

Thank you for that clarification, in order to avoid any possible ambiguities in the report.

Does the Committee agree to that solution?

Paragraph 21bis is adopted.

And the addendum is adopted.

That I think concludes our consideration of L.269/Add.1.

Ladies and gentlemen, representatives, we are now going to move on to our consideration of A/AC.105/L.269/Add.2 draft report, chapter II, C. Report of the Scientific and Technical Subcommittee on its forty-fourth session.

Paragraph 1. Any comments? I see none.

Paragraph 1 is adopted.

Paragraph 2. No comments on 2?

Professor Kopal, Czech Republic.

Mr. V. KOPAL (Czech Republic): My colleague, Petr Lála has just drawn my attention that the language of article 2, I emphasize the language only of article 2, not the substance, the substance is quite alright and we agree. It is not quite balanced, there should be here, the first sentence “the Committee expressed its appreciation to the outgoing Chairman of the Scientific and Technical Subcommittee, B.N. Suresh, India, who” and we should add “for his able leadership” “and contributions” if you wish “during the forty-third session of the Subcommittee” and then, the second sentence would be identical or parallel “the Committee also expressed its appreciation to Mazlan Othman, Malaysia, for her able leadership and contributions during the forty-fourth session of the Subcommittee”.

The CHAIRMAN (*interpretation from French*): Thank you Professor Kopal for that very wise comment because Mr. Suresh chaired the forty-third session and Ms. Othman chaired the forty-fourth session.

With that correction, can we approve paragraph 2?

Paragraph 2 adopted. With the correction suggested by our distinguished colleague the representative of the Czech Republic.

Paragraph 3. No comments?

Adopted.

Paragraph 4.

Distinguished delegate of Greece.

Mr. V. CASSAPOGLOU (Greece) (*interpretation from French*): The French version for paragraph 3, it should be “La President” in the feminine not “Le President” or you have to say “Le President Madam Othman” purely relating to the French text.

The CHAIRMAN (*interpretation from French*): Thank you very much for that appropriate comment which affects the French version. Perhaps the Spanish version too? [the interpreter confirms that is indeed the case] And the Russian version to boot.

Mr. F. PELLERIN (France) (*interpretation from French*): Well, if we put “La President” in the first sentence, you have to say “elle à présenté” in the second sentence, second line.

The CHAIRMAN (*interpretation from French*): So those corrections will be made to the French version.

So we are on paragraph 4. Any corrections or comments on paragraph 4? I see none.

Paragraph 4 is adopted.

Paragraph 5. Any comments? I see none.

Paragraph 5 is adopted.

Paragraph 6. Can we approve it?

Paragraph 6 adopted.

Paragraph 7. I see no comments.

Adopted.

Paragraph 8. No comments?

Adopted.

Paragraph 9. No comments?

Adopted.

Paragraph 10. No comments?

Adopted.

Paragraph 11. No comments?

Adopted.

Paragraph 12. No comments?

Adopted.

Paragraph 13. In paragraph 13 there is a request from my colleague Raimundo González from Chile to add something at the end of that paragraph. Let us say paragraph 13*bis* provisionally, which would read as follows in English “the Committee noted with satisfaction the initiative of the Chilean Space Agency in cooperation with the Office for Outer Space Affairs to hold in Santiago from 1-7 April 2008 in the context of the International Air and Space Fair a workshop on space applications and climate change.” So this sentence would take the form of a separate paragraph 13*bis* following current paragraph 13.

So can we adopt paragraph 13 first of all? As well as 13*bis* which would be added and which I have just read out. I see no objection.

Paragraph 13 and paragraph 13bis supplementing it are adopted.

Paragraph 14. I see no comments?

Adopted.

Paragraph 15. No comments?

Adopted.

Paragraph 16. No comments?

Adopted.

Paragraph 17. No comments?

Adopted.

Paragraph 18. No comments?

Adopted.

Paragraph 19. No comments?

Adopted.

Paragraph 20. No comments?

Adopted.

Paragraph 21. No comments?

Adopted.

Paragraph 22. No comments?

Adopted.

Paragraph 23. No comments?

Adopted.

Paragraph 24. No comments?

Adopted.

Paragraph 25. I would like to confirm that the URL between brackets at the end of paragraph 25 is correct. No comments?

Adopted.

Paragraph 26. No comments?

Adopted.

Paragraph 27. No comments?

Adopted.

Paragraph 28. No questions or comments?

Adopted.

Paragraph 29. No comments?

Adopted.

Paragraph 30. No comments on 30?

Adopted.

Paragraph 31.

Distinguished delegate of Greece.

Mr. V. CASSAPOGLOU (Greece) (*interpretation from French*): In line 2 of the French text, should it be the regional centre “en langue Français” or “de langue Français”. Which preposition should be used in French?

The CHAIRMAN (*interpretation from French*): I think it is “en langue Français” but I could not guarantee that 100 per cent.

Mr. V. CASSAPOGLOU (Greece) (*interpretation from French*): It is the centre in English language in 32 and in French language in 31. I am not sure whether that is right in English or in French.

The CHAIRMAN (*interpretation from French*): Thank you for the question but the Secretariat tells us that we are actually using the official title of this training centre.

No further comments on 31?

Paragraph 31 is adopted subject to checking out the correct term in French.

Paragraph 32.

Algeria? On 31? Fourth line, only the Government of Morocco is mentioned but Algeria also participates. “Support of the Algerian and Moroccan Governments” we could say.

So 31 would be modified, amended in the fourth line “was supported by the governments of Algeria and of Morocco and important national institutions such as” and so on.

With that amendment to 31, we have adopted paragraph 31.

Paragraph 32. No comments?

Adopted.

Paragraph 33. No comments from the floor?

Adopted.

Paragraph 34.

Colombia please.

Mr. C. ARÉVALO-YEPES (Colombia) (*interpretation from Spanish*): Merely to say, towards the end of 34, that we might add a comment that was made “it is hoped that that cooperation will continue for the sixth Space Conference of the Americas” after “2006” we could have a comma instead of a full stop “and hopes that this will continue in terms of the organization of the sixth Conference of the Americas”.

The CHAIRMAN (*interpretation from French*): 34 would be amended and, after “2006” “Government of Ecuador in 2006 and hopes that such cooperation will continue in terms of the organization of the sixth Conference”.

Subject to the agreement of the Committee. I hope you may agree.

Article 34 is adopted with the additional language inserted by Colombia.

Paragraph 35. I have no comments?

Paragraph 35 is thus adopted.

Paragraph 36. No comments?

Adopted.

Paragraph 37. On 37, I have no comments.

Adopted.

Paragraph 38. I have no comments.

Adopted.

Paragraph 39. No comments on 39?

Adopted.

Paragraph 40. No comments?

Adopted.

Paragraph 41.

United States, Mr. Hodgkins.

Mr. K. HODGKINS (United States of America): I would just like to make one minor change to really reflect the broader nature in COSPAR-SARSAT. In the second line, we propose to delete the words “aviators and mariners” and the word “assist” and insert the following “save the lives of people in distress around the globe”. So the first sentence of paragraph 41 would read “The Committee noted with satisfaction that COSPAR-SARSAT was using space technology to save the lives of people in distress around the globe”. So we have broadened it a bit beyond just aviators and mariners.

The CHAIRMAN (*interpretation from French*): I thank the representative of the United States

for that comment. I think that is wise and in line with the reality.

With that amendment are we in a position to adopt 41?

Paragraph 41 is adopted.

Paragraph 42. In the last sentence we might also discuss the tense of the verb since this is going to continue in future. I would rather we say "COSPAR-SARSAT has helped" and not "had helped" but that is a problem that has been with us since the outset.

With this slight amendment are we in a position to adopt 42 now?

Paragraph 42 is adopted.

Paragraph 43.

United States.

Mr. K. HODGKINS (United States of America): I would like to propose an amendment to paragraph 43 to be more precise as to what is happening with the 121.5 megahertz beacons. In the second line of paragraph 43, we would delete the phrase "as of" and insert "which will be completed by". So the first sentence of paragraph 43 would read as follows "the Committee took note of the phasing out of the beacons operating at 121.5 megahertz which will be completed by 1 February 2009". Thank you.

The CHAIRMAN (*interpretation from French*): I thank the representative of the United States for this important specification. Having corrected that may we now adopt paragraph 43?

Paragraph 43 is adopted and includes the amendment suggested by the United States.

Paragraph 44. I have no comments on 44.

Adopted.

Paragraph 45.

I call on the distinguished representative of Brazil.

Mr. G. CAMARA (Brazil): I would like to make a small amendment at the third line from the bottom, when it says "the importance of providing non-discriminatory access to remote sensing data into

derived information at a reasonable cost" I would like to propose that we add "or for free" regarding yesterday's announcement by Brazil of such possibilities. So "at a reasonable cost or for free" and then it goes "in a timely manner". That is my suggestion. This is a statement of fact because this data is already being made available for free for some countries.

The CHAIRMAN (*interpretation from French*): We have to be careful because we are saying the Committee stressed. This sentence in 45 is a commitment on the Committee in its entirety and not this or that delegation. So let me check that all delegations would be in a position to go along with the suggestion that the representative of Brazil has brought forward. If that is so and it seems to be the case. We will insert that language "or for free".

In the fourth line of 45, just checking the other languages and also in the English language version in addition to the French language version, fourth line.

So, paragraph 45 is adopted as amended.

Paragraph 46. We have had several requests to take the floor. Mr. Suresh, India, first please.

Mr. B. SURESH (India): This is a view expressed by the Indian delegation. Just to bring more clarity as we expressed. I would like to suggest the following amendment. "The view was expressed that the free availability of high resolution imagery of sensitive areas on the Internet" "is a point of concern". The rest is OK. "That delegation proposed that guidelines consistent with the national policy should be _____ (*inaudible*)" instead of "developed". _____ (*inaudible*) the availability of such sensitive data in the public domain". Thank you.

The CHAIRMAN (*interpretation from French*): Mr. Suresh I do apologize. What are you suggesting in the second sentence instead of "developed".

Mr. B. SURESH (India): "The delegation proposed that guidelines consistent with national policies should be _____ (*inaudible*)" instead of "developed" "to delay the availability of such sensitive data" it is coming later, that has to be brought earlier "of such sensitive data in the public domain". Is that clear?

The CHAIRMAN (*interpretation from French*): We have other requests and thank you Mr. Suresh, to speak on 46.

France please.

Mr. F. PELLERIN (France) (*interpretation from French*): This is merely to take you back a little to 44 where a word is missing in the French language version. Sorry, I was mistaken.

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

Mr. A. ABIODUN (Nigeria): My delegation is also taking you back. We had applied before you called for paragraph 46. There should be a paragraph 45*bis* to reflect what Nigeria reported to this session of the Committee about the EU/UNESCO effort in trying to develop remote sensing schemes in Africa. I think the Secretariat has the text, they could develop an appropriate paragraph commensurate with what is already in the document.

The CHAIRMAN (*interpretation from French*): Thank you, Mr. Abiodun, for that suggestion, could you hand in to the Secretariat the text that you would like to have appear as 45*bis*.

Mr. A. ABIODUN (Nigeria): They have a text on my presentation on this subject.

The CHAIRMAN (*interpretation from French*): Mr. Abiodun to make matters easier for the Secretariat could you, in the Nigerian statement to which you were making reference, highlight the portion of the text that might be fitted in here? Thank you, Sir.

Mr. A. ABIODUN (Nigeria): We do respect you Mr. Chairman we will oblige but the Secretariat should have included that paragraph here because they have the text. But, we will oblige.

The CHAIRMAN (*interpretation from French*): Thank you so much for that. Thank you for being so cooperative.

We have other requests. Venezuela has asked to speak.

Ms. N. ORIHUELA-GUEVARA (Venezuela, Bolivarian Republic of) (*interpretation from Spanish*): Would you please read out 46 as it now stands, to make sure that we get it right after having listened to India.

The CHAIRMAN (*interpretation from French*): Let me read 46 as amended and in keeping

with my notes following India's statement. I am reading the English text otherwise I might be doing translation work in real time, that would not be appropriate. "The view was expressed that the free availability of high resolution imagery of sensitive areas on the Internet is a point of concern due to strategic reasons. That delegation proposed that guidelines consistent with national policies should be evolved to regulate the availability of sensitive data in the public domain".

Mr. Suresh is that about correct?

Venezuela please.

Ms. N. ORIHUELA-GUEVARA (Venezuela, Bolivarian Republic of) (*interpretation from Spanish*): I still have a doubt in respect of this language because discretionary powers in respect of characterizing a zone of conflict might inabilitate access to images which might be necessary for a population. I do understand where we want to go but, in keeping with the statements and the original proposal, Venezuela I confess and this paragraph as a whole might give rise to discrimination, might create problems for populations that often are hard hit due to reasons beyond their control.

The CHAIRMAN (*interpretation from French*): I turn to our distinguished colleague from Venezuela. Paragraph 46 expresses the view of a delegation, in this instance India, conveying its views, it is not the general view or position of the Committee. If Venezuela has additional views on this item that might be the subject of a separate paragraph but then perhaps you should propose language for the Secretariat to bear in mind.

Is that appropriate, Madam?

Ms. N. ORIHUELA-GUEVARA (Venezuela, Bolivarian Republic of) (*interpretation from Spanish*): Yes, thank you. The interpreter has provided some additional elements. I do understand that it is the views of a single delegation so I am saying that this might have other repercussions but I will be drafting a text for this.

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

Other delegations wishing to take the floor?

The Russian Federation please.

Mr. E. ZAGAYNOV (Russian Federation) (*interpretation from Russian*): Mr. Chairman, our comment again concerns solely the Russian language version. We understand that in 46 we are reflecting the views expressed by India and that is why we do not want to influence or change the substance but the translation into Russian is not clear enough. We are willing to hand in a text to the Secretariat and we hope that those comments will be borne in mind in the final version of this report.

The CHAIRMAN (*interpretation from French*): I thank the Russian Federation for that statement. You will be handing in a text that reflects the English language version. The original is English. Thank you.

I think we have a request from Greece to take the floor.

Mr. V. CASSAPOGLOU (Greece) (*interpretation from French*): It was in order to make the comment that you have just made for the benefit of our distinguished representative of Venezuela.

The CHAIRMAN (*interpretation from French*): May we now adopt 46 as amended by India? In view of the fact that the Russian version will be corrected.

Paragraph 46 is now adopted.

From Venezuela we will be getting a language for 46*bis* expressing Venezuela's views. We do not have it for the time being so I cannot put it to you.

Paragraph 47. No comments on 47?

Paragraph 47 is adopted.

Paragraph 48. I have no comments.

Paragraph 48 is adopted.

Paragraph 49. I see no comments.

Adopted.

Paragraph 50.

Greece please.

Mr. V. CASSAPOGLOU (Greece) (*interpretation from French*): Since this has quite outstanding significance, I refer to the text on space

debris, I would like to suggest that this text be appended to the report of the Committee. As you know the Scientific and Technical Subcommittee text is first read by participants in the Subcommittee, possibly read by the plenary but not by the 191 member States of the Committee. They will have to read this during the Fourth Committee meeting. So please be so kind as to add, at the end of the guidelines, attached herewith as annex I. I am sure we can find proper language for that in French as well.

The CHAIRMAN (*interpretation from French*): I would like to thank Mr. Cassapoglou for that suggestion. I had noted in fact very much the same suggestion to bring to your attention so that the guidelines are easily accessible to any reader of the Committee report. I thus suggest that we adopt the suggestion put forward by our colleague from Greece to append, as an annex, the debris mitigation guidelines.

I see no objection.

We therefore have supplemented the sentence in 50, to announce the appearance in an annex.

Having so decided, paragraph 50 is now adopted as amended.

Paragraph 51. Any comments please on 51?

Adopted.

Paragraph 52.

United States.

Mr. K. HODGKINS (United States of America): My delegation would like to propose a paragraph 51*bis* to reflect the views of my delegation and others. I will read it at dictation speed "Some delegations expressed their concern about the risk to human space flight, space infrastructure and space activities created by the intentional destruction of space systems which generated long-lived space debris."

So I will read it again but not quite as slowly "Some delegations expressed their concern about the risk to human space flight, space infrastructure and space activities created by the intentional destruction of space systems which generated long-lived space debris." Thank you.

The CHAIRMAN (*interpretation from French*): We have a suggestion brought forward by the

United States to add a new paragraph 51bis, the language was just read out by the delegation.

Any comments please?

China.

Mr. D. QI (China) (*interpretation from Chinese*): We have just now received this proposed text by the United States. We feel that there is a bit of contradiction between this paragraph proposed with the next upcoming one. Rather I believe that what is said in paragraph 52 is enough to represent what is now proposed. Paragraph 52 has accurately reflected the discussion. Therefore, China cannot accept this new paragraph proposed by the United States.

The CHAIRMAN (*interpretation from French*): Thank you distinguished representative of China.

Delegation of Greece.

Mr. V. CASSAPOGLOU (Greece) (*interpretation from French*): I just want to make a comment. If the United States proposal instead of beginning with "some delegations", I was not actually present when this discussion was held unfortunately but if we say "the view was expressed" then we could include anything else that has been said because just a little while ago we had the opinion expressed by India. So each delegation would have expressed its opinion in its individual capacity. So through you, Chairman, perhaps I could kindly ask the delegate of the United States to avoid a debate on whether we approve this or not by adopting this solution. Thank you.

The CHAIRMAN (*interpretation from French*): Thank you Mr. Cassapoglou for that statement. In any event it was a view which was expressed by one or more delegations. So, I turn back to the United States delegation as well as to ...

Russian Federation has the floor.

Mr. Y. SHEVKO (Russian Federation) (*interpretation from Russian*): I do not have a comment just a question to the United States delegation. Apart from destruction of space systems you might just talk about debris as well which can also hamper operational aeronautics. So I cannot see why this would be included if it does not fully cover all of the situations. I am not sure if you have understood my question. We should not be just talking about the concern of intentional destruction perhaps something may not be

destroyed at all but debris may just be sent out into space. That can also hamper these operations. That is the question.

The CHAIRMAN (*interpretation from French*): I am not certain, delegate of Russia, that I have fully understood your point but since it is a question which was addressed to the United States delegation I turn to the United States delegation to see whether it is in a position to answer this question about intentional destruction vis-à-vis other ways of interference.

Mr. K. HODGKINS (United States of America): Our addition was only designed to reflect the discussions that we had in the Committee under this agenda item and there are two separate thoughts. One expressed in paragraph 52 which addresses the relationship between the creation of debris and the implementation of the space debris guidelines. The other paragraph that we have suggested, 51bis, discusses the concerns that we have by intentional destruction that creates debris that will be in orbit for long periods of time. The guidelines anticipate that you can have intentional destruction of space systems as part of normal operations so long as it does not generate long duration debris. We wanted our view and the view of others expressed as 51bis in order to add the proper balance to the discussions that we had had over the past week and a half. Thank you.

The CHAIRMAN (*interpretation from French*): Thank you, Mr. Hodgkins, for that explanation of the gist of your proposal for 51bis.

Delegation of the United Kingdom.

Ms. C. LAVERY (United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland): I would just like to say that the UK delegation would like to support the US suggested language because it is very similar to some of the points that we actually made during our statement as well and we do feel that it is saying something different from paragraph 52. As my US colleague said, you are talking here about the deliberate destruction of space objects which then results in space debris rather than simply avoiding the creation of space debris. I think we are talking about different things and it would be helpful to have an extra paragraph along the lines of the one suggested by my US colleagues. Thank you.

The CHAIRMAN (*interpretation from French*): I thank the delegation of the United Kingdom for that statement. So we have a proposal for a paragraph 51bis which refers to a statement made by at

least two delegations. I think it was at the start of our meeting and perhaps during the session as well.

Venezuela.

Ms. N. ORIHUELA-GUEVARA (Venezuela, Bolivarian Republic of) (*interpretation from Spanish*): 46bis does not take account, I do not think, of what was suggested. Could I ask you to re-read that text please.

The CHAIRMAN (*interpretation from French*): We are on paragraph 51 at the moment.

Ms. N. ORIHUELA-GUEVARA (Venezuela, Bolivarian Republic of) (*interpretation from Spanish*): I am talking about the US proposal. I was not able to hear it and I would like to be able to hear the full text of that proposal.

The CHAIRMAN (*interpretation from French*): Could I ask Mr. Hodgkins of the United States if he could kindly repeat the proposal which you have suggested on 51bis. Thank you.

Mr. K. HODGKINS (United States of America): 51bis is proposed as follows "Some delegations expressed their concern about the risk to human space flight, space infrastructure and space activities created by the intentional destruction of space systems which generated long-lived space debris."

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

Ms. N. ORIHUELA-GUEVARA (Venezuela, Bolivarian Republic of) (*interpretation from Spanish*): Well, now I can better understand what Russia was driving at. I understand that it is extremely difficult to draw a distinction between this risk vis-à-vis all types of space debris which can always cause this sort of complication. So, I fully endorse the concern expressed by Russia. Thank you.

The CHAIRMAN (*interpretation from French*): Delegation of Cuba. Thank you Venezuela.

Mr. D. CODORNIU-PUJALS (Cuba) (*interpretation from Spanish*): Very brief, as is usually the case. Although we are not able to attend all of these debates we do think it is important to bear in mind that two views have been expressed or two approaches have been expressed on the same matter and we need to bear in mind there are different approaches to this issue and we would certainly express our support for the concern

expressed by Russia, seconded by Venezuela. Thank you.

The CHAIRMAN (*interpretation from French*): The United States.

Mr. K. HODGKINS (United States of America): I have to say I am a bit confused. I am not quite sure what the point of this debate is. Is it being suggested to my delegation that we are not going to be allowed to have our view expressed and that suddenly we need clarification on all of these paragraphs, whether it is one view, or some views expressed? Because if that is the case then I would like to go back and I have a lot of questions on some of these other paragraphs that have been suggested that express the view of one delegation or some delegations. We made a very straightforward, concise and accurate proposal for a paragraph to be added and I am astounded, at this stage in our proceedings, that we are arguing about my delegation's ability to make a suggestion and have it included in the report. But, if this is going to be the standard operating procedure for the rest of the meeting then I am more than happy to engage in long and detailed discussions about the views expressed by various delegations. Thank you.

The CHAIRMAN (*interpretation from French*): Thank you, Mr. Hodgkins. Clearly the form of these reports is such that delegations can express their views on a given matter and there is a standard procedure for allowing all delegations to do this. This is the rule of thumb. However, the Russian Federation made a comment which was, if I have understood it correctly, supported by Venezuela and by the delegation of Cuba. Consequently, if the Russian Federation wants to insert a paragraph reflecting that concern then it too is welcome to do so. In that case, I would like some sort of text to be drafted so that we can make it known to all the delegations. When I am absolutely certain I understood it fully.

The Russian Federation.

Mr. Y. SHEVKO (Russian Federation) (*interpretation from Russian*): Once again, I would like to clarify that this was not a statement it was a question. It was just a question to the United States delegation but since what I said has been supported by the delegations and since there seems to be some misunderstanding then we have to say that we did not really hear an answer to that question from the United States delegation. Thank you.

The CHAIRMAN (*interpretation from French*): I now return to the United States delegation

insofar as the Russian Federation statement took the form of a question or a query. Perhaps the United States delegation might be in a position to answer it although I myself, did not grasp it.

Mr. K. HODGKINS (United States of America): Let me explain again what our intent here was. Debris is generated in a variety of ways and the guidelines address those. In one particular case, the intentional destruction of space systems is one that is highlighted in the guidelines and what it says in the guidelines is that if you are going to intentionally destruct a space system, do it in such a way that you do not create debris that will be in orbit for a long duration i.e. 25 years or more. Our paragraph is addressing the question of intentional destruction of systems that generates debris that is in orbit beyond the 25-year period as agreed by the experts and as reflected in the debris guidelines. So we are not suggesting that there is only one way of creating debris which is through the intentional destruction. We are saying, you can create it in a variety of ways, the intentional destruction is one and if you choose to do this then you should do it in such a way that it does not generate long duration debris as reflected in the guidelines. Thank you.

The CHAIRMAN (*interpretation from French*): Thank you, Mr. Hodgkins, for that answer. So I turn back to the Russian Federation just to check that you have had the answer to your question.

Mr. Y. SHEVKO (Russian Federation) (*interpretation from Russian*): Yes, I understand the answer but we are not entirely satisfied by it. What happens to debris which is released but which is not actually destroyed. Are you saying it does not hamper space activities?

The CHAIRMAN (*interpretation from French*): I am sorry I am not sure this is really the time to re-open a discussion on the guidelines. The guidelines were adopted by this Committee and, at present, what we are trying to adopt is just the report of the Committee. So I see a request from the delegation of France as well as India. France has the floor.

Mr. F. PELLERIN (France) (*interpretation from French*): We are now engaged in a difficult exercise for the report, that is, to reflect what actually happened. I note that in the proposal which has been made this statement was indeed made. We are not taking a stand on who is right, who is wrong, what is complete, what is incomplete, otherwise we will be here to a very late hour of the evening and we are already running very late. It is just a case of reflecting what actually happened and I do not think this

necessarily commits the Committee in its entirety. That is why I see no objection to this paragraph that has been proposed being featured. I think it reflects the statement _____ (*inaudible*), the words were indeed voiced and I would suggest that when we continue with our consideration of the report delegates stick to what actually happened or as close as possible to what happened because that is the point of this exercise. Thank you and I apologize if I spoke at undue length.

The CHAIRMAN (*interpretation from French*): Thank you, India please.

Mr. B. SURESH (India): I think we are in the process of adopting the report and what we are discussing, 51bis, proposed by the US, is essentially a statement of a few countries, I think it is only recording what they have told. I think _____ (*inaudible*) certain areas and then again get into a discussion at this point of time. It is an expression by a few States, which we have been doing all along. They have every right, we can accept it and proceed further.

The CHAIRMAN (*interpretation from French*): Thank you, Mr. Suresh for your statement and indeed, this wording proposed for 51bis does reflect, nothing more nothing less, what was actually stated by at least two delegations, perhaps more.

Delegation of Cuba.

Mr. D. CODORNIU-PUJALS (Cuba) (*interpretation from Spanish*): Just briefly to explain that our delegation's intent was at no point to prevent the views of any delegation being expressed clearly in the report and of course it should be reflected according to established practice. What I am saying is that we understood that there was a proposal being made and that proposal was clarified by the Russian Federation in the form of a question was intended to address the same issue but we are certainly not saying that delegations should not be allowed to have reflected what they said. That is the right of every delegation. We are certainly not speaking against it.

Secondly, we need to take on board everything that is said in connection with this issue. Thank you.

The CHAIRMAN (*interpretation from French*): Thank you distinguished delegation of Cuba, which prompts me to ask the question again to the Russian Federation. Does it have a written proposal to express what is maybe its view? Or not?

As things stand you do not seem to have actually proposed a sentence or paragraph for inclusion. You simply asked a question as I understood it.

Right, so we do not have any proposed wording from the Russian Federation. It was just a question.

We seem to have spent a lot of time on 51*bis*. 51*bis* does reflect the view of a number of delegations. I see no reason why it should not be accepted.

The delegation of China.

Mr. D. QI (China) (*interpretation from Chinese*): First of all we feel that obviously we cannot reach a consensus, an agreement on this paragraph we are discussing i.e. the new wording proposed by the United States. I think as far as my delegation is concerned we need some time to further reflect upon it. Thank you.

The CHAIRMAN (*interpretation from French*): Thank you delegation of China. Can I just remind you that this is not a question of reaching consensus on the contents of paragraph 51*bis*, it is not an amendment to an existing paragraph, it is not an amendment to 51. It is simply a reminder of the position expressed by some delegations during our proceedings. There is no need to achieve consensus on an expression of a position.

Delegation of China.

Mr. D. QI (China) (*interpretation from Chinese*): Sorry, I did not make myself very clear. I mean to say that we still have differences over this point. My delegation needs more time to come up with a constructive proposal. Thank you.

The CHAIRMAN (*interpretation from French*): My apologies, delegate of China, but I do not think that on this issue the Committee is expecting any proposals from China. This text which has been proposed merely reflects the positions stated by some delegations. End of story.

Delegation of China.

Mr. D. QI (China) (*interpretation from Chinese*): I find it difficult to agree with your proposal. I think we have the right to express our opinion and come up with a proposal under discussion. I just want to repeat, my meaning is that I find it difficult to

understand what was said by the Chairman. In my view, my delegation has the right, with regard to any paragraph formulation, to come up with our proposal for revision. Now we need time to see if we can come up with a new wording. I do not think this is in any way against the rules and the proceedings of this Committee's meeting. Thank you.

The CHAIRMAN (*interpretation from French*): Well, I fear that I cannot agree with the distinguished delegate of China. When it is stated in this report that some delegations expressed a view, that text reflects what was said by those delegations. It does not need to take into account the views of other delegations which might disagree. This is well-established rules with respect to adoption of United Nations reports so I cannot agree with the delegate of China. Conversely, I can confirm that if he wishes to reflect his own position through another paragraph which might be 51*ter*, reflecting a different view then that is perfectly possible and that opportunity is open to you of course.

Delegation of China.

Mr. D. QI (China) (*interpretation from Chinese*): We do not like to haggle over this point. We just need some time so that we will be able to tackle this problem from a more constructive approach. Thank you.

The CHAIRMAN (*interpretation from French*): So, I note that China is going to make a proposal, in due course, for a separate paragraph expressing China's position on this issue. I would invite the delegation of China to submit this paragraph, as soon as possible, to the Secretariat.

Delegation of China.

Mr. D. QI (China) (*interpretation from Chinese*): For the sake of time may I propose that we can continue to discuss the next paragraph. We can set aside this paragraph for the time being. Thank you.

The CHAIRMAN (*interpretation from French*): Delegation of Greece.

Mr. V. CASSPOGLOU (Greece) (*interpretation from French*): I asked for the floor on a matter of procedure, a point of order because I fear that our distinguished colleague from China has misunderstood. We are discussing the contents of each paragraph of the report to see if it reflects the views of the person that expressed those views but if this does not meet with the approval of the Committee then we

need to take account of the fact that some views were expressed by one delegation or some delegations and how that position would be reflected in the text of the report. It is only the delegation or delegations that have a different view that are authorized to discuss the precision, the accuracy of the wording of the text which we already have in the text of the report.

So if the dear colleague from China would like to submit a divergent opinion or at least a different opinion vis-à-vis that expressed by the delegations since that we have understood this is not just the position of the United States it is also the position of the United Kingdom and perhaps others. If they wish to put forward an alternative text then China is free to do so. Only the United Kingdom and the United States have the right, however, to say whether the views have been duly reflected or not. It is not for us, it is not our right to tamper with what they want said to reflect their views. That I hope makes life a little easier for you, Mr. Chairman, and I hope it facilitates the dilemma of the Chinese delegate as well that may wish to see its views expressed in the text. Otherwise I see no way out we have only got one hour left now to conclude the report in its entirety, so I suggest we press on Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN (*interpretation from French*): Thank you, Mr. Cassapoglou from the delegation of Greece. You are absolutely right, the rule of thumb is that delegations express their own views and once again I would invite the Chinese delegation to insert a sentence or paragraph reflecting its view which evidently is going to differ from that of the United States and the United Kingdom. If China has such a proposal then it is invited to submit a text to the Secretariat. So I repeat this invitation which is customary practice in this Committee.

Delegation of China please.

Mr. D. QI (China) (*interpretation from Chinese*): We have every respect for your office of Chair, we also have every respect for the statements of other delegations. I do not think it was too excessive of a request we made because this text has only just been submitted to us. Before that there had been no contacts prior to the text being submitted. We had some difficulties clearly understanding the suggestion and we were taking a very positive, constructive attitude in order to resolve this matter. I hope our position may be properly understood by colleagues. We do not want us to dwell unduly on this matter but I can promise that we will find a solution which is acceptable and satisfactory to all delegations. Thank you.

The CHAIRMAN (*interpretation from French*): I thank the Chinese delegation for such a cooperative attitude. I maintain that 51bis as suggested, as worded, is in line with the working methods and standards of this Committee. However, I would like to state yet again that if different views are expressed by China there is that possibility of coming forward with a text clearly reflecting your position.

Paragraph 52. I am calling paragraph 52, on space debris and their intentional creation or otherwise.

Spain please.

Mr. J. ROSELLÓ-SERRA (Spain) (*interpretation from Spanish*): I would merely make a suggestion. It has to do with terminology and I do hope that it will not be creating any major discussion, it is creation, in respect of space debris. Any creation would imply something that is created x-novo but space debris is produced or generated and even the distinguished representative of the United States used the term when he made his reasonable suggestion, he said generation or production of space debris. I think it also says creation in the English text. I am merely suggesting that instead of "creation" we say "production" or "generation". I do not want to waste more time but if this does not suit you I withdraw my suggestion immediately. Thank you.

The CHAIRMAN (*interpretation from French*): I thank the distinguished representative of Spain. I think we here have to conform to the language used in the Scientific and Technical Subcommittee and the guidelines themselves. I do not think this is the proper time to introduce variations in terms of terminology. I suggest that the Secretariat should check whether both in the guidelines and the report of the Subcommittee the term "creation" is used or whether there are synonymous terms used. We do have to remain consistent with the terminology used in the reference documents and that is the guidelines. Otherwise, we are going to generate some misunderstandings.

Other remarks on 52? I see no other comments on 52.

Paragraph 52 is now adopted.

Paragraph 53.

Greece please.

Mr. V. CASSAPOGLOU (Greece) (*interpretation from French*): For both texts, French and English, towards the end of 53 there is a reference to “binding legislative framework” it is “binding legal framework”. It should also read in English and French. “legislative” is wrong. It is to be corrected.

The CHAIRMAN (*interpretation from French*): Thank you Mr. Cassapoglou. It is indeed a “legal framework” “juridique” in French.

Having amended 53, can we now adopt paragraph 53?

Adopted.

Paragraph 54. No comments?

Adopted.

Paragraph 55. Any comments on 55?

Adopted.

Paragraph 56. Does not contain any problems.

Paragraph 56 is adopted.

Paragraph 57.

Distinguished representative of Germany.

Ms. K. SCHICK (Germany): The German delegation would suggest to add, after the third word in paragraph 57, the words “with appreciation” because regarding the effect that only the implementation of mitigation guidelines on national level by the relevant stakeholders brings us nearer to a more safe space environment. The Committee should not only note by “note” but “note with appreciation” they have already taken measures concerning space debris mitigation by some States. The German delegation proposes to replace the third word “noted by” “noted with appreciation”.

A second point. Germany would like to pinpoint to the fact that States implement mitigation measures to safeguard their space mission and space environment in general and not to promote the mitigation measures in itself as the wording at the end of paragraph 57. Germany proposes to either delete in paragraph 57 the subordinate clause following the words “guidelines” or to consider re-wording the aim as follows “with the aim to safeguard space missions and space environment”.

The CHAIRMAN (*interpretation from French*): I thank the distinguished representative of Germany. That comes in two parts. At the very outset it would be to say “noted with appreciation”. Second suggested amendment, change the end of the sentence to specify that it is to safeguard space missions and space environment.

That does, I think, improve the paragraph.

Can the Committee go along with this in paragraph 57?

Paragraph 57 is adopted, as amended by Germany.

Paragraph 58. I see no comments on 58.

Paragraph 58 is adopted.

Paragraph 59.

Venezuela.

Ms. N. ORIHUELA-GUEVARA (Venezuela, Bolivarian Republic of) (*interpretation from Spanish*): It is very simple to settle the issue of 47 and possibly make headway. It really is a translation problem into Spanish, as pointed out by the interpreter. This should be sensitive and not conflict.

The CHAIRMAN (*interpretation from French*): What is this on? Which paragraph?

Ms. N. ORIHUELA-GUEVARA (Venezuela, Bolivarian Republic of) (*interpretation from Spanish*): My impression is that it is a problem that has to do with translation because when we read the English text there is no problem whatsoever for us.

The CHAIRMAN (*interpretation from French*): I merely wanted, distinguished representative of Venezuela, to check that you were really referring to 46. Yes, thank you.

We take 59 now. I have no comments on paragraph 59.

Paragraph 59 is adopted.

Paragraph 60.

Adopted.

Paragraph 61. No comments on 61?

Adopted.

Paragraph 62. If I have no comments on 62?

Paragraph 62 is adopted.

Paragraph 63. No comments on 63?

Paragraph 63 is adopted.

Paragraph 64. No comments?

Adopted.

Paragraph 65.

Adopted.

Paragraph 66. I have no comments on paragraph 66?

Adopted.

Paragraph 67. No comments?

Adopted.

Paragraph 68. No comments on 68?

Adopted.

Paragraph 69. No comments on 69?

Adopted.

Paragraph 70. No comments on 70?

Adopted.

Paragraph 71. Since I have no comments on 71 I think we can now adopt 71.

Adopted.

Paragraph 72. Comments please on 72?

Adopted.

Paragraph 73. I have no comments on 73.

Adopted.

Paragraph 74. No comments?

Adopted.

Paragraph 75. No comments on 75?

Adopted.

Paragraph 76. No comments?

Adopted.

Paragraph 77. No comments on 77?

Adopted.

Paragraph 78. No comments?

Adopted.

Paragraph 79. I have no comments.

Adopted.

Paragraph 80. I have no comments.

Adopted.

Paragraph 81. You will have noted that this is the agenda of the Scientific and Technical Subcommittee at its forty-fourth session.

No comments on 81?

Adopted.

Paragraph 82. Since I have no comments.

Adopted.

Paragraph 83. No comments on 83?

Adopted.

Paragraph 84. Comments on 84?

Adopted.

Distinguished representatives, the Secretariat has just told me that addendum 4 to L.269 is at present being distributed. During distribution we will continue our consideration of the draft report by looking at document L.269/Add.3.

Chapter II, E. Spin-off benefits of space technology: review of current status.

We will start consideration of Add.3, paragraph 1. I am calling for comments on paragraph 1. Document L.269/Add.3.

No comments on paragraph 1.

Adopted.

Paragraph 2. No comments?

Adopted.

Paragraph 3. No comments on paragraph 3?

Adopted.

Paragraph 4. No comments on 4?

Adopted.

Paragraph 5 for which I have no comments?

Adopted.

Paragraph 6. I have no comments on 6.

Adopted.

Paragraph 7. I have no comments.

Adopted.

Paragraph 8. No comments on 8?

Adopted.

Paragraph 9. No comments on 9?

Adopted.

Paragraph 10. No comments?

Adopted.

Paragraph 11. No comments on 11?

Adopted.

Paragraph 12. 12 does not seem to pose any particular problems.

Adopted.

Paragraph 13.

Ecuador please.

Mr. B. MOREJÓN-ALMEIDA (Ecuador) (*interpretation from Spanish*): May I ask the following question. Could we include in the list of countries that took the floor and made statements on education and space, could we add Ecuador? My recollection is that when I made, on behalf of the pro temporary secretariat of the fifth Conference of the Americas, a statement to the work and the projects and proposals in this area, I also made reference to very active cooperation with UNESCO. So you could you add Ecuador in this paragraph? And also the pro temporary Secretariat if that applies? Thank you.

The CHAIRMAN (*interpretation from French*): I thank the distinguished representative of Ecuador. Subject to the agreement of the Committee we could insert Ecuador and the pro temporary secretariat of the Space Conference of the Americas.

Colombia.

Mr. C. ARÉVALO-YEPES (Colombia) (*interpretation from Spanish*): Very briefly, to support the statement made just now by the distinguished Ambassador of Ecuador in terms of including the pro temporary secretariat of the Space Conference of the Americas and, furthermore, Colombia also spoke on education. Thank you.

The CHAIRMAN (*interpretation from French*): So unless the Committee objects, of course, we will add Ecuador acting also as pro temporary secretariat of the Space Conference plus Colombia.

In paragraph 13 and with this amendment, I take it that paragraph 13 can now be adopted.

It is so decided, as amended of course.

Paragraph 14. I have no comments on 14.

Adopted.

Paragraph 15. On 15, I have no comments.

Adopted.

Now in paragraph 16, there is a minor correction, the bracketed portion, I am counting lines, eighth line, at least in French, it should be NASRDA. Please correct that.

No additional amendments.

Paragraph 16 adopted.

I call on Canada.

Ms. A-M. Lan PHAN (Canada) (*interpretation from French*): Let me take you back to 8 if I may. Paragraphs were adopted very quickly so I did not have time to react. I was wondering whether you had introduced the amendment concerning “the view was expressed that” because in French “?” is in the text. We have made the appropriate correction.

The CHAIRMAN (*interpretation from French*): Well, this is a recurrent feature so let me reassure the Canadian delegation, the Secretariat has taken all necessary steps. They will be going through the French language version, from the beginning to the end, to make sure that everywhere we have the standard terminology which is the equivalent of the English language version. It is truly a problem we have not encountered that in previous years but it will be set right.

Paragraph 17. Any comments?

Adopted.

Paragraph 18. No comments?

Adopted.

Paragraph 19. No comments?

Adopted.

Paragraph 20. No comments?

Adopted.

Paragraph 21.

Delegation of India.

Mr. D. RADHAKRISHNAN (India): Is the reference to International Space Station correct? Or is it meant to be University?

The CHAIRMAN (*interpretation from French*): By way of answer I would like to say that the Secretariat is going to check this because it could also be the International Space University. The Secretariat is going to check that out.

So let us skip that paragraph for the time being.

Paragraph 22. No comments?

Adopted.

Paragraph 23. No comments?

Adopted.

Paragraph 24. No comments?

Adopted.

Paragraph 25. No comments?

Adopted.

Paragraph 26. No comments?

Adopted.

Paragraph 27. No comments?

Adopted.

Paragraph 28. In 28 the Secretariat points to a change to be made, so I would like to give the floor to Mr. Hedman to read out the corrected sentence in paragraph 28.

Mr. N. HEDMAN (OOSA Secretariat): Paragraph 28 should be slightly amended and read as follows “The Committee requested the Office for Outer Space Affairs to prepare a presentation on its education and capacity building programme to be delivered to the Committee at its fifty-first session in 2008”. Thank you.

The CHAIRMAN (*interpretation from French*): Thank you Mr. Hedman for that correction to paragraph 28.

No objections?

Paragraph 28 is adopted.

Paragraph 29. Before paragraph 29, it might be advisable for the Committee to thank Mr. Beckel for his very important presentation on education in space and space and society in general. Once again there has been some strong mobilization but also thank him for making available to each delegation a copy of the school space atlas. So I would suggest that we ask the

Secretariat to draft a sentence expressing thanks to Mr. Beckel for this contribution to space and society.

The Committee seems to consent to this suggestion. So, could I ask the Secretariat to prepare this paragraph which will be inserted between paragraphs 28 and 29, which just leaves paragraph 29 under this section.

No comments?

Adopted.

Paragraph 30. No comments?

Adopted.

Paragraph 31. No comments?

Adopted.

Paragraph 32. No comments?

Adopted.

Paragraph 33. No comments on 33?

Adopted.

Paragraph 34. No comments?

Adopted.

Paragraph 35. No comments?

Adopted.

Paragraph 36. No comments?

Adopted.

Paragraph 37. No comments?

Adopted.

Paragraph 38. No comments?

Adopted.

Paragraph 39. There is a request from the delegation of France.

Mr. F. PELLERIN (France) (*interpretation from French*): The penultimate sentence, it talks about the Saudi Government and the word obviously in

English was “nominate” but the French text is “nominé” and I suggested we say “proposé” instead of the verb currently used in the French text. Obviously this only pertains to the French language version. Paragraph 39.

The CHAIRMAN (*interpretation from French*): Thank you, indeed it is the word “proposé” that should be used for nomination in English and it does only apply to the French text.

Any further comments on 39?

Adopted with that correction to the French version.

Paragraph 40. No comments on paragraph 40?

Adopted.

Could we just go back one second to the question asked by India about paragraph 21. The Secretariat confirms that it is indeed the International Space Station which is involved. So there is no correction to be made to the text.

So we now move on to Addendum 4 which was distributed to you a while ago.

So we continue our consideration of the report with Addendum 4, chapter II, H. International cooperation in promoting the use of space-derived geospatial data for sustainable development.

Paragraph 1. No comments?

Adopted.

Paragraph 2. No comments?

Adopted.

Paragraph 3. No comments?

Adopted.

Paragraph 4. No comments?

Adopted.

Paragraph 5. No comments on 5?

Adopted.

Paragraph 6. No comments?

Adopted.

Paragraph 7. No comments?

Adopted.

Paragraph 8. No comments?

Adopted.

Paragraph 9. Any comments on 9?

Adopted.

Paragraph 10. No comments?

Adopted.

Paragraph 11. No comments on paragraph 11?

Adopted.

Paragraph 12. No comments?

Adopted.

Paragraph 13. No comments?

Adopted.

Sorry. Canada.

Ms. A-M. Lan PHAN (Canada) (*interpretation from French*): In the French version. It talks about free access in the French text for global open data access in the first line. When we say free are we talking about free of charge “libre” in French is a word which can be interpreted in all sorts of ways. So we would like it brought in line with what is said in the English text which says “global open data access policies”.

The CHAIRMAN (*interpretation from French*): The English text refers to “open data access” the French version actually would be “?” there is still an ambiguity incidentally in the French text even with “?”. Perhaps the French delegation has a suggestion.

Mr. G. CAMARA (Brazil): Open data access is a clear and defined term by UNESCO and other nations and a form of information society. So open data access is a well-known term. In French I think there is a dispute on our _____ (*inaudible*) languages. We prefer “ouvert” “aberto” “abierto” because this is more

the sense than “libre” or “livre” we prefer “ouvert” word equivalent in Spanish and Portuguese.

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

Ms. A-M. Lan PHAN (Canada) (*interpretation from French*): Could I ask the Secretariat in that case to check the term which is standard usage in UNESCO so that we have the equivalent of “open” in the various language versions and to make sure that the rest of the text is consistent with the English version.

The CHAIRMAN (*interpretation from French*): Well this is a term which is widely used in UNESCO and other international fora, it needs to be consistent with the English version. That means the French text and the other Latin language versions as well. Perhaps the Secretariat could check that. So the word “libre” will be replaced by the word “ouvert” subject to a check that this is the right term in French.

So that is 13. Any further comments on paragraph 13. That does not appear to be the case.

With that caveat on 13 it is approved.

Paragraph 14. No comments.

Adopted.

Paragraph 15. Could I draw the attention of delegations to the fact that it is 5.50 p.m. We shall be compelled to stop at 6.15 p.m. sharp. It is Friday evening, we have managed to secure a 15-minute extension from the interpretation services but we must finish by 6.15 so we must speed things up.

Paragraph 15. No comments on 15?

Adopted.

Paragraph 16.

Canada.

Ms. A-M. Lan PHAN (Canada) (*interpretation from French*): Our delegation read out a statement on this item and regrettably it has not been very well reflected in this paragraph 16 of the report. Could I ask for a few minutes to revise it with the help of the Secretariat please. We have submitted a copy of the statement to the Secretariat and I would like a few

minutes to rephrase this paragraph and come back to it subsequently.

The CHAIRMAN (*interpretation from French*): I thank the distinguished representative of Canada. So 16 goes into abeyance pending your proposed improved wording which would better reflect the position expressed by Canada.

Paragraph 17. I see no comments?

Adopted.

Paragraph 18.

Japan.

Mr. S. YAMAKAWA (Japan): I would like to ask to add "Japan" to the country list of which have taken the floor in this agenda item.

The CHAIRMAN (*interpretation from French*): I thank the representative of Japan. You are absolutely right. Japan should indeed feature in this list.

So "Japan" will be added to the list of delegations in paragraph 18.

With that correction. Any further comments on paragraph 18? I see none.

Paragraph 18 adopted with the addition of "Japan" in the list of countries.

Paragraph 19. No comments on 19?

Adopted.

Paragraph 20. No comments?

Adopted.

Paragraph 21.

Adopted.

Ladies and gentlemen, representatives, as we progress, the Secretariat is distributing addendum 5. However, the French version and the Arabic version are not yet available, they will be available a little later. So for the time being you have the English, Spanish, Russian and Chinese versions.

Let us continue our consideration of this addendum.

Paragraph 22. No comments?

Adopted.

Paragraph 23. No comments on 23? No misspellings of names I hope?

Adopted.

Paragraph 24. No comments?

Adopted.

Paragraph 25. No comments?

Adopted.

Paragraph 26. No comments?

Adopted.

Paragraph 27. No comments?

Adopted.

Paragraph 28. No comments?

Adopted.

Paragraph 29. Any comments on 29?

Adopted.

Paragraph 30.

Greece.

Mr. V. CASSAPOGLOU (Greece) (*interpretation from French*): In Greece we say, that if you do not express compliments about your house then it will collapse around your ears, so perhaps we should follow that advice in the Legal Subcommittee. The English and French text, it is not very complimentary "the Legal Subcommittee made considerable progress in addressing practical legal issues" but the Subcommittee has achieved tremendous success in drafting the five treaties and then the principles as well. So saying "considerable progress" is not too clear to me, even in English "made considerable progress in addressing practical legal issues" it is a statement which simply does not reflect the reality. Since I have the floor, I have seen no reference to our opinion

concerning the preparation of a compilation, that is your proposal together with that of our distinguished colleague Professor Kopal. So that everybody knows exactly what text was used for this debate to be held. I know it is getting very late now to re-word the text but perhaps, through you, the Secretariat might be authorized to produce more appropriate language. Thank you.

The CHAIRMAN (*interpretation from French*): Thank you Mr. Cassapoglou. Greece in actual fact, after consultation with Professor Kopal, I can tell you that the idea is that Professor Kopal would turn his statement into a working paper which will be submitted to the Legal Subcommittee next year rather than annexing it to another document or to the report. So that I think is a more effective solution which explains why you do not have this compilation. As far as your comment about "considerable progress". As far as that is concerned perhaps we could just talk about "progress" without saying "considerable".

Mr. V. CASSAPOGLOU (Greece) (*interpretation from French*): My point is that I think this is damning with faint praise. I think it has been a great success not just a considerable success.

The CHAIRMAN (*interpretation from French*): I am sorry Mr. Cassapoglou, I misunderstood what you had said. It thought you thought the term was a bit over the top. Perhaps we could ask the Secretariat to highlight the pre-eminent role played by the Legal Subcommittee. It certainly has been a pre-eminent role in legal space law activities. That, I think, is your idea.

So would the Committee agree to re-wording the text along the lines suggested in paragraph 30?

Paragraph 30 adopted with an amendment to be made by the Secretariat to reflect the idea of this pre-eminent role played by the Legal Subcommittee with respect to space law activities.

Paragraph 31. I have no comments.

Russian Federation.

Ms. O. MOZOLINA (Russian Federation) (*interpretation from Russian*): We do not have much time left but there is obviously a misprint in the Russian text. It is on the Russian text, we do not have the English text before us, but it was _____ (*inaudible*) the Secretariat of GEO. There seems to be a problem with the English text as well because we have a chairman in this Secretariat not a director as

I understand it perhaps that could be checked. We are talking about GEO.

The CHAIRMAN (*interpretation from French*): Could I answer the colleague from the Russian Federation by saying that it is indeed the Director of the Secretariat of the GEO in Geneva that we are talking about. It is not a chairman it is a director.

Can paragraph 31 now be adopted?

Adopted.

Paragraph 32. I think we should read 32 and 33 together.

Any comments please on 32 and 33 as a whole? I see none.

Paragraphs 32 and 33 are now adopted.

Paragraph 34. No comments on 34?

Adopted.

Paragraph 35. Here we have a request for the floor from Mr. Kopal, followed by the United States.

Mr. V. KOPAL (Czech Republic): First of all, I would like to confirm that indeed we have discussed the question how to reflect the ideas and comments made in my statement in the report and find the proper way for preserving it for further discussions. I agreed to this, I confirmed it, the preparation of a working paper to be submitted well before the sessions of the Scientific and Technical Subcommittee and the Legal Committee next year and to be eventually discussed there.

My second point that I would like to say, however, is that paragraph 35, in its end, does not reflect what I was saying, it does not fully reflect what I was saying because I requested that not only non-governmental organizations working in the legal field should also be invited to consider the aspects that are mentioned here in paragraph 35 but first of all I requested this role for the Legal Subcommittee. So therefore I suggest to re-draft the end of this paragraph, it means the three last lines, saying "it was desirable that the Legal Subcommittee and non-governmental organizations working in the legal field should also be invited to consider such issues." And the rest "to brief the Legal Subcommittee on them" would be deleted. It was supported by several delegations.

The CHAIRMAN (*interpretation from French*): Thank you, Mr. Kopal, for that statement. The sentence will be re-drafted as you have indicated.

So with these amendments can we now adopt 35?

Adopted.

I am so sorry that was a little too quick because the United States had asked to speak.

Mr. K. HODGKINS (United States of America): Paragraph 35 is acceptable to us. I wanted to add a paragraph 34*bis* to reflect the view that my delegation had expressed during our discussions on other matters. I will read this through slowly but not at full dictation speed and I can give the Secretariat the paragraph if that is acceptable to everyone.

34*bis* would read as follows "The view was expressed that a new item should be added to the agenda of the Committee dealing with the use of space technology within the United Nations system. It was noted that this item could be taken up on an annual or biennial basis with the view to establishing a better understanding of how United Nations specialized agencies use space technology to fulfil their respective mandates."

I will read that one more time in order for delegations to get the idea of what we are suggesting here. Paragraph 34*bis* would read as follows "The view was expressed that a new item should be added to the agenda of the Committee dealing with the use of space technology within the United Nations system. It was noted that this item could be taken up on an annual or biennial basis with the view to establishing a better understanding of how United Nations specialized agencies use space technology to fulfil their respective mandates." Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN (*interpretation from French*): Thank you, Mr. Hodgkins, for that suggestion which would appear as 34*bis*.

Colombia please.

Mr. C. ARÉVALO-YEPES (Colombia) (*interpretation from Spanish*): This merely is a question to the representative of the United States. In this paragraph he is solely and exclusively referring to specialized agencies or are we also referring to units in the United Nations system? There is a difference because if it is part of this and the United Nations

likewise mentioned, this was something that Colombia also said, that is, the relationship between the various bodies of the United Nations specialized agencies should be increased.

The CHAIRMAN (*interpretation from French*): United States, please.

Mr. K. HODGKINS (United States of America): Whatever wording would be all inclusive is what I intend. So obviously when I use specialized agencies I am also including the offices that are part of the Interagency Meeting. Maybe there is a better way of being more inclusive but it certainly would include the specialized agencies as well as the offices.

The CHAIRMAN (*interpretation from French*): Therefore I will call on the United States delegation to hand in the text to the Secretariat, including the extra clarification provided by this exchange of views with Colombia, for inclusion in 34*bis*.

It is now 6.12 p.m., I also have an obligation to leave you at 6.15 p.m. and I have asked my Vice-Chairman to take over at 6.15 p.m. sharp. I will not be able to continue to chair this meeting beyond 6.15 p.m. Our interpreters will no longer be available after 6.15 p.m. and that is why the meeting will have to continue in English or else we will not finish our work but I think you all want us to do that.

We have adopted 35. We will be bringing in 34*bis* and we are now considering 36.

I am calling 36. I have no comments?

Adopted.

Paragraph 37. I have no comments on 37.

Adopted.

Paragraph 38.

Adopted.

Paragraph 39.

Venezuela please.

Ms. N. ORIHUELA-GUEVARA (Venezuela, Bolivarian Republic of) (*interpretation from Spanish*): I propose the following language immediately after "Moon and other celestial bodies,

and the use of nuclear energy in space, and issues related to the development of passenger space transport” and the remainder as it stands.

The CHAIRMAN (*interpretation from French*): We have a problem with that suggestion to the extent that the use of nuclear sources in space was not part of the items 1 through H in the document. Of course, in the introductory portion of the document it was there and furthermore on nuclear sources in space there is already a work plan adopted by the Committee. I would not want us to interfere with the work plan already adopted by the Committee.

Could the Venezuelan delegation suggest language that would be inserted? Either between 38 and 39, possibly reflecting the statement they made on nuclear sources in outer space.

Ms. N. ORIHUELA-GUEVARA (Venezuela, Bolivarian Republic of) (*interpretation from Spanish*): Yes, we will.

The CHAIRMAN (*interpretation from French*): Thank you for that. That is what we intend to do. This will come in between 38 and 39.

Paragraph 39 could now be adopted as it stands.

Adopted.

Paragraph 38*bis* will go in between the two.

Paragraph 40.

France please.

Mr. F. PELLERIN (France) (*interpretation from French*): I have a suggestion. The amendment would give the possibility of considering the continuation of that work which would consist of asking that this be done in addition to the normal Committee meeting to avoid losing a year. The space of one year between one and the other.

The CHAIRMAN (*interpretation from French*): I see what you intend, representative of France and we will insert language to that effect. The salient features that the informal consideration started this year should then continue and progress and during the fifty-first session should be officially considered. That is the concept that you want to put in and the sentence might be amended to that effect.

Having corrected 40 in this manner, can we now adopt it.

Since we will now be losing our interpreters we intend to continue in English and I forthwith hand over to the Vice-Chairman, Mr. Elöd Both.

Mr. A-M. Lan PHAN (Canada) (*interpretation from French*): May I yet take you back to the paragraph, since the interpreters are still here, where I had asked that we ensure consistency with the statement I made. I think it is paragraph 16, could I read it?

[sorry, interpreters are instructed to leave]

[*continued in French with no interpretation*]

The CHAIRMAN: Let me say this again in English. I thank the Canadian delegation for this proposed new wording of paragraph 16. The Canadian delegation will now elaborate with the help of the Secretariat an English version of this and that will be presented to the delegation in the English language. If the Canadian delegation agrees with this procedure.

I have to apologize. I have to leave and I will now ask Elöd Both to take over the chairmanship of the Committee for the rest of the evening. In the meantime I am happy to inform you that the Chinese delegation has provided text for paragraph 51*ter* which would come after 51*bis* and that will be read by my Vice-Chairman.

I thank you for your cooperation, I am very sorry that I cannot be with you until the end but in fact you will see me next year, beginning of June 2008. I will be staying in touch with Sergio, I will be staying in touch with his successor and we will meet some of you in New York when we present the report of the Committee to the Fourth Committee in the third week of October. Again, I apologize for having to leave you now.