

**Committee on the Peaceful
Uses of Outer Space***Unedited transcript***623rd** Meeting

Wednesday, 16 June 2010, 3 p.m.

Vienna

Chairman: Mr. Dumitru Dorin PRUNARIU (Romania)*The meeting was called to order at 3.24 p.m.*

The CHAIRMAN: Good afternoon, distinguished delegates, I now declare open the 623rd meeting of Committee on the Peaceful Uses of Outer Space.

This afternoon we will continue and hopefully conclude our consideration of agenda item 13, Space and climate change, we will continue our consideration of agenda item 14, Use of space technology in the United Nations system. We will begin our consideration of agenda item 15, Use of space-derived geospatial data for sustainable development, and we will continue agenda item 16, Other matters.

This afternoon there will be two technical presentations, the first one by the representative of the Space Generation Advisory Council entitled "Recommendations from the Space Generation Congress. Input from the next generation of space sector leaders on the development of space". The second one by China entitled "Global Lunar Conference".

This evening Germany has a reception at the residence. Invitations have been circulated.

We will then continue and hopefully conclude our consideration of agenda item 13, Space and climate change.

Space and climate change (agenda item 13)
(continued)

The first speaker on my list is the distinguished representative of Brazil.

Ms. DA FONSECA E SILVA (Brazil): Mr Chairman, thank you. I would like to use this opportunity to provide some information on Brazil's national monitoring systems with particular emphasis on the Amazon forest, as well as recent initiatives to introduce these systems in the African continent and other interested countries to monitor in particular change in forest cover.

Although, as previously mentioned, the operations of the Chinese-Brazilian Earth observation satellite CBERS 2B have been interrupted early this year, China and Brazil have already signed an agreement to ensure continuity of the CBERS series with CBERS 3 expected to be launched in the second semester of 2011. Meanwhile, the monitoring of the Brazilian territory, in particular the annual wall-to-wall assessment of the rate of growth of deforestation in the Brazilian Amazonia will be maintained through the use of imagery from other similar satellites such as the North American Landsat in TerraMODIS, the Indian resource satellite in the United Kingdom, DNC satellite.

Mr. Chairman, the vision shared by Brazil and China in the joint declaration made during the GEO Ministerial Summit in Cape Town in 2007 regarding free access to CBERS data to all African countries has already resulted in three international agreements for the installation of CBERS ground stations in different parts of the African continent, the Canary Islands, Egypt and South Africa.

It is our pleasure to announce four agreements to be signed early July by the Gabonese Agency of Space Study and Observation, AGEOS, Gabon, the National Institute for Space Research, INPE, Brazil, and the Institute for Research and Development, IRD,

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.



France. These agreements concern the establishment of a CBERS ground station and broad capacity building to create a centre of expertise in remote sensing for sustainable management of the environment in Gabon. It is expected that all Congo Basin countries will benefit from such initiatives, in particular for the monitoring of their forests. It is very likely that developing countries will be entitled to positive incentives to reduce emissions from deforestation or forest degradation, as well as for the maintenance of their carbon stocks for sustainable forest management and the increase of forest carbon stocks as part of the United Nations Foundation on Climate Change REDD-Plus.

To the same end, the initiatives of the Amazon Regional Centre, CRA, created in 2008 to promote widespread dissemination on the use of remotely sensed data and tools for handling large data sets for forest monitoring should help all interested countries to build technical expertise and work towards becoming autonomous in their land monitoring and reporting activities. Towards this goal, the CRA will offer training in the use of the Brazilian forest monitoring systems for estimated annual rates of deforestation and forest degradation which can be adapted to meet the specific national conditions and capacities of interested countries.

Additionally, CRA's activities also foresee cooperation to ensure free satellite data distribution to enable consistent monitoring over time. As I have already mentioned, international cooperation with the Japanese International Cooperation Agency, JICA, as proved in December 2009, will help promote forest and tropical forest monitoring over a period of three years in three languages – English, Spanish and French – using the recently developed software platform Terra Amazon by INPE presently used by Brazil in its Amazon rainfall forest monitoring system for deforestation and forest degradation assessments.

Likewise, the Memorandum of Understanding signed between INPE and FAO in Copenhagen, Denmark in December 2009 envisaged the dissemination of the forest monitoring systems to all developing countries interested, as well as to propose MRV tools that may be useful for REDD-Plus at some stage. It is expected that FAO and INPE will provide the necessary tools and training to allow national implementation of REDD-Plus, thus facilitating access to incentives to reduce emissions from deforestation and forest degradation, such as that from the recent Global Forest Partnership signed in Oslo last week.

The training will be initiated in the second half of 2010 and will engage some countries from the Congo Basin as well as from South America.

Mr. Chairman, thank you very much.

The CHAIRMAN: I thank the distinguished representative of Brazil for her statement.

The next speaker on the list is the distinguished representative of France.

Mr. HUCTEAU (France): Thank you, Mr. Chairman. In connection with what we mentioned in the course of the general debate regarding the launch of the Picard satellite, I wanted to take the floor again to provide more information, an update on this mission.

The Picard satellite, yesterday on 15 June, was launched into space by the Dnepr launch vehicle from the Yasny launch base in Russia. It was initially envisaged for March but it was delayed several times but finally yesterday the launch took place.

Picard separated from the third phase of the rocket 15 minutes after launch and was placed in the lower terrestrial orbit less than 800 kilometres in altitude. The first signs of life from the Picard satellite were rapidly visible from the Kiruna base in Sweden. This is a CNES satellite, its name is Picard, it was designed to measure simultaneously such parameters as the speed of the revolving of the sun, its radiation, the presence of spots on the surface, its form and diameter to better understand how the sun functions.

Another part of the mission would be to give us more information regarding the relationship that exists between solar activity and climate change on Earth. On the other hand, it should provide necessary data to improve the models currently used to foresee the evolution of solar activity over the 11-year cycle.

Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN: Thank you, distinguished delegate of France for this important information. I hope it will settle the world problems because we need it for the space weather initiative.

Is there any other delegation wishing to speak under this agenda item at this afternoon meeting? I see none.

We have therefore concluded our consideration of agenda item 13, Space and climate change.

Distinguished delegates, the Inter-Agency Meeting held its thirtieth session in Geneva from 10 to 12 March 2010. I would like now to invite Mr. Atila Matas of the International Telecommunication Union to report on the outcome of the meeting on behalf of the Chairman of the thirtieth session of the Inter-Agency Meeting, Mr. Yvon Henri of the ITU. This is included in the use of space technology in the United Nations system, item 14.

Mr. Matas, you have the floor.

Mr. MATAS (International Telecommunication Union, ITU): Thank you, Mr. Chairman, good afternoon Ladies and Gentlemen, distinguished delegates. The annual United Nations Inter-Agency Meeting on Outer Space Activities serves as the focal point for inter-agency coordination and cooperation in space-related activities.

This year the thirtieth annual session of the Inter-Agency Meeting was held in Geneva from 10 to 12 March and hosted by the International Telecommunication Union. Representatives of eight United Nations entities participated in the meeting. The report of the meeting is before you in document A/AC.105/960.

The main issues before the meeting were the adoption of the Secretary-General's report containing document A/AC.105/961, which is also before you. Discussion on the future prospects for improved coordination, cooperation and synergy within the United Nations system in space-related activities and the importance of satellite communication during disasters and emergency situations, which were also the topics for this year's formal sessions within the representatives of Member States.

The theme chosen for this year's open informal session held on the afternoon of 12 March was the space technology for emergency communications with a view to engaging Member States in a direct dialogue with United Nations entities on the importance of space technology to better predict catastrophes, warn people in advance and when it occurs quickly help and restore white-out communication.

The opening formal session was well attended by the Member States and presentations were made by the UNOOSA, UN-SPIDER, and two ITU sectors, ITU-D and ITU-R and WMO.

Distinguished delegates, I will now briefly report on the meeting highlights. Delegations will

recall that the General Assembly, in its resolution 64/86 of 10 December 2009 welcomed the increased effort to strengthen further the inter-agency meetings as the central United Nations mechanisms for building partnership and coordination in space-related activities. Starting in 2002, a reform process was initiated aimed at streamlining the meeting's efficiency and effectiveness in the context of growing importance of space applications for United Nations entities and taking into account the Secretary-General's commitment to deliver S1. Such reforms included the publication of space solutions, interruption of the open-ended informal sessions and at the end, change of reporting structure when the annual reports were revitalized and the IAM reporting directly to the COPUOS. I am pleased to inform you that during the ensuing discussion this year measures to further enhance UN coordination reports through the establishment of long-standing mechanisms were identified.

The structure of the Secretary-General's report has been dramatically overhauled and its contents will be closer aligned to the forward-looking thematic clusters work and cross-cutting issues of the Commission on Sustainable Development in view of the increasing role that space technology and the applications hold in achieving sustainable development. Further, the Secretary-General's report will from now be issued on a biennial basis, starting with the period 2012 to 2013 with a review of the reporting structure in 2017. The report will also identify challenges facing the space-related activities of the United Nations system in monitoring progress made in addressing those challenges.

In 2009 the IAM adopted the report "Space benefits for Africa: Contribution of the United Nations system", which was prepared by the UNOOSA in cooperation with ECA. This report was presented at the Third Africa Leadership Conference in Algeria in December 2009. The report is contained in the document A/AC.105/941 which you have before you.

The meeting this year agreed that the next report will address climate change and the use of space technology within the United Nations system to be prepared under the leadership of WMO in cooperation with the UNOOSA and with the contribution of the UNFCCC Secretariat and the other United Nations entities for endorsement by the meeting at its thirty-first session in 2011 and for submission to the fifty-fourth session of the COPUOS next year. This report will be presented at the Conference of the Parties to the United Nations Convention on Climate Change.

The meeting also agreed that in the year when there is no report to the Secretary-General, a special report on the selected topics should be considered.

UNOOSA, as the Inter-Agency Secretariat, is continuing its efforts to involve the participation of a greater number of United Nations entities and programmes in the inter-agency meetings. In that regard, the meeting agreed that Geneva was the most convenient venue for the future meetings. UNOOSA is coordinating the Geneva-based United Nations entities, some of which have offered to host the thirty-first session in 2011.

Building on the relationship between the United Nations Geographical Information Group and in order to facilitate the integration of(?), the agenda items of the Inter-Agency in the agenda of the UNGIWG, the meeting recommended that the thirty-first session to be held in conjunction with the annual meeting of UNGIWG in Geneva during the first half of 2011. The meeting agreed to issue a brochure drawing in the main elements of the special publication on climate change to be prepared by the UNOOSA in consultation with the WMO, the UNFCCC Secretariat and other United Nations entities for publication in time for the Conference of Parties to the United Nations Convention on Climate Change to be held in late 2011.

Mr. Chairman, distinguished delegates, the presentations made at the Inter-Agency Meeting this year and the open informal session, as well as all the reports and up-to-date information on the current space-related activities of the United Nations entities are available on the website dedicated to the coordination of outer space activities within the UN system on the UNOOSA website.

This concludes my report on the thirtieth session of the Inter-Agency Meeting. Thank you very much for your attention.

The CHAIRMAN: Thank you very much, distinguished representative of ITU.

Is there any delegation wishing to speak on agenda item 14, Use of space technology in the United Nations system? I see none.

We will continue and hopefully conclude our consideration of agenda item 14, Use of space technology in the United Nations system, tomorrow morning.

I would now like to begin our consideration of agenda item 15, Use of space-derived geospatial data for sustainable development.

I would like to start by noting that in paragraph 2 of its resolution 64/86, the General Assembly agreed that the Committee should continue to consider at its fifty-third session its agenda item entitled "International cooperation in promoting the use of space-derived geospatial data for sustainable development" to allow the Committee to finalize its report containing recommendations on ways and means of fostering international cooperation with a view to building up national infrastructure for the use of space-derived data. The Secretariat has circulated a note on international cooperation in promoting the use of space-derived geospatial data for sustainable development in document A/AC.105/2010/CRP.7/Add.1 which has been placed in your pigeon-holes.

I now want to give the floor to the Secretariat to make an explanation to this.

Mr. HEDMAN (Secretariat): Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Yes, very briefly an explanation.

In addition to what the Secretariat briefed delegations on yesterday in introducing the document CRP.7, which is the main bulk of what will be a final report under this agenda item, and CRP.7/Add.1, which contains an updated set of recommendations provided by the delegation of Brazil. It is the understanding of the Secretariat that the delegation of Brazil will conduct informal consultations on the content of this particular CRP.7/Add.1 and the Secretariat has made available room M-7 from 9 a.m. until lunch tomorrow for such consultations, and delegations who are interested are invited to contact the delegation of Brazil to decide on how to conduct these informal consultations.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN: Thank you. I now return to the list of speakers. The first speaker on my list is the distinguished representative of India.

Mr. GOWRISANKAR (India): Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

The Indian delegation is delighted to note that the deliberation on this agenda has asked the Committee to finalize its report on ways and means of

fostering information and cooperation with a view to building a national infrastructure for the use of space-derived geospatial data.

India places great importance on international cooperation for taking up new scientific and technological challenges and also for defending the international framework for peaceful uses of outer space. Currently, India operates through a memorandum of understanding agreements with more than 30 countries and international organizations on this subject. In the past year, India added three more countries into its cooperation umbrella, namely Argentina, Saudi Arabia and the Republic of Korea. India also plays an active role in several international bodies in fostering partnership with member countries in sharing and use of space technology for the benefit of mankind.

Mr. Chairman, many of these understandings pave the way for sharing our expertise and experience in the use of space-derived geospatial information for sustainable development. To initiate this space programme for the development and purpose in, India is establishing a user terminal to receive multi-spectral observation data from Indian mini-satellite IMS-1.

India is also closely working with France in jointly developing a megatropic observation satellite that will benefit the global community in weather and climate studies. India has also agreed to share the data from recently launched Oceansat-2 with major space agencies for transmitting the same to the global community in metrology and oceanography.

India is actively participating in the initiatives of the Asia-Pacific Regional Space Agency Forum, including the Sentinel Asia project and the satellite technology for the Asia-Pacific region, the STAR programme, and sharing satellite data and expertise for the benefit of this region.

The Indian delegation is happy to announce that India hosted the Secretariat for the International Charter on Space and Major Disasters and has contributed significantly to supporting disaster assessment and relief activities in different parts of the world.

Under a strong programme of Asian countries, India is committed to provide a Doppler weather radar to Nepal which will be established near Kathmandu. India is also committed to sharing data obtained from a radar satellite with Asian countries mainly for disaster

management support. India has recently started providing(?) data to Brazil under a cooperative agreement.

Mr. Chairman, sharing of expertise in space, the SHARES programme, is a scheme that India has set up in which training in the application of space technology is provided to scientists from other developing countries. So far 35 officials from 17 developing countries have benefited under this scheme. The newly affiliated Centre for Space Science and Technology Education for Asia and the Pacific set up in India offers training to 928 scholars from 48 countries in various fields of space technology.

India is actively participating in the global observation systems and foreseeing a ten-year implementation plan for the years 2005-2015 in various societal benefit areas. India is co-chairing the data-sharing task force of GEOSS along with the United States, Italy, China, Japan and the European Commission and working on an action plan for data-sharing principles for the Beijing Ministerial Summit this year. India is also hosting the Secretariat for the Global Agricultural Monitoring System of GEOSS. The Indian delegation is happy to announce that India will take the chair of the Committee on Earth Observation System, CEOS, for 2012 and host the plenary in its activities of supporting space-based virtual constellation of satellites on various themes by committing its satellites and data products.

In conclusion, the Indian delegation would like to convey that India supports COPUOS and all its activities to increase awareness of space-based benefits and aiding developing countries in the use of the space-derived geospatial data for sustainable development.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN: I thank the distinguished representative of India for his statement.

The next speaker on my list is the distinguished representative of Malaysia.

Mr. SALAM (Malaysia): Thank you, Mr. Chairman. [almost inaudible]

My delegation wishes to inform that the Department of Survey and Mapping Malaysia (JUPEM) was established under the Global Navigation Satellite System (GNSS) infrastructure, which is called MyRTKnet. It benefits GNSS users in(?) application, including surveying and mapping

indication, position,, seismic monitoring and others.

The real(?) competent web consists of 50 reference stations in peninsular Malaysia and 28 reference stations in Sabah Sarawak in East Malaysia. The network will be made available to everyone in the area. The(?) of the network is only indicating one thing, for stepping up real time GPS operation in the whole of the country. MyRTKnet is making use of the free existing royalty(?) for it appears station in

Like other reference station networks, it enables surveyors to claimlevel positioning. We are investing in, setting up local network stations which makes GPS surveying available to every surveyor who can only afford a single GPS unit instead of having two or three.

MyRTKnet will also put all users on the geocentric(?)frame. Projects such as communication infrastructures, an mass transit system will be aligned on the same system asconnecting to the network and therefore to the

Mr. Chairman, in the context of terrestrial(?) surveying, in the key terrestrial application, GNSS creates the following rules in providing for (1) establishment, improvement, intensification and maintenance of the control network section connection for the control network and periodic; a framework for the coordinated cadastral system (CCS) which is based on the fundamentalcontrol network such asnetwork and is established using the well-known ...-hold to..... principle. All terrestrial surveys shall be in some way connected to the existing control network that will control points andis needed for this purpose.

Therefore, the establishment of terrestrial control infrastructure is needed for two specific processes: (1) to adjust the whole TCTB(?) and (2) to be used as control for surveying the coordinated terrestrial system. Telecomunal(?) terrestrial control infrastructure consists of four phases including the commission, monumentation, GNSS field observation and GNSS processing and assessment. Terrestrial control is connected toor MCPM(?) through the GNSS network.

MyRTKnet with the establishment of the terrestrial control infrastructure will survey and employ an authenticconcept. It will make GNSS

and GLS computable since coordinates are the basic input for the output unit of..... . It is proposed to use for acquisition and storage, processing and waste maintaining.

Mr. Chairman, the rule of regional working group of the Permanent Committee of GIS Infrastructure in the Asia and Pacific Region, PCIAP, is the coordinating regional cooperation in among national agencies and the new interregional security infrastructure. One ongoing activity of the working group is the Asia-Pacific Security Project. The Asia-Pacific Security Project is where member agencies contribute or continue global verifications to assist the working group. GNSS data from the regionalprogramme high-level participant members canglobalin local application.

The composite GNSS is subsequently realized by the working group's to estimation coordinates in the international terrestrial network frame, the result of the general project how to supply the working group to the international terrestrial reference regimecentral to identify the international terrestrial reference frame in the specification. We would explain the rule as one of the contributing agencies whereby several GNSS data from operating reference station will get concrete data and submit it to the working group for real GNSS kingpin

I thank you, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN: I thank the distinguished representative of Malaysia for his statement.

Is there any other delegation wishing to speak under this agenda item?

The United States of America has the floor.

Mr. HIGGINS (United States): Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

I wanted first to thank the Secretariat for providing us with CRP.7 dealing with the cooperation and promoting the use of space-derived geospatial data for sustainable development. I think this paper CRP.7 captures the discussions that we have had over the past several years, including the discussions we had at last year's session.

Mr. Chairman, I have to admit that there is a bit of confusion as to how we are supposed to proceed based on my delegation's understanding of how we are going to treat this item this year, as is reflected in last

year's report, and I call delegates' attention to the report from last year's session of the full Committee. At that time we had I think developed the report fairly sufficiently, but we agreed that we needed one more year to consider various inputs that had been received, so my delegation came here fully expecting that we could dispose of this item on the basis of CRP.7.

At the time last year in paragraph 303 the Committee agreed that the delegation of Brazil would hold informal intersessional consultations with all interested members of the Committee to reach consensus on a proposal for a draft set of recommendations. The Committee agreed that on the basis of those recommendations, the information contained in CRP.3 from last year in the discussions at the present session of the Committee, the Secretariat would prepare a draft report in the form of a conference room paper to be submitted to the Committee in 2010 for its consideration and finalization.

But now, Mr. Chairman, you have announced that there is going to be another set of consultations tomorrow: We were going to discuss CRP.7/Add.1, which is a stark departure in my delegation's view from what was contained, or what is contained, in CRP.7. So, from the procedural standpoint, my delegation is wondering what we are supposed to do now, because Addendum 1 suggests complete substitution of paragraphs 42 and 50 of CRP.7, which means that we are now going to have to go back and analyse the recommendations in Addendum 1 which, from my delegation's standpoint, is not going to be possible at this session of the Committee.

My delegation's real concern is that this item is kind of limping along into the future and we are not bringing this to a close when it was the intent to produce a report and finalize our work. Last year we thought we would give ourselves one more year, but it seems as though now that we are taking a bit of a step backwards.

So I guess, Mr. Chairman, that I am putting these views out for consideration of the other members and asking the question what are we going to do with this item at the end of this week.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN: Thank you, distinguished representative of the United States of America.

Before answering, I will give the floor to Belgium.

Mr. MAYENCE (Belgium): Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

I would like to take the floor just to explain what happened on CRP.7 since the last session of the Committee, since Belgium participated in what it could call the informal discussions that were held on the recommendations part that had been presented by Brazil last year.

What happened was that in the sidelines of the Committee last year we had an informal meeting with Brazil, as well as other delegations that were present, and Belgium committed itself vis-à-vis Brazil to an alternative draft recommendation, and I think that this is what was the situation in October 2009, this is what was done then. So possibly there were some technical problems, the draft did not circulate the way it should have, but in any case the Brazilian delegation did receive it this year and did take this into account in the material that it conveyed to the Secretariat for the development of CRP.7/Add.1.

I have just taken the floor to say that much of the substance in CRP.7 and what is actually the contribution of Belgium, as well as other States, but possibly we were the ones who replied to the Brazilian proposal in the greater substance. So as far as I am concerned I am really under the impression that we fully applied the procedure that was proposed last year, because last year various delegations had problems with the language of the Brazilian proposal and we put some work into that draft and the Brazilian delegation was then able to come up with another draft this year.

We are ready to discuss this informally, but as we see things, our goal is to have a document that could be adopted this year and, just as the United States have said, I would confirm that it is this year that my delegation would like to adopt the draft as proposed and as it will look after the consultation that we will be holding this week.

Thank you.

The CHAIRMAN: Thank you, distinguished representative of Belgium.

I will not have a consultation with the Secretariat I will give you the answer.

I give the floor to the delegation of Brazil to give some explanations.

Ms. DA FONSECA E SILVA (Brazil): I wish to thank the Belgian delegate for his comments.

Yes, we received a welcome contribution from the Belgian delegate last year, in October, and we believe this already reflects many of the inputs and comments received by all the delegations last year, so in many ways this document is a ready reaction to all previous comments received last year, and so we are very happy to present it this way.

However, there may have been really some technical problems in circulating, as we expected this to have been circulated before. We note that the previous version of the document CRP.7 had the recommendations exactly as they were presented last year, so it had not shown any advance in relation to last year. So this is the new proposal, and we are happy to hear any new comments tomorrow morning, as mentioned by the Secretariat.

The CHAIRMAN: Is there necessarily any other explanation from the Secretariat or from the Chair?

The United States of America has the floor.

Mr. HIGGINS (United States): Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Chairman, again I have to admit that I am not quite sure how we will proceed. We have CRP.7, which purports to represent the results of several year of discussion, including last year. Now, I do not recall that we had the intersessional consultations on this particular paper. We reviewed CRP.7: it is fairly consistent with our views as to where we should end up in terms of a final report.

The challenge we now have with Addendum 1 is that it seems to be taking a different approach. First of all, in Addendum 1 we have a whole section that reads like a preamble to a General Assembly resolution, which is just a very fundamental concern that my delegation has.

Secondly, the recommendations in paragraph 1 through 6, I know that a couple of them track with what is in CRP.7, but some of them take a totally path in terms of what we are asking States to do. For example, in paragraph 5 we ask that States encourage developing countries to make full use of satellite capacity – that is fine – but then we say to

that end States should ensure full transparency on mechanisms, channels or procedures which allow developing countries to have access at the lowest cost or free of charge, and so on and so forth. I do not recall where that came from in terms of our discussions.

So I am concerned that we are going to have to start really from the beginning, going through these recommendations and seeing how the recommendations in Addendum 1 can be brought back in line with what we believe is better reflected in terms of recommendations in CRP.7.

Thank you.

The CHAIRMAN: Thank you, distinguished representative of the United States.

Distinguished delegates, in my view, the only way to solve the problem is to have tomorrow some informal consultations and to solve all these misunderstandings; after that to submit the report to be approved by the Committee. Do you agree with this proposal?

The distinguished representative of the United States has the floor.

Mr. HIGGINS (United States): Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Well, Mr. Chairman, we are always prepared to engage in the informal consultation but to hear the proposal means that we are going to meet from 9 a.m. to noon tomorrow, and our session begins at 10 a.m. So that means that there are going to be some delegations who are going to have to decide whether they attend this session or they attend the consultations. Tomorrow morning we are still have some very important matters that will have to be taken up, so the best that can probably happen is for an hour, which will be from 9 until 10 a.m. we can discuss this, and then we will have to decide on how to proceed, I suppose.

Thank you.

The CHAIRMAN: Thank you. We could allow more time for consultation if necessary, if you reach an agreement in one hour, half an hour. It is much better that you take part in the Conference. There is no other time and no other way to solve this misunderstanding.

The distinguished representative of the United Kingdom has the floor.

Ms KEYTE (United Kingdom): Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

I have just one small comment to add. Could I ask that the addendum is added electronically to the papers available by COPUOS as soon as possible, so that we can actually circulate this to random experts and get comments, because as our United States colleague has mentioned, we now need to get comments very quickly, indeed by 9 a.m. tomorrow, which will be difficult for me, let alone I presume some other colleagues in this room who work on different time-scales.

Thank you.

The CHAIRMAN: Thank you. We will arrange with the Secretariat to do it.

So tomorrow morning the consultations will start at 9 a.m. in room M-7. Thank you.

Is there any other delegation wishing to speak under this agenda item at this afternoon's meeting?

The distinguished representative of China has the floor.

Ms Kun PAN (China): We would like to make a statement on this agenda item 13. Thank you. Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Chairman, in recent years, China has witnessed all-round development in its geospatial infrastructure and applications, particularly in its space-derived geospatial information acquisition capability, geospatial information application services and the geographic information industry. China now has much stronger and digitized capability for acquiring space-derived geospatial information, and the Foundation have underlined that national geospatial resources have been made.

China has put into operation meteorological, maritime and a semi-terrestrial remote sensing satellite backbone series, Earth observation(?) flights, Beijing 1, a double satellite navigation experimental system, and small satellites for environmental and disaster monitoring. A new generation of satellite navigation systems is under development.

Progress has been made in the construction and integration of remote sensing satellite ground systems with more and more information resources. Geospatial information applications services are beginning to generate effects. A group of R&D and

demonstration systems is in business operation and provides important support for national and local resources and the environment surveys dynamic monitoring, planning and management as well as decision making. They have produced enormous effects in resources survey, environmental assessment, disaster monitoring and assessment, estimates of crop production, transportation and E-government.

The geographic information industry has already developed its basic structure. Geographic information services are developing rapidly in telecommunications, energy as well as in societal administration and the services. The vehicle monitoring business and the satellite navigation industry are growing very fast in size. The sector of remote sensing data acquisition and processing is in accelerated development and the R&D for remote sensing satellites is beginning to be commercialized.

There is a rapidly growing number of businesses engaged in geographic information technology development and application services, generating steadily increasing output from data services and engineering. In the years to come, China's space-derived geospatial information sources will become greatly more assured.

At the same time, China has conducted excessive international cooperation in space-derived geospatial information acquisition, reception processing and application. China/Brazil Earth resources satellite CBERS co-developed by China and Brazil has made important contributions for sustainable development in the two countries and their respective neighbours, and the data from these satellites are distributed to the African region free of charge. Ground stations for CBERS and the small satellites for environmental monitoring and disaster relief have been established in South Africa and Thailand and have actively promoted data application of space-derived geospatial information.

Having acceded to the International Charter on Space and Major Disasters, China provides space data with its own space-derived information resources for natural disaster monitoring in other countries.

Mr. Chairman, the Earth is the homeland for all mankind. It is our unshirkable responsibility to promote the use of space-derived geospatial data for sustainable development through extensive international cooperation. China is ready with all countries of the world to take an active part in the international cooperation in Earth observation and satellite navigation with a view to establishing an

Earth-space integrated Earth observation system and achieving space-derived geospatial data sharing and thus making due contributions for the sustainable development of mankind.

Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN: I thank the distinguished representative of China for her statement.

Is there any other delegation wishing to speak under this agenda item?

The distinguished representative of Germany has the floor.

Mr. PFANNE (Germany): I would like to mention a possible overlap from activities with the Statistical Division of the United Nations, especially the meeting that was held in New York on 10 and 11 May, chaired by Dr. Paul Cheung, Director of the United Nations Statistics Division, and attended by experts from 16 Member States and representatives of 15 non-governmental organizations. This meeting intended to follow the tradition of the UN resolution of 1948 and the ECOSOC resolution for conducting the Regional Cartographic Conference for the Americas, Asia and Pacific. There was an effort to build the UN spatial data infrastructure, which is a very complicated effort.

I would like to draw your attention to the European Union Directive INSPIRE, which has very practical consequences. It is a general framework for a spatial data infrastructure for the purposes of the European Community environmental policies and policies or activities which have an impact on the environment. It entered into force on 15 May 2007 and it is based on the infrastructures of spatial information established and operated by 27 Member States of the European Union. So there is a really huge effort to understand what practically is concerned and gathered on data of all kinds and different countries.

The Directive addresses 34 spatial data scenes needed for environmental applications, and the purpose is to ensure that the spatial data infrastructure of the Member States is compatible and usable in a Community and transboundary context. It goes from very active space-bearing nations to less active nations and tries to harmonize everything and especially with a focus on practical activities.

The INSPIRE Directive requires of course additional legislation or common implementing rules, and they are adopted for a number of specific areas,

metadata, interoperability of spatial data sets and services, network services, data and service sharing, monitoring and recording, and these are published either as Commission regulations or as decisions. The Commission assisted in the process of adopting such rules by a regulatory committee, the INSPIRE Committee, composed of representatives of the Member States and chaired by representatives of the Commission. This is known as the comitology procedure.

So I think this regional example of JOR(?) information mechanism could serve as a model to proceed on that road.

Thank you very much for your attention.

The CHAIRMAN: Thank you, distinguished representative of Germany.

Is there any other delegation wishing to speak on this agenda item? I see none.

We will continue our consideration of agenda item 15, Use of space-derived geospatial data for sustainable development tomorrow morning – of course, after consultations.

I would like now to continue our consideration of agenda item 16, Other matters, to consider this afternoon the following sub-items: Organizational matters. The request for reflecting in the report views expressed by regional groups, and Future role of the Committee.

Other matters (agenda item 16) (continued)

Organizational matters. The request for reflecting in the report views expressed by regional groups

Future role of the Committee

There are several delegations that have already put down their names as speakers.

The first delegation who wants to have the floor is the delegation of Venezuela.

Mr. BECERRA (Venezuela): Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman.

Before I make comments on this agenda item, I have a point of order. With the greatest respect and because we are discussing what we are going to discuss this is particularly relevant. We have to take the

maximum advantage of the time we have allocated to the COPUOS sessions. Today we started at 3.25 p.m. and this morning after 10.15 a.m. So that means 40 minutes roughly wasted. I am saying this precisely because when we talk about this subject, delegations have asked to be given a chance to speak and we need the time to be able to discuss this item and continue with our agenda.

We believe that it is very important – in fact this item is the most important of the substantive items. We have to draw a distinction here between substantive items and technical presentations. For example, when Japan asked to be given a chance to move their presentation to the afternoon because we needed more time to discuss that substantive item, that was very meaningful. Would it be possible perhaps to be more disciplined, not to have to wait for 25 minutes after the planned time of the start of our work and have delegations sit here and wait, wasting time specifically allotted to the discussion of very important substantive items? Earlier we spoke and we were cut short because we were running out of time. This should not be the way it is. We have to take more control of our time to be really efficient.

I am also taking advantage of this opportunity to say that, with regard to technical presentations, we have to be very careful – they are important, do not misunderstand, do not misinterpret me, technical presentations are important – but we have many, many of those and we really have to be selective here, because a lot of the technical presentations are not directly related to the remit of COPUOS and they take a lot of time, and some of them are basically designed to promote services and products of a commercial nature, whereas the idea of this Committee is to work for the benefit of all mankind, to see the best ways to apply technology and science for the benefit of humankind, for our nations, not commercial promotions of any sort.

Now on agenda item 17(16?), I am going to be very brief. This delegation applauds all these initiatives, welcomes some, they are very important because precisely we need to take our time in hand and make the best use of it. That said, we share the concerns of the Chinese delegation. I am not going to repeat that, because the Chinese delegation very clearly expressed these concerns this morning.

With reference to paragraph 13 of the proposals before us, the time for statements and for presentations – we have to look for the best methods, the best procedures. People talk about eliminating days

from our work, but how do we use those days, that is the point? Let us say ten minutes at the most, three pages at the most, for those presentations, otherwise we can spend hours and hours. Let us respect all delegations all of our time, highlight the most important things – ten minutes, three pages – and it is the responsibility of the delegations themselves to make sure that they fit those parameters, and when they go beyond the time limits, we should take action. Improve process, time management, take control, statements and presentations need to fit within time limits and the delegations must see to it.

This is all I wanted to say this morning. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN: Thank you, distinguished representative of Venezuela.

As you have seen, I was here sharp at 10 a.m. and 3 p.m., but with only one third of the delegations in the room it was quite impossible to start right on time. I was even asked unofficially to repeat some information I already gave in the morning because the delegations were not in the conference room, so I prefer to start a little bit later and to not repeat anything, than starting sharp and not having anybody here.

I fully agree that we should start sharp at 10 a.m. and at 3 p.m. I ask delegations for more discipline at least during the next two days and especially as regards the questions of the organization during “Other matters” to have the opinions of more delegations and if it is necessary to take some measures or to decide on something.

Thank you.

The next delegation wishing to speak on this agenda item is the distinguished representative of Colombia. You have the floor.

Mr. YEPES (Colombia): Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman.

I am going to be very brief because I already had an opportunity to speak in connection with this item and also when I spoke regarding the United Nations policies in space activities. At this point on behalf of my delegation I would like to thank all those who have supported the proposal and in February we put forward our proposal with regard to space policy. Obviously, we met with support in New York and other delegations and we will continue developing those ideas in accordance with our mandate.

Under agenda item 14, I already pointed out the result of consultations. I sense that the theme continues to be in the focus of the delegations' interest, so it needs to be elaborated further and we will continue considering it in the sessions of COPUOS, hopefully more consultations will take place. We were able to consult at the time of the Scientific and Technical Subcommittee session in February.

A number of delegations have made their own contributions to this discussion, making it even more relevant, providing their perspective. This subject should not be marginalized. We believe that it should not figure in "Other matters" but is worthy of a stand-alone agenda item. It should read "Future role of the Committee". This would be a simple way of putting it, but we believe that putting that on the agenda would be welcomed by many delegations and they have already expressed their profound interest in this subject and emphasized its relevance.

Thank you very much.

The CHAIRMAN: Thank you, distinguished representative of Colombia.

Are there any other delegations wishing to speak? First, the delegation of Italy, then the delegation of the Czech Republic, and then the United States.

Distinguished representative of Italy, you have the floor.

Ms PASTORELLI (Italy): Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman.

The Italian delegation would like to join the other delegations in supporting proposals which could encourage more effective work within COPUOS. Our delegation is ready to work with other Member States in the effort of making the debate of 42 subcommittees and the main Committee of COPUOS more efficient and effective. In this regard we would like here to bring to the attention of all delegations the possible institution of an informal working group in order to present an agreed draft set of procedures for the work of the COPUOS to be submitted to the COPUOS for approval.

Thank you very much.

The CHAIRMAN: Thank you, distinguished representative of Italy

The next speaker is the distinguished representative of the Czech Republic. Professor Kopal, you have the floor.

Mr. KOPAL (Czech Republic): Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

I will start with a special remark. I remember several sessions, if I could not many sessions, of the Committee and of the subcommittees and I have been comparing them with the present practice particularly of the Committee and I have to say that the character of the sessions has been changing in the last year. We listen to too many reports informing us about national activities, about different projects and so on and so on, and we have less opportunity to negotiate.

In the past, you know, the work was done in the subcommittees, but the subcommittees sometimes could not reach an agreement, a conclusion, and the debate continued during the session of the main Committee. These often informal consultations and meetings of working groups helped very much and it was possible that during the main Committee the conclusions were successfully reached.

So this I wanted to bring to the attention of the delegates. Perhaps we should try to return a little bit more to the older practice and indeed to limit our information statements and papers, studies, presentations – technical presentations. I think that indeed there should be a certain fixed number of these presentations during the session of both the main Committee and the subcommittees, well, first come, first served, and at the same time there should be a certain balance. Of course there should be indeed the best presentations executed.

Also, I believe that perhaps 20 minutes could be still a little bit more limited. I would suggest 15 minutes, because it is not necessary to elaborate in greater detail. What is essential is to inform about the conclusions, about the result and this can be summarized within 15 minutes.

Secondly, I would also like to support your statement when you made an appeal for greater discipline. There should be discipline not only perhaps in starting, but sometimes it is difficult to be on time here because you have other talks, other discussions and consultations outside the conference room, but particularly in coming for presentation of statements. At this session we heard still statements on the general

exchange of views during the second week. It is not possible. There was a reservation for this purpose for two days according to the tentative schedule of work and I think these two days should be sufficient. If indeed necessary we could extend it perhaps for half a day or so, but not until the second week. This is too much.

Thirdly, I would like to state that I appreciate the publication of the provisional agenda document by the Secretariat. It is first of all a very useful document, and the tentative schedule of work, as was already mentioned this morning by one delegation, is very good for orientation. I have checked, for example, the schedule of work for today and indeed we are considering these points, so if we really keep it for all days of our session it would be very helpful.

I have listened with attention to the views that were pronounced this morning and also this afternoon by other delegations. Some of these views indeed are useful, some of them in my assessment are not that useful. For example, I fear that if some members of the delegations come only for two days or three days and then they leave, then again other delegates come, their experts or someone like that, they will not see any continuity in the session of the Committee and there is a danger of the fragmentation of our session.

Finally, I would like to make one more remark. I fully agree with the proposals made by the Scientific and Technical Subcommittee. I think we could extend these proposals also for other bodies, I mean for the main Committee and for the Legal Subcommittee, and I fully agree that we should cancel the request for unedited transcripts, because they are useless. Frankly speaking, I never use it, and it is expensive. I never use it because it is not precise, nobody controls it, nobody checks it, whether it was really said, because it is also made from translations and so on, so why should we have such a costly document? But, on the other hand, I would insist on having good reports and as valuable and as concise and precise and extensive as they are today, because we cannot accept any limitation of these reports. The present size is always appropriate, about 30 or more pages are sufficient, and I think they are indeed valuable.

Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN: Thank you very much, Professor Kopal, for your very valuable recommendations and information based on very old and fruitful experience with COPUOS. I encourage delegations to make such proposals, to sustain, to

agree, and if you agree, we will take measures for next year.

The next delegation on my list is the distinguished representative of the United States of America.

Mr. HIGGINS (United States): Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

First, let me again reiterate our appreciation to the Secretariat for putting together Non-paper 1 which we believe contains many useful suggestions on how we can conduct our work more efficiently, more effectively.

Secondly, I think there are some very good ideas expressed by our speakers, particularly the need for discipline among the delegations on arriving here on time, beginning the meetings promptly. Limiting the length of statements I think would be extremely effective in terms of how we use our time. In terms of special presentations, I agree we have to strike a balance between the need for us to consider the substantive items, or having the time to consider substantive items, with the need to continually revitalize the work of our Committee and subcommittees by hearing from eminent personalities from outside the national delegations. I think that the presentations have enriched the work of this Committee, the presence of experts coming to Vienna to participate in our work gives delegates exposure to people that we might not otherwise interact with, and on the flipside it gives the Committee higher visibility in the space community.

So I think on balance that having these special presentations is a good idea, though we do have to be disciplined in how much time we give each of the speakers. I believe that the Committee should not send the wrong message to our colleagues who have come here to make special presentations, that is the fact that we do not appreciate what they do and that we consider it to be a burden. I think there are ways of working around that.

I would like to suggest another practical step that we can take in terms of using our time more efficiently. We have a speakers' list and the speakers' list is designed to give delegations an idea of when they want to speak, indicate to the Chair that their delegation wishes to speak under a specific agenda item, but in theory that speakers' list is also there to limit the number of interventions one delegation makes on a particular item. In theory, once you have spoken and you have been on the list, then that should be it,

unless you have to raise a point of order or write a reply or make some inquiry of the Chair. We have in the past, as I think many of us are aware, delegations at any particular time making multiple interventions under the same agenda item, which uses a considerable amount of time.

So I would suggest that if we are having a list of steps to be taken, starting our meetings promptly, trying to limit the length of statements should be on that list as well as limiting the number of interventions that delegations can make under a specific item once they have spoken as a result of being on the speakers' list.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN: Thank you, distinguished representative of the United States.

The next speaker on my list is the distinguished representative of Mexico.

Mr. CAMACHO (Mexico): Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

I am going to try to be brief. Getting back to the items before us that we are addressing at present, I will try not to repeat what has already been said.

Mr. Chairman, my delegation deeply agrees. We should seek to streamline, rationalize, optimize the use we make of the time that we have. This said, various proposals have been presented here. These proposals are sometimes headed in different directions, sometimes in diametrically different directions, so I would like to make an appeal here. I would like to encourage one and all in the room to think through the consequences that taking one decision or another could have.

If we for example open items in the agenda one after the other, my delegation believes that that would allow us to maintain a certain order in the way we broach items. We will know where we are and what we are supposed to be addressing. That could have yet another consequence. If we have not provided for opening more items, once all the speakers under a given item have spoken, then we will not be able to use the remaining time. Why is it that we have various items which are opened concurrently, at the same time it is because this matter had already been looked into by the Committee and the Committee had felt that it would be wiser once speakers had been exhausted on a given item for us to go on to consideration of yet another item.

So in saying this, I would encourage you to think through the consequences of whatever decision may be taken.

We believe furthermore that the technical presentations are valuable, not just because we have experts coming here from various countries who are brilliant, but also because our delegations are able, even though we do not necessarily tune in to technical conferences in this field, to nonetheless keep up to date as to what developments may avail in these conferences dealing with peaceful uses of outer space.

Furthermore, as to the question of the reports and the costs of these reports, when we have verbatim reports that cost us roughly \$300,000 and subsequently given the difference of cost, \$30,000 for the reports we have today, we decided to use these non-revised records. If we need more information – you know that in the reports there is always a certain amount of pressure in the Secretariat to make more compact reports – I think that we would have more to lose than to gain. My delegation could work on the basis of these two options, whichever alternative is chosen, but once again I would like to encourage you to think through the consequences of whatever decision is taken.

To conclude we just wanted to support the proposal made by the delegation of Colombia. Given the fact that during these statements made, reference was made to elements that had to be factored in and possibly the proposal of Colombia could indeed be used. As the Ambassador of Colombia said, maybe this matter should be taken out of “Other matters” and “Miscellaneous”. Perhaps this would allow us to more validly take up the document which we have been considering for more than one year now which is still just an informal document.

Thank you.

The CHAIRMAN: Thank you, distinguished representative of Mexico.

The next speaker is the distinguished representative of Belgium. You have the floor.

Mr. MAYENCE (Belgium): Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

I can join various speakers speaking before me on many points, especially I can join Professor Kopal of the Czech Republic. I would like to apologize for reopening the matter under the general debate because we asked for this, and this was quite exceptionally because our Ambassador only deposited

his powers last Friday. We will make sure that that does not happen again.

On discipline: it is not new. We have always had rather slower beginning of afternoon sessions rather than morning. In order to break silence it is necessary to have a little bit of order in the room. It is the Chairman's responsibility. Maybe I could suggest the Chairman not wait for too many delegations to be present? I think that some delegations actually operate a decision to either come on time or else to rather go to a meeting that is possibly more critical. So it is not normal to have delegations who do turn up on time to have to pay the price for those who do not. But of course, this is a discretionary matter. It is in your hands, Mr. Chairman.

Now, I would like to get back to what has been said by Mr. Camacho of Mexico on the need to think through the consequences of any decisions that we may be taking in this regard. We must not forget that as the situation presently stands COPUOS includes a weekend, which means that for some delegations there is a decision to be made for either the first or the second week. Of course, this is not a choice that should paralyse the Committee, but as long as we reason on the basis of a span of time including a weekend, it is clear that some delegations will not be able to be there throughout, so I think that maybe what people need is a minimum of flexibility. I am not saying that we have to have items that stretch out and out, but we must arrange for a bit of flexibility as long as we have this more or less two-week span of session.

About limiting the technical presentations' time allotments, and I quite agree here, this is very valuable and is relevant to COPUOS. Maybe the solution would be to group them into a given time period during the session rather than stretch them out throughout. Sometimes they can interrupt consideration of a given item of the agenda, sometimes they sort of break in, intrude, into consideration of a given item of the agenda. So possibly we could concentrate them in one or two days and then go into more of a discussion and debate sort of mode of discussion of consideration of session items.

On the point made by the United States, if I correctly understood, they asked for us to take into due account the existing instruments, the journal, the indicative time schedule. It is true, we have those instruments, so before we restructure maybe we should exploit to the hilt what we already have.

On this point of limiting the number of statements made by delegations rather than as per item on the agenda, there I have my reservations, because I think that it should be possible to respond to a delegation. It is not because of the statement that has been made that we have nothing to rejoin subsequently, the philosophy of COPUOS being to have a dialogue of give and take, a discussion, not just statements delivered to which there is no possible rejoinder. So I think that we should reserve the right for delegations to react to what they have heard, and nonetheless of course somewhat restrict the time of their statements, which I will immediately apply to myself.

Thank you.

The CHAIRMAN: Thank you for your intervention, distinguished representative of Belgium.

As I understood from the proposal made by the United States, we need statements, not comments and interventions and answers to some other questions.

The next speaker on my list, the last on this agenda item, is the distinguished representative of Slovakia.

Ms KOVACOVA (Slovakia): Thank you, Mr. Chairman, for giving me the floor. I will be very short.

The Slovakian delegation fully supports the Non-paper prepared by the Secretariat and Slovakia is ready to cooperate with other delegations in this regard and hopefully next year, 2011, we will try to find positive results in – so to say, as our American distinguished delegate mentioned – revitalization of the work of the COPUOS and subcommittees on their organization matters and enhancing the efficiency of the Committee.

Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN: Thank you, distinguished representative of Slovakia.

We will continue our consideration of this Non-paper tomorrow morning, when the Secretariat will make a summary of the proposals made and will inform me about the summary.

Now we want to take into consideration Non-paper 2, Consideration of terminology adopted.

Distinguished representative of Colombia, you have the floor.

Mr. YEPES (Colombia): Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

A very simple question: I have already asked twice, actually, but once again. When are you going to be giving us the Colombian proposal on the basis of what I said when I spoke? I just wanted to ask whether this is going to happen this afternoon or not.

Thank you.

The CHAIRMAN: Yes, distinguished representative of Colombia. As we said in the beginning, first we discussed the organizational matters, and then Non-paper 2 is included in the organizational matters. The we take also your proposal, including Other matters.

The distinguished representative of the United States, you have the floor.

Mr. HIGGINS (United States): Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Just a clarification on my proposal, because if the Secretariat is listening and preparing a paper with proposals, I wanted to make sure that I was clear. In fact I did suggest that intervention should be limited to one per delegation per agenda item, unless the next intervention deals with a procedural matter or a point of clarification or inquiry to the Chair.

Thank you.

The CHAIRMAN: Thank you.

Non-paper 2, Language used in the reports of the Committee and its subsidiary bodies for reflecting the views and participation of regional groups.

Well, now we have the Non-paper 2, Language used in the reports of the Committee and its subsidiary bodies for reflecting the views and participation of regional groups.

Are there any comments on this Non-paper 2?

I would remind you that it was a request to have this item for discussion.

I will ask again. Are there any comments? Of course, maybe some delegations did not know about

the procedures adopted at the twenty-first session of the Committee. Now you have the full information.

The distinguished representative of Ecuador, you have the floor.

Mr. ROSENBERG (Ecuador): Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Well, it is a question which we started broaching in the two subcommittees at previous meetings, and we decided not to take a decision on this matter before, to just await the Plenary Committee meeting.

We believe that this is an issue which is easy to broach. I am part of a group of countries that meets each session and which collectively adopts and reads out a statement which reflects the views of the entire region. Just like in other forums of the United Nations, we believe that these views should be reflected in the final report of the meeting.

We would like to thank the Secretariat for having been so kind as to give us the historical background on this issue, and we believe that this is quite tenable. We just hope that the delegations present will be able to agree to proceed in this fashion in the future.

Thank you.

The CHAIRMAN: Thank you, distinguished representative of Ecuador.

The distinguished representative of Venezuela has the floor.

Mr. BECERRA (Venezuela): Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Well, of course we also would like to endorse what Ecuador has said. We would like, however, to stress certain important aspects. Let us not forget that within the United Nations system the regional groups are playing an important role in all of the decision-making processes, in the organization of work, etc., and given this role played by regional groups, our regional group, in order to step up this working process, the name of our group must be referred to specifically in the report. It has to be like the America and Caribbean Regional Group. This will give indeed more status to the work programme that we are advocating.

Thank you.

The CHAIRMAN: Thank you, distinguished representative of Bolivarian Republic of Venezuela.

The distinguished representative of the United States has the floor.

Mr. HIGGINS (United States): Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Chairman, we appreciate the effort that the Secretariat put into preparing Non-paper 2 regarding the procedures for language used in the reports of the Committee and its subsidiary bodies for reflecting the views of Member States.

As noted in the first paragraph, the Committee, on the basis of a recommendation made by the Legal Subcommittee, agreed at its twenty-first session to use certain terms to reflect the views expressed by Member States during the course of the deliberations of the Committee and its subcommittees.

We believe that this approach is important and quite useful and remains as relevant today as it did then, because the Committee works on the basis of consensus and trying to reach middle ground. Using terms like “the majority if delegations felt this way”, or “certain delegations” or “a number of delegations” did not serve that purpose because it reflected dissent as opposed to trying to reach consensus. So the term “some delegations expressed the view” or “the view was expressed” or “the Committee agreed” are three very practical ways of approaching this.

My delegation’s concern about specifically identifying certain views expressed by a regional group is that it gives a reader the impression that those views are more important than the views expressed anonymously by other delegations. I do not think that that serves the purpose that the Committee is intended to serve. All the views that are expressed here are equally important, whether you agree with them or not.

So to take as a general rule now, that a regional group will be expressly cited in our report as expressing certain views, in our opinion creates an imbalance between the importance of views of other Member States that have been expressed.

Now you might say that the other regional groups are free to do this. Well, perhaps, but we all operate in different ways, so I do not think that this particular approach needs to be applied to all of the regional groups. Perhaps there are other ways of reflecting the fact that the original group did express a view, maybe there is some way of handling it within

the report, but I think as a general rule we should stick with the procedural terminology adopted at the twenty-first session of the Committee.

Thank you.

The CHAIRMAN: Thank you, distinguished representative of the United States for your comments.

The distinguished representative of Bolivia has the floor.

Mr. MARCA PACO (Bolivia): Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

We are thankful to the Secretariat for having clearly put before us various suggestions regarding the organization of work for this Committee and its subcommittees. It is a matter of great concern to us, Member States, who participate in these three entities. That said, my delegation notes that this way of proceeding is not necessarily the only one, or it is not imperative.

We are just talking about an agreement that we have been able to arrive at up to this point in terms of the duration of the sessions and in the past regional groups, in particular GRULAC, the Group of Latin American and Caribbean States, were not asked to formally contribute and that, for some delegations, has been a source of concern. But also looking at the various suggestions here, in 2005 to 2008 the Scientific and Technical Subcommittee did provide GRULAC with an opportunity to make a statement and it was made by the Ambassador of Bolivia, who was then President of GRULAC, and certain criteria were put forward.

There are other precedents as well that are not included in the Secretariat’s document, but something that we have been able to find in the archives at our Permanent Mission. In 2008, at the COPUOS of the main Committee session, Bolivia also, as the leader of GRULAC, made a statement on issues that were on the agenda of the Committee and at that time I do not know to what extent that was reflected formally, but GRULAC did make statements as a regional group stating the common views, the shared views, of its member States. On the basis of these precedents, where Bolivia spoke on behalf of GRULAC, once in the Scientific and Technical Subcommittee and once in the 2000 session of COPUOS, the main Committee, I understand that the Legal Subcommittee was also affected and the meetings of the subcommittees happen in succession, as we know, and at that time Bolivia represented GRULAC in both subcommittees. So we

believe that this is an important historical precedent that the Secretariat should take note of, that there were statements made on behalf of this group of States.

Taking note of these precedents, of this history, this background, the current session of COPUOS should accept, as suggested by GRULAC in the 2008 session, that whenever a group of States is making a statement as a group, it should be recorded as such, as a view or views expressed by GRULAC, by the group of countries, not just a country or some countries, and whenever the country that at this time presides over the group GRULAC, in this case Costa Rica, makes a statement on behalf of the group, it should be recorded as a group statement. As I said, we should refer to Bolivia's statements in the past as an important precedent.

We believe that this Committee should thus accept the specific request of GRULAC that we are formally putting on the table that whenever the leader of GRULAC makes a statement specifically defined as a statement on behalf of GRULAC, that is how it should be mentioned in the records, as a statement by GRULAC including all of its member States. That would be accepted by all and in the past sometimes our statements were not reflected in what we consider to be an adequate or proper manner.

Of course, countries can speak on their own behalf and that is different, but once a statement is made on behalf of the group, on behalf of GRULAC, it should be recorded as such.

I would insistently ask the Committee to accept this and make this an important formal requirement. Of course, other countries have every right to make statements on behalf of their own regional groups that they belong to, but I am talking about GRULAC specifically. When the presidency of a group changes the Committee is informed in due form and when the new country assuming the function of president of GRULAC takes the floor as the representative of the Group, again it should be recorded in appropriate fashion.

Thank you very much.

The CHAIRMAN: Thank you, distinguished representative of Bolivia.

The next speaker on my list is the distinguished representative of Colombia.

Mr. SERRANO CADENA (Colombia): Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

What we have heard from our colleagues from Ecuador, Bolivia and Venezuela is very clear and we obviously support that. I am going to be very brief.

For my delegation, Mr. Chairman, this is a subject for debate and for a decision in this Committee. Our reports have the objective of reflecting what truly transpired in the course of the debate that took place during the session, and this does not apply just to this Committee. It is a principle of multilateralism that the debate should be reflected in full and also the decisions, the recommendations, the resolutions that were adopted by the various entities should be based on those debates, but when a statement is made by a group, by GRULAC, it is a fact, it is a fact that needs to be reflected in the report.

Therefore, we are formally asking, Mr. Chairman, that this rule be respected once we make the point that what is said addresses the will of the regional group it needs to be reflected in the report. We believe that regional groups are a reality, are an important element of multilateralism, as my distinguished colleague from Bolivia just pointed out with such clarity, and they consult among themselves and the Bureau asks the opinion of regional groups and those propose their representative for the Bureau.

That is how it works, and this Committee, Mr. Chairman, is a General Assembly Committee and it should follow the rules of procedure approved by the UN General Assembly. This is a procedural norm of the General Assembly. There is no norm or requirement to the contrary that would prohibit a regional group which exists as a matter of fact to make a statement as a group and to demand that that statement be reflected in the report as the statement of a group.

Of course, group statements have implications. We are all aware of that, these are political implications, and reflecting a group statement as such in the report is politically very important.

So once again the Colombian delegation joins that request. We want the report to truly reflect a fact, it is a question of fact, and the fact is that a regional group that exists and is recognized as such can take the floor, can speak, make a statement as a group and Costa Rica in this case, as the president of GRULAC, can speak on behalf of the Group.

Thank you.

The CHAIRMAN: Thank you, distinguished representative of Colombia for your intervention to not

be misunderstood when countries make statements under one agenda item, it is exactly reflected in the report. These countries, or these groups of countries, make statements under agenda items. Stop. But then the debates, the discussions, then they follow the rules, the procedure or terminology adopted at the twenty-first session. And also when we try to reach a consensus, and sometimes it is very difficult to reach a consensus, we could really have difficulties in pointing out the names of different countries, of regions and groups, but it is up to the Committee to decide what to do and how to do it.

I give the floor to the distinguished representative of China.

Mr. Yu XU (China): Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

The issue in the debate as far as China is concerned is a terminology issue which is in the nature of a procedural matter. As far as the issue is a procedural matter, China can be flexible. Unfortunately we have encountered this issue in the last sessions, both in the Scientific and Technical Subcommittee as well as the Legal Subcommittee, so it is really for this session of COPUOS to make a decision to solve the problem, otherwise we will waste our time in the coming sessions both at the Scientific and Technical Subcommittee and the Legal Subcommittee.

Mr. Chairman, if we can share with others our understanding of this issue on the terminology, some delegations did not carry the spirit of equal treatment. On the same understanding, a group of States did not carry the spirit that you just get imbalanced treatment between this group and other delegations. If a group speaks as a group it is quite reasonable to get reasonable presence in the report. I do not think that if you mention a group of States it will give some advantage against other States, so try to avoid over-reading of the terminology in this report.

I quite agree that we have set the rules in the twenty-first session of the Committee, that we have to pay attention to those rules which were set in 1978. That is a long time ago, so if we are ready and we have been encouraged to change the rules, it is time now. So I agree that this Committee always works on a consensus basis but I do not think that you mentioned that a certain group will break the rules of consensus. I do not think that there is a close relationship between the terminology issues as well as the decision-making procedure of this Committee.

So we have to be honest: what is the problem at issue? I hope that we keep the original rules as(?), but we should have indulgence with some delegations because we have their unique position under issue. As the GRULAC has mentioned, we have had their unique position on the dual-station orbit for quite a long time. I do not think that there is no(?) to account their unique position in the report.

So China always tries to be flexible and to compromise on these issues. I think there is a way to find a solution.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN: Thank you, distinguished representative of China.

The next speaker on my list is the distinguished representative of Venezuela.

Mr. BECERRA (Venezuela): Thank you, Mr. Chairman for giving me the floor yet again.

I am going to be brief. First of all, I would like to endorse the position that has been stated here that our position should be expressed in the report properly, but also to react to what the United States delegate said.

We do not think that this going to undermine the consensus, not at all. We have to take into account the fact that a group of countries' regional group is an important answer to an important role to play and it must be reflected. There are five regional groups that take a proactive position, often make an important contribution to the discussions. We devote a lot of time to keeping consensus within working regional groups and making sure that we are part of the consensus processes, a mechanism that has worked very well throughout the United Nations system.

Regional groups contribute to the composition of the Bureau, and regional groups take certain positions as part of the debate. This is extremely important and I think we have demonstrated time and time again on many occasions that it does no damage to consensus overall.

Thank you very much.

The CHAIRMAN: Thank you, distinguished representative of Venezuela.

The next speaker on my list is the United States of America.

Mr. HIGGINS (United States): Thank you, Mr. Chairman for allowing me to take the floor again.

I would just like to add a couple of other points on why the procedure that was adopted at the twenty-first session of the Committee has its merits. When you read our reports, the Secretariat summarizes a view that is expressed or what some delegations expressed, and it is a summary, it is not precise. If it had to be precise we would need an entire week in order to precisely reflect in our reports what some delegations or one delegation had said. Where we want total and complete clarity is those paragraphs that say "The Committee ... The Subcommittee ... agree". So, if you see the distinction I am making, having terminology that some delegations where the view is expressed gives the Secretariat a little bit of leeway in terms of reflecting what was said in a summary form. It may not be exact, but in the case of our work we are not looking to be exact.

If you specifically call out a country by name or groups of countries, then that particular paragraph or view those expressed has to be precise. So we are adding a burden to the work of the Secretariat, in my delegation's view. And then what happens if one or two delegations who have a view that they consider to be very important but is not necessarily shared by a regional group, why can those two delegations not be named? "Delegation x and delegation y were of the view". But I do not think that that would be practical in terms of our report.

Finally, I would like to make another distinction in terms of our point. We have no objection if, in the introductory paragraph of each section dealing with an agenda item, the Secretariat lists the States and Observers who made statements. That is regularly done I think in the Scientific and Technology Subcommittee report. We have no objection to that. So if a country or delegation gives a statement on behalf of a regional group, that can be noted. Where my delegation has problems is if in the report a specific view is attributed to a specific country or a specific regional group. That is where we then run into problems because the terminology we agreed to use was anonymous, as opposed to attributive.

So I would have no objection at this stage if we note that in the summary paragraph leading into each agenda item we list which delegations made statements, and if they made statements on behalf of a

regional group. That is fine, but again, where we run into trouble is attributing a very specific view expressed by a specific regional group.

Thank you.

The CHAIRMAN: Thank you, distinguished representative of the United States.

The next speaker on my list is the distinguished representative of Costa Rica.

Mr. ESPINOZA SOLANO (Costa Rica): Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Quite simply, I wanted to support what has been expressed by other members of our regional group. As temporary president of GRULAC and as an Observer at COPUOS, as Venezuela and others pointed out, something that is expressed by a group on the basis of consensus within the group should be adequately and appropriately reflected in the report, as such.

All the work carried out within GRULAC specifically to promote consensus, to support consensus that this Organization seeks should be recorded. This happens in the other Vienna-based organizations and in the system of the United Nations in general. For GRULAC it is difficult really to see why it should not be the case in COPUOS as well.

Thank you

The CHAIRMAN: Thank you, distinguished representative of Costa Rica

The next speaker on my list is the distinguished representative of Cuba.

Mr. FERNÁNDEZ RONDÓN (Cuba): Thank you, Mr. Chairman for giving us the floor. I am going to be brief as well.

Talking about organizational matters, a number of delegations have voiced a request through the Secretariat and my delegation would like to join our fellow members of GRULAC. The report should reflect a statement made by a group as such as pointed out by the distinguished delegate of Colombia. It is something that is pronounced on behalf of a regional group and should be qualified as such. If it is based on the consensus of a regional group, obviously it needs to be reflected as such.

Thank you.

The CHAIRMAN: Thank you, distinguished delegate of Cuba.

We have three more delegations wishing to speak. I want to stop here because we do not have any more time for this item this afternoon.

The next speaker is the distinguished representative of Chile.

Mr. ACUÑA (Chile): Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

The delegation of Chile would like to express its decisive support of the statement made by Bolivia.

Thank you.

The CHAIRMAN: Thank you, distinguished representative of Chile.

The next intervention is by Belgium.

Mr. MAYENCE (Belgium): Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

I apologize, Mr. Chairman. I think the United States delegation has already clarified things. I heard at least two proposals that at least in the eyes of my delegation are quite different. One was to say "A delegation spoke on behalf of a group", the other suggestion was for the report to say "A group made a statement". So we need to have clarity. What is it that we are suggesting? It is quite different if we just suggest saying that "a delegation spoke on behalf of a group", that is one thing, and there is no problem with that, it is another thing to say "a group expressed the following view". If that is the case, we need to know who decides whether or not it was the group that expressed the view.

The CHAIRMAN: Thank you, distinguished representative of Belgium. In my view, some Member State acts as a representative, not the group itself, expresses somebody on behalf of the group.

The next speaker on my list and the last one for this item is the distinguished representative of Canada.

Mr. BAINES (Canada): Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

We wish to keep the procedural terminology agreed at the work in its twenty-first session in 1978

for discussions of COPUOS. We agree with our American colleagues that if a country speaks on behalf then makes a statement on behalf of other members of the regional group, then it can be noted as such.

Just to be clear so that this discussion will be reflected that some delegations wanted this and other delegations wanted something different. So Canada aligns itself with the United States on this issue.

The CHAIRMAN: I thank the distinguished representative of Canada for his statement.

I just ask for one minute, distinguished delegates, to consult with the Secretariat on how to organize some informal consultations to reach an agreement, if it is possible, because otherwise if we do not have consensus, we stay with what we already have. We do not change anything if we do not have consensus.

The CHAIRMAN: Nigeria has a proposal on how to solve the problem – please.

Mr. ABIODUN (Nigeria): Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

I have listened with both interest and without passion to the debate that has been going on, and I did not intend to make any intervention until I heard a statement to the effect that what is being demanded of this Committee is standard practice in other committees here. The question I ask, do we have an established procedure in the United Nations that each committee has to abide by, or does each committee establish its own rules? For example, how many committees of the United Nations operate on the basis of consensus, other than COPUOS? Now, who established that procedure for COPUOS?

So the point I am raising is that this Committee does not owe its legitimacy or its operation to what transpires in other committees of the United Nations, and therefore it establishes its own rules – period.

Thank you, Sir.

The CHAIRMAN: Thank you, distinguished representative of Nigeria. I understand that at the twenty-first session when there was the agreed language use of reports, the Committee had the right to establish its own rules, but we have to study the problem within the Secretariat to find out exactly what other committees do.

One way proposed could be procedural consensus, if you agree. We could for sure say that a Member State expressing the view of a regional group made this statement and so on, without nominating the regional group, because it is true that one State could make a statement on behalf of a regional group. It shows that the regional group agrees with that proposal, but it sticks to the formulations we already have approved that without nominating exactly the country or the group, and also shows that the opinion was shared by the full regional group.

Otherwise we propose you to have informal discussions during the receptions tonight and tomorrow to raise again the problem and to take a decision, having a consensus. If we do not have consensus, we should leave this problem for the next year and next year, because we do not have too much time to analyse and to debate for a week such problems now, even if it is very important.

The representative of Ecuador, please.

Mr. ROSENBERG (Ecuador): Thank you very much.

Mr. Chairman, I know we have little time. My delegation, and I think others from our region also, believes that this is an extremely important subject. It is a matter that was decided in 1978, 32 years ago. We were still then in the high school or primary school at that time. I call on everybody. Nowhere in that decision does it say that regional groups can not express views as such. It is not sufficient to refer to some country on behalf of some group. It has to be very clearly reflected in the report that a regional group has this or that position.

The majority of Latin American countries have spoken here today who are members of COPUOS, so we all have positions, and I really can not believe that any delegation would oppose reflecting the expression of a group view. I think such a position frankly smacks of disrespect for my region, for our regional group.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN: Thank you, distinguished representative of Ecuador.

I propose to continue tomorrow morning. We still have some items to be discussed here, also connected with Member States belonging to the GRULAC, and our proposal is to have informal discussions and to find a formulation agreed by all

Member States. If we do not have consensus on the specific formulations, we can not agree on them what you propose.

So it should be balanced. Maybe it will be taking out one part, putting in another part. But that is enough – we have until tomorrow morning.

We had approached one item connected with the future role of the Committee. Colombia has proposed that the sub-item on the future role of the Committee be transformed in a separate agenda item of the Committee. I add support to that proposal.

Are there any objections to this proposal that the future role of the Committee be transformed in a separate agenda item of the Committee?

The representative of Canada, please.

Mr. BAINES (Canada): Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Could you repeat what the proposal is?

The CHAIRMAN: The proposal was that the item, Future role of the Committee, should be taken from “Other matters” and be transformed in a separate agenda of the Committee.

Please, Professor Kopal

Mr. KOPAL (Czech Republic): Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

As a matter of fact my delegation was supporting this suggestion, but it should be made more precise, saying that it should be not only a separate item but that it should be a single item, a single issue item for discussion.

The CHAIRMAN: Thank you, distinguished representative of the Czech Republic.

So, the proposal is to transform “Future role of the Committee” in a separate single agenda item – single issue item for discussion.

The representative of Belgium, please.

Mr. MAYENCE (Belgium): Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

This is on a point of clarification, if I might. Does that mean that we are predetermining the decision that will be taken as to the agenda of the upcoming

Committee? Are we already taking a decision on that if we take that decision now?

The CHAIRMAN: The proposal was made by Colombia. There is a delegation sustaining the proposal. If we agree now, the item would assign the future role of the Committee as a single issue agenda item.

The representative of Spain, please.

Ms ZABALA UTRILLAS (Spain): Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

This is just a question. Does the suggestion refer to this year's agenda or to next year's agenda, please?

The CHAIRMAN: It refers to next year's agenda, because this year we already discussed the item. This year it is included in "Other matters".

The representative of Spain, please.

Ms ZABALA UTRILLAS (Spain): Sorry, Mr. Chairman, I will speak Spanish and automatically shunt it into English.

When we speak about the agenda for the next session, do we not talk about this? This is just an open question.

The CHAIRMAN: I call the distinguished representative of the United States.

Mr. HIGGINS (United States): Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

My understanding on the basis of yesterday's discussions is that the proposal is as you suggested – we pull out the future role of the Committee as a single issue item to be taken up for one year to allow sufficient time to discuss L.278, the initiative on behalf of our former distinguished Chairman. So if that is the understanding, one year single-issue item in order to give us time to consider L.278, then my delegation has no objection to that. And certainly we can take a formal decision later in our session when we come to the full agenda of the Committee.

Thank you.

The CHAIRMAN: Yes, you have the right interpretation, distinguished delegate of the United States. We decide if it could become a separate item, a

single issue item, for next year and when we approve the agenda for next year, we include it.

The distinguished representative of China first.

Mr. Yu XU (China): Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Very briefly, China supports the proposal made by the distinguished delegate of Colombia, with the hope that the future role of the Committee will be incorporated in next year's agenda as a single item on the agenda, although the final decision will depend on the adoption of the report of this Committee. We support that

The CHAIRMAN: Thank you, distinguished representative of China.

I call the distinguished representative of Mexico.

Mr. CAMACHO (Mexico): Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

You really took the words out of my mouth. Over and above supporting the proposal of Colombia I wanted to indicate that we agree, but officially that can only be rendered official once we get to considering the agenda for the next session, and I would see no problem as to taking that decision here and now.

Thank you.

The CHAIRMAN: Thank you, distinguished representative of Mexico.

Are there any other comments?

Should I take it that we decide to have the future role of the Committee as a single issue item for next year?

I see no objections.

I call the representative of Belgium.

Mr. MAYENCE (Belgium): Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

A question: my delegation has no quarrel in principle with this. We do have a problem about deciding this now, apart from a general global decision on the agenda for next year. If we decide in a disorderly

fashion, blow by blow, on every single agenda item, there is no balance. So I suggest that we take this when we get to our consideration of the agenda for next year, although on the matter, we have no quarrel, no problem with this.

The CHAIRMAN: Thank you, distinguished representative of Belgium.

Colombia has a comment to make.

Mr. YEPES (Colombia): Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

The delegate of Belgium has no objection. I would like to thank him for his very constructive and positive approach to this.

As you said, Mr. Chairman, when we broach the agenda of the agenda for the next session, then we will take this decision.

Thank you.

The CHAIRMAN: Thank you, distinguished representative of Colombia.

I call the distinguished representative of the Czech Republic.

Mr. KOPAL (Czech Republic): Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Chairman, perhaps I could facilitate our decision today that the point of the future work of the COPUOS will be included as a single issue item in the draft of the agenda for the next session of the Committee.

The CHAIRMAN: Thank you, distinguished representative of the Czech Republic.

So the decision is to include this item in the draft agenda to be approved by us at the end, together with the report.

I see no objections.

It is so decided.

So we only have for this afternoon two technical presentations. If they could be short, we could take both of them. If not, we will take the first one.

I would like to give the floor to Ms Ariane Cornell of the Space Generation Advisory Council for

her presentation entitled "Recommendations from the Space Generation Congress: Input for the next generation on space sector leaders on the development of Space".

Please, Ms Cornell.

Presentation by Ms Ariane Cornell of the Space Generation Advisory Council (SGAC): Recommendations from the Space Generation Congress: Input for the next generation on space sector leaders on the development of Space

Ms CORNELL (SGAC): Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

It is my pleasure to present to you today the Space Generation Congress 2009 prospectus from university students and young professionals in the space sector. Today I will cover briefly our SGAC, the Space Generation Congress, or SGC, before moving into the details from our 2009 Congress where I will cover the results from the working groups who dealt with topics on the themes of industry, agency, climate, exploration and peace.

So first, for those who are less familiar with the Space Generation Advisory Council – who are we? SGAC is a non-profit organization that represents 18 to 35-year-olds in international space policy at the United Nations agencies, industry and academia. We started as a result of the UNISPACE 3 Conference in 1999 and we have permanent Observer status here at the United Nations since 2001. We are hosted by the European Space Policy Institute in Vienna, Austria, and our network now contains about 4,000 members in over 90 countries.

Our Space Generation Congress is our annual conference which is always held in conjunction with the International Astronautical Congress. It allows up to 100 members, selected members, to congregate and to network not only amongst each other but also with top space professionals who come as speakers, and they represent the world's top space organizations. The other important key part of the Space Generation Congress is to bring delegates together to work together on projects to develop recommendations on pertinent space topics.

The Space Generation Congress 2009 was held in Daejeon, Korea, last October. We had 75 delegates from 32 countries. We are also quite proud that 21 of those delegates were supported by SGAC to attend, an additional ten came from the IAC Youth Grants Programme. We had about 60 per cent males

and 40 per cent females and these students and young professionals represent a wide spectrum of technical and non-technical space backgrounds. They addressed topics on the themes of industry, agency, climate, exploration and peace, which in fact were those of the Astronautical Congress.

The speakers at SGC, nine as mentioned, were high-level members of the international space community. Our keynote speech was in fact written by Ambassador Shirdi Valen, the former chairman of UN-COPUOS. We also had Bernd Feuerbacher, president of IAF, Jim Zimmerman who was the former president of IAF, current president of International Space Services, Soon Dal Choi, the founding director of SATRAC of Korea, Ray Williamson, Executive Director of the Secure World Foundation and G.R. Edwards, Senior Business Analysis for Lockheed Martin.

So now on to the project work of the delegates: this slide gives you a pictorial view of how the project groups work. Selected delegates were assigned to project groups based on the themes. They were given approbatory pre-reading, and then during the three-day conference they meet in their groups to discuss these topics and come up with their findings or conclusions which at the end of the conference are presented to the rest of the delegates. After the conference reports are written and conclusions are presented globally.

So on to the different themes: The first one that I would like to discuss is that of industry. What I want to do is actually walk you through some of the recommendations of the project groups, but I would also like to say that full and expanded conclusions and recommendations and the findings in the SGC final report, and that is available on our website. The industry group investigated the relationship between space industry and the global youth. So some of the questions they looked at what are key international workforce issues and how they vary by region, as well as the relationship between the space industry today and global youth, and how can it be improved.

Five global space workforce issues that they identified are the following: the lack of recognition by developed countries' employers and developing countries' employer qualifications; limited visibility or awareness of space careers and opportunities across the globe in developing countries; perceived cultural barriers across non-western countries impacting motivation of foreign students to enter into the space sector; lack of collaboration within the developing regions, even where opportunities do exist; and finally,

limited access to global opportunities due to restrictions in information transfer.

The final recommendations from this group include developing training programmes for post-academia in developing countries: they recommend that we raise awareness if possible for youth in developing nations using SGC national points of contact rather than the space sector personnel to create a young message that is targeted; increased sector's awareness of intercultural differences that impact the global use and motivation into the sector; relieve the disconnects between government, industry and youth in different regions of developing space programmes; and ease restrictions that limit entry into the space sector all around the world.

The next theme addressed was agency. This group looked at GNSS applications for transportation and infrastructure in developing nations. Generally speaking, this group looked at how education outreach tools can be used in order to increase the awareness of GNSS, but they honed in on looking at how innovative ways of using GNSS can help developing countries through a key study in fact of India's transportation needs.

Taking on the case study of India they thought was an optimal way of summarizing challenges in an urban transportation area. They also thought it would highlight the benefits of using GNSS technology in a way in which the public can relate, and then finally focusing on the use of GNSS for helping developing countries advance more quickly.

Some of the conclusions of this group: Generally speaking, they found that from the urban design quality aspect the problem is really to balance the benefits of private automobiles while limiting the negative impacts such as congestion and pollution. They found examples of GNSS traffic tools that could be helpful are land surveying, traffic flow measurement and real-time automobile monitoring. When applied to India but also other with other countries' troubled transportation systems, the benefits of GNSS include, according to this group, diminishing the number of traffic jams, reducing travel time, distributing traffic loads, limiting air pollution and finally decreasing the number of road accidents.

The next theme was climate. This group looked in particular at what it will take for space technology to optimally aid in climate change mitigation. Specifically, they looked at how to raise awareness among the general public and decision makers about the relationship between climate change

and space technology, but also how that space technology can optimally help to rationalize(?) technology using climate mitigation efforts.

The conclusions from this group were the following: In fact that awareness of climate change is not satisfactory among the public and not only that but there is a need to understand and predict more in detail the effects of climate change. Climate mitigation must be addressed internationally and the key to this in fact is global data sharing which needs proper policies and data standards. Space as well is not the only solution to any climate change-related problem. Satellite data combined with good service infrastructure is essential and finally, to get proper long-term funding for these climate projects, one has to have popular support and to get the popular support we reached the top conclusion that awareness of climate change needs to be improved among the public.

The next theme was exploration. This group looked at developing awareness to then develop space exploration. One of the key questions is similar to that of the climate group, which is how to improve the appreciation of the benefits of space exploration and to get the word out among the general public, decision makers and also politicians who control budgets. Also they looked at how to develop this awareness to improve sustained exploration programmes.

This group had the following recommendations. First, we have to do market research of the existing initiatives in space education to make sure that we are in fact targeting the right group and we are doing this effectively. The next is to organize available web-based information related to space exploration to generate an information exchange platform, to strengthen student-to-student knowledge exchange, to promote free knowledge, to promote bottom-up as well as top-down education, to reinforce travelling education projects to get the word out more broadly, to create incentives for companies to support people with new ideas, to develop prizes and competitions as motivational drivers to creativity, to give exploration a face or person that people can relate to, and finally making space cool and breaking the space nerd image.

The final theme that was addressed by the delegates of the Space Generation Congress was that of peace. This group looked at which issues needed to be taken into account when talking about peace in space. They also looked at which are the key players involved and what are the key players' incentives, motivations and inhibitions.

This group's conclusions were grouped into three sections: what are the drivers of cooperation, what are the constraints for cooperation; and what are near-term future cooperation projects that we can start on right now?

First, drivers of cooperation: This group found that there were incentives through cost-sharing, increased levels of standardization, crowd sourcing, potential high technology sharing and value added to security prediction and consequently to peace issues.

The next section constraints for cooperation: What are the issues that need to be overcome? First is the unequal amount of costs and unequal resource sharing, the issue of intellectual property, as well as national security.

And finally this group pointed out a couple of projects that could be addressed in the near term, and as you will notice they generally are addressing terrestrial challenges and space applications. Here they pointed out disaster monitoring, medical applications as well as child education.

Mr. Chairman and distinguished delegates, what you have seen here by way of these findings and recommendations is that the next generation of space sector leaders are active, knowledgeable and eager to participate in space policy discussions. You actually see in our Space Generation Congress that we give them the opportunity to do so, but this opportunity would not be possible if it were not for our sponsors and supporters who, yes, contribute financial resources but just as importantly they contribute access to subject-matter experts and other intellectual resources to make our Space Generation Congresses as fruitful as possible. Our SGC 2009 supporters were the National Aeronautics and Space Administration, or NASA, the Secure World Foundation, ESA, Lockheed Martin of the United States, DLR Germany, Kori and Keiss(?) of Korea, the ILC Organizing Committee of Daejeon Korea, Bozong(?) County, as well as a collection of very dedicated individuals listed here.

I would also like to extend a special thank you to Ambassador Choi Hon Sik and Soo Yong Chong whose respective roles of IAC Organizing Committee Secretary General and IAC Local Organizing Liaison to SGC were integral to the successes SGC 2009.

With that, I would like to thank you, Mr. Chairman and distinguished delegates, for your time this afternoon. I would remind you that the full report from the Congress and the project sessions are

available on our website at www.spacegeneration.org and I would like to encourage all nation States to have their university students and young professionals join us from 23 to 23 September of this year in Prague, Czech Republic.

The CHAIRMAN: Thank you, Ms Cornell.

The next presentation will be made tomorrow. I will shortly adjourn this meeting of the Committee, but before doing so I would like to inform delegates of our schedule for tomorrow morning.

We will reconvene promptly at 10 a.m. and that time we will continue hopefully to conclude our consideration of agenda item 14, Use of space technology in the United Nations system. We will continue our consideration of agenda item 15, Use of space-derived geospatial data for sustainable

development, and will continue agenda item 16, Other matters.

There will be four technical presentations tomorrow morning. The first one is by a representative from Austria IIASA, entitled Global land cover validation tool, Geo-wiki.org; the second one by the Russian Federation, Geospatial data utilization for complex diagnosis of earthquake precursors; the third by India on Space education, international outreach activities of India; the fourth by China, Global Lunar Conference.

Are there any comments on this proposed schedule? I see none.

This meeting is now adjourned until 10 a.m. tomorrow morning.

The meeting adjourned at 6.10 p.m.