

**Committee on the Peaceful
Uses of Outer Space
Legal Subcommittee**

Unedited transcript

742nd Meeting

Monday, 10 April 2006, 3 p.m.

Vienna

Chairman: Mr. R. González (Chile)

The meeting was called to order at 3.04 p.m.

The CHAIRMAN (*interpretation from Spanish*): Ladies and gentlemen, we will now be resuming our work.

Before we start our afternoon meeting, I would like to state that views have been aired and the Chairman, or rather you, we have the intention to conclude our work officially on Thursday at midday. We must try to bear that in mind in accomplishing the remainder of our work.

There are certain delegations with very long trips home, 24 hour flights, if not more, and there is religious customs in those countries which are to be observed and since the United Nations is a non- or cross-denominational organization, we will be seeking to ensure that delegations will be home by Good Friday morning at the outside. This next Friday is Good Friday.

So we are going to be seeking to work in harmony with all the religious denominations and those who do not have any religious convictions as well.

In this fashion, the Chairman would like to ask the delegations to bear this in mind so that we can conclude and wrap up our work by Thursday midday. I have seen that there is a general spirit of cooperation in the room and I doubt whether we will have to extend the meeting past midday.

I would like to call upon you for your cooperation, ladies and gentlemen.

Is this agreeable to you, this proposal on my part to conclude at 1.00 p.m. Thursday?

There is something that should be borne in mind is that we still have a report as there are questions on which we do not have particularly diverging views. We must indeed be serious in our approach and seek to achieve consensus for Thursday as a deadline. So that is one half day's loss but we will recover that half day next year. In that way everyone will be satisfied.

Now I would like to know whether this proposal of mine is agreeable to you, allowing us to finish our work Thursday at midday.

Would you have any comments? I do not want to impose this on you. I would like to ask you whether you can give your agreement to this. If you wish to think this over, you can give me your answer in a little while. You do not have to reply instantaneously. I can give you two minutes. So we will break for two minutes to think this over.

The meeting was suspended for two minutes.

The meeting was resumed.

Let us resume the meeting. So I turn to you. What are your views on the proposal that I have just made to you all two minutes ago?

Can I take your silence to be consent?

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.



The United States delegation is moving a bit. I do not know whether they would like to speak or not. Did they? No? No, apparently not.

Well, ladies and gentlemen, thank you very much. Next year we will recover and make up this half day and all of this will be consigned to our report.

We are now going to be closing, adjourning Thursday at midday.

I would now like to declare open the 742nd meeting of the Legal Subcommittee of COPUOS. This afternoon we will continue and conclude our consideration of agenda item 9, Review and Possible Revision of the Principles Relevant to the Use of Nuclear Power Sources in Outer Space.

We will also continue our consideration of agenda item 11, Practice of States and International Organizations in Registering Space Objects.

Time permitting, we will begin our consideration of agenda item 12, Proposals to the Committee on the Peaceful Uses of Outer Space for New Items to be Considered by the Legal Subcommittee at its Forty-Sixth Session.

I would like to invite delegations wishing to make statements under these agenda items to inscribe their names with the Secretariat as soon as possible.

The Working Group on Agenda Item 11 will then hold its first meeting under the chairmanship of Mr. Kai-Uwe Schrogl of Germany.

Review and possible revision of the Principles Relevant to the Use of Nuclear Power Sources (agenda item 9)

I would now like to continue and conclude our consideration of agenda item 9.

I have no speakers on my list for item 9 so I think that we may conclude that we have finished our consideration, our virtual consideration of agenda item 9. It is difficult, of course, to conclude without having started. But no one wishes to speak on nuclear power sources in outer space?

Right. I take it that no one wishes to speak on nuclear power sources, agenda number 9.

We have "concluded". We did have three speakers on this. So we have concluded on 9.

Would the Ambassador of Colombia like to take the floor? I had thought that you wished to speak. Apparently not. No one wishes to speak on this. Korea possibly.

Practice of states and international organizations in registering space objects (agenda item 11)

Alright then, let us go on to agenda item 11, Practice of States and International Organizations in Registering Space Objects. I would like to remind delegates that this agenda item was to be discussed in a Working Group on Item 11 which will hold its first meeting following this plenary meeting under the chairmanship of Mr. Kai-Uwe Schrogl of Germany.

Did I pronounce this properly?

The first speaker on my list on 11 is the representative of Japan. You have the floor Madam.

Ms. _____(?) (Japan)
(*Speaker unknown – no speaker list for this meeting*): Thank you Mr. Chairman. Mr. Chairman and distinguished delegates, on behalf of the Japanese delegation, I have the honour to present Japan's practice in registering space objects.

Japan recognizes the operational challenges that exist in the international registration of space objects, particularly in the lack of consistency of submission of data and international adjustments among two or more launching States.

Mr. Chairman, today, Japan derive to explain our country's practice in registering space objects for which two or more States participate in its launch.

Japan registered satellites that are solely operated by Japan even though they are launched by foreign rockets. In the case of Japan's Optical Inter-Orbit Communications Engineering Test Satellite, OIOCETS(?), called KIARI(?), for example, KIARI(?) was launched last August by Ukraine's Donoble(?) rocket and was registered by Japan.

However, in the case of a satellite that is operated in partnership with a foreign country, we discuss which State will register such a satellite effectively, regardless of which country launches the satellite. For example, Tropical Rainfall Measuring Emissions, TRMM satellite which was launched by Japan's H-II rocket and operated by NASA and JAXA had been registered by the United States, after having consulted and agreed upon it first.

Mr. Chairman, with regard to jurisdiction and the control of a space object launched by multiple launching States, Japan envisages that a State who has registered a space object will retain jurisdiction and control over that object.

According to Article VIII of the Outer Space Treaty, Japan also recognizes that if we are to change the jurisdiction and control over the satellite, an appropriate agreement has to be concluded among launching States, according to Article II of the Registration Convention.

Thank you for your attention.

The CHAIRMAN (*interpretation from Spanish*): Thank you very much Madam for your statement.

I would now like to give the floor to the next speaker, the representative of the People's Republic of China. You have the floor Madam.

Ms. _____? (China) (*speaker unknown – no speakers list for this meeting (interpretation from Chinese)*): Thank you Mr. Chairman. Mr. Chairman, we are very happy to see that this Working Group will hold its third meeting, the meeting for the third year. At the same time, we would like to congratulate Mr. Kai-Uwe Schrogl for his assumption as Chairman of this Working Group.

Mr. Chairman, the Chinese delegation has noted the background document prepared by the Secretariat under this agenda item.

Now I would like to elaborate briefly on China's understanding and the practice with regard to the several issues related to the registration.

Mr. Chairman, first of all, China has joined this Convention in 1988. In 2001, China has issued the regulations on the ways and means for the registering of outer space objects and we have also established a domestic registry for this registration.

In accordance with this registration method, we have carried out a registration for the satellites launched by China and satellites launched in cooperation with other countries outside of China.

With regard to the registration of a change of ownership of space objects in orbit, registration needs to be carried out.

We must pay attention to the following situation and that is when there is a change in the area of jurisdiction of the registering country, the situation may also arise where registering countries should be changed. For example, before 1 July 1997, four communication satellites, including ASIASAT-1, ASIASAT-2, APSTAR-1, APSTAR-1A, owned by Hong Kong, were registered in Great Britain, which also registered them with the United Nations. After Hong Kong's return to China, the registering country for Hong Kong satellites also changed. In March 1998, Permanent Missions of both China and Great Britain to Vienna sent a Note Verbale to the Secretary-General of the United Nations requesting him to change the registering country of Hong Kong satellites from Great Britain to China. We believe this practice does offer some experience in settling similar issues.

With regard to the registration of foreign space objects, our registration regulations also stipulate as a country of common launches, the Chinese Government will discuss with partner countries to decide who will be the registering country. In our practice, we follow such a principle, that is the Chinese launching company which provides launching services for foreign space objects to carry out a domestic registration for the last stage of the launching vehicle that enters the outer space, to be followed by international registration by China as the launching State of this launching vehicle. However, the operating country and owner country of this payload should carry out a registration for this effective payload. We believe when the launching country and the owner country and the operating countries of this payload are different, if there is no specific agreement on registration, it is desirable for the latter countries to make the international registration because the latter countries can carry out continuous monitoring of this payload and, therefore, is in a position to report to the United Nations Secretary-General on any future changes of the space object, including when the object is no longer in orbit.

On the scope of space objects registration, China has carried out domestic and international registration for both the space objects that have been successfully launched and those that have not entered their orbits yet have entered outer space. We believe that this is also important for the transparency of such kind of registration.

Thank you Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN (*interpretation from Spanish*): Thank you very much representative of the People's Republic of China.

I would now like to give the floor to the representative of the Republic of Korea.

Mr. _____? (Republic of Korea) (*speaker unknown – no speakers list for this meeting*): Thank you Mr. Chairman. My delegation in its statements in the previous session mentioned the importance of achieving universality of the treaty system and of establishing national implementation systems in order to tackle those issues arising from technological development and increasing participation of the private sector in space activities. And given its close links between the Registration Convention and other United Nations space treaties, Korea, as a member of the Registration Convention, emphasized the significance of strengthening of the Registration Convention which entered into force 30 years ago.

In this regard, my delegation is pleased to note that the forty-fifth session of the COPUOS Legal Subcommittee continuously serves in your Work Programme on the agenda item on Practice of States and International Organizations in Registering Space Objects, in particular by establishing a Working Group on the agenda item to be chaired by Dr. Kai-Uwe Schrogl.

Mr. Chairman, my delegation would like to inform the Legal Subcommittee of the Registration Practices of Korea in accordance with the newly enacted national space law.

Any Korean national who launches space objects, both within and outside the territory of Korea, and any foreigner who launches space objects within the territory of Korea, is required to register the space objects to the National Registry of Korea, maintained by the Ministry of Science and Technology, unless the space objects are to be registered in the Overseas Registry in accordance with the Agreement between Korea and other launching States concerned.

The Ministry of Science and Technology, through the Ministry of Foreign Affairs and Trade, registers the space object in the United Nations Registry in accordance with the national law. All entities, including non-governmental entities, which have registered space objects in the National Registry of Korea are required to immediately inform the Ministry of Science and Technology, exchanges on the data they provide to the Ministry take place before or after their launches.

It is provided that the Government of the Republic of Korea will inform and update the provided

data to the United Nations if changes occur due to some reasons including the retirement of space objects.

To guarantee the effectiveness of the implementation of the registration, the national space law has introduced some _____(?) penalties to be imposed on those who fail to comply with the national registration procedures.

Mr. Chairman, in conclusion, I hope that the Legal Subcommittee will continue to conduct meaningful discussions on this matter on practice of States and international organizations in registering space objects, thereby clarifying the practical issues and strengthening the Registration Convention.

Thank you Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN (*interpretation from Spanish*): I would like to thank the distinguished representative of the Republic of Korea.

I recognize France.

Mr. _____? (France) (*speaker unknown – no speakers list for this meeting*) (*interpretation from French*): Thank you very much Mr. Chairman. Mr. Chairman, in 2004, the French delegation made a presentation on French practice with regards to registration, in keeping with the working plan drawn up by the Legal Subcommittee in 2003. According to this plan, 2006 is devoted to gathering common practice and 2007 to defining recommendations on the part of the Legal Subcommittee.

The four points identified in 2005 by the Legal Subcommittee with regards to registration have led, on the part of France, to the following observations.

The first point, standardization of practices. According to Article IV of the 1975 Registration Convention, each registry State provides the United Nations Secretary-General as soon as possible with information, the information provided hereafter with regards to each space object registered in its Registry.

As regards the name of the State or the launching States, a registry State is one of the launching States, subject to the possibility of the transfer of registration, as you will see below under point three. And, generally speaking, only one State is mentioned. Should there be several launching States for one launch, the question arises as to whether the Secretary-General of the United Nations should also be

informed of these other launching States. France informs the Secretary-General about satellites launched and of their presumed State or organization which they belong and we feel that it is appropriate for such information to be provided by way of providing information, of providing details.

As regards the appropriate designatory or the registration number of the space object, France uses the international numbering system provided by the COSPAR and is in favour of all countries using COSPAR numbering system.

As regards the date and country or place of launching, this does not give rise to any particular difficulties except that the date might, in practice, be communicated in local time or coordinated universal time and France is in favour of preferring UTC, universal coordinated time.

And as regards the main orbit parameters including the nodal period, here this should be mentioned in minutes, inclination should be mentioned in degrees, the apogee should be mentioned in kilometres and the perigee also in kilometres.

The initial position of geostationary orbit should also be communicated so it is proposed.

As regards the general function of the space object, it is proposed that countries should be encouraged to make a precise a description as possible of the space object.

Secondly, each registry State may, from time to time, provide the Secretary-General of the United Nations with additional information on a space object in its Registry.

With regards to the contents of the additional information, France is in favour of the following information being communicated.

The expected lifespan, the frequencies used, the modification of the orbital position during the life of the satellite and, finally, any significant manoeuvre on the part of the satellite, in particular dis-orbiting manoeuvres or return to Earth or re-orbiting of satellites.

As regards the communication frequency, the formula, as soon as possible, leads to rather different practice between some days and some years. France communicates such information every six months which would seem to be a reasonable time span and the recommendation of our delegation would be that such

communication should be made as soon as possible and as a minimum once a year.

Thirdly, each registration State informs the Secretary-General of the United Nations insofar as possible and as soon as feasible of space objects where information has already been previously given and which were, but are no longer, on a terrestrial orbit. France provides such information every six months.

The implementation of this recommendation affects space objects which are leaving the terrestrial orbit because of the satellite operator as it also affects space objects re-entering into the atmosphere via the laws of space mechanics, generally a long time up to the end of the lifetime of the object.

Second point, non-registration of space objects. Here, France would like to raise a number of individual cases which cause difficulties in the area of registration. Firstly, given the privatization of some international organizations and, in particular, INTELSAT, a large number of satellites which had not already been recorded by these organizations, have been transferred to private companies and the relevant States have not hitherto carried out their registration. It would, therefore, be desirable for the States concerned which are Party to the Convention to carry out registration, subject to the possible transfer of registration.

Secondly, as soon as a State has ratified the Registration Convention, its international obligations should lead to it registering national satellites. This should happen whether the satellites are governmental or not. Pursuant to Article VI of the Space Treaty, States are responsible for national space activities including space activities carried out by private entities. In the light of this provision, a State should be considered to be the launching State including in the case where it is a private entity that carries out the launching or causes the launching to be carried out and, therefore, the launching State must register the satellite owned by a private operator. Most States comply with this rule. The compliance with the obligations pursuant to Article II of the Registration Convention should be encouraged.

Thirdly, France registers national, governmental and non-governmental satellites, as well as the non-functional elements of the launch which parts of it should remain(?) in orbit after the mission and not only the payloads.

Thirdly, practice with regards to property transfer of space objects in orbit. The 1975

Convention does not provide for such a situation. The registration State preserves jurisdiction and control of the space object in orbit. The transfer of property of a satellite in orbit could, if it was agreed that the transfer of registration were possible, this could lead to consequences in terms of jurisdiction and control as well as in terms of international responsibility which is still incumbent upon the State or States which have launched said object. If a State which wishes to carry out registration is one of the launching States, transfer of registration should be able to be carried out although such an operation is not foreseen in the Convention.

Fourth point, registration and non-registration of so-called foreign space objects and relevant practices. This question is that of the non-registration of space objects launched from a State on behalf of foreign operators where the country to which the operators belong does not register the satellite in question. With regards to France, the operator informs its client of the necessity to take the steps with regard to registration which are pursuant to its international obligations. Nevertheless, France remains the launching State in such a case.

Thank you very much Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN (*interpretation from Spanish*): I should like to thank the distinguished delegate of France for his statement.

And I would like to make a few comments if I might by way of opening up the debate. We have heard a lot of information today so I would like to make some specific comments which I feel important. In particular, I think it is important to mention the general function of space objects, for instance, with regards to communications frequencies which have been mentioned and this is related to the non-registration of space objects. And you mention a particular major example from the legal and political point of view and finally I am also anxious to mention the fact that your country does register national, governmental and non-governmental satellites as well as non-functional elements of the launcher.

These are elements which are the basis for a debate and, of course, each and every one of us is in a position to express an opinion on these matters. I was simply anxious to underline a few points, having listened to these statements so, of course, I cannot take up every point because I do not have enough time.

I would now like to recognize The Netherlands.

Mr. _____? (The Netherlands) (*speaker unknown – no speakers list for this meeting*): Thank you Chair. Mr. Chairman, the background paper prepared by the Secretariat for our last session on the practice of States and international organizations in registering space objects provides ample evidence that consideration of this matter merits our urgent attention.

We hope that the Legal Subcommittee will produce effective solutions to address the increasing number of problems in registering space objects.

The Netherlands is a Party to the Convention on Registration of Objects Launched into Outer Space but has never furnished any information to the Secretary-General of the United Nations in accordance with the Convention. The Netherlands has procured the launch of two space objects. Both space objects were launched from the territory of the United States. One space object was launched before the adoption of the Convention and the other after the entry into force of the Convention.

With respect to the space object that was launched before the adoption of the Convention, the United States has meanwhile furnished information on its decay.

With respect to the space object that was launched after the entry into force of the Convention, the United States has furnished information in accordance with Article IV, paragraph 1, of the Convention.

Mr. Chairman, in our perception, the increasing number of problems in registering space objects is related to the increasing number of commercial activities in outer space. The background paper prepared by the Secretariat mentions several examples, such as the non-registration of foreign space objects by the State from whose territory or facility a space object is launched, and the transfer of ownership of a space object after it has been launched and placed in orbit.

The State from whose territory or facility a space object is launched may have reason to think that another State or international organization should furnish information in accordance with Article IV, paragraph 1, of the Convention.

However, in the absence of an affirmation of that other State or the international organization to that end, the registration of the space object may be overlooked. To secure compliance with the Convention, it would seem to be in the interests of the

State from whose territory or facility a space object is launched to contact other States or international organizations that it considers to be involved in the launch.

When establishing contact, the State from whose territory or facility a space object is launched could refer to Article II, paragraph 2, of the Convention. That provides a framework to determine which of the States or international organizations involved shall register the space object and furnish information in accordance with Article IV, paragraph 1, of the Convention.

The transfer of ownership of a space object, after it has been launched and placed in orbit, is also a matter that could be addressed through the enhanced implementation of the provisions of the Convention.

Following the transfer of ownership, the State of registry could furnish additional information on the basis of Article IV, paragraph 2, of the Convention to reflect the new state of affairs in the United Nations Register of Objects Launched into Outer Space.

This is particularly important when a space object is transferred from the jurisdiction or control of the State of registry to the jurisdiction or control of another State. Following the transfer of ownership, the State of registry will no longer bear international responsibility for the space object under Article VI of the Treaty and Principles Governing the Activities of States in the Exploration and Use of Outer Space, Including the Moon and Other Celestial Bodies.

The provision of additional information by the State of Registry and the publication of that information in the United Nations Register of Objects Launched into Outer Space, is the best practical procedure to disclose that it is no longer the State of Registry but another State that bears international responsibility for a space object and hence is entitled to exercise jurisdiction and control over that space object.

Mr. Chairman, besides addressing the above-mentioned complicated technical and legal issues, we hope that the Working Group will also further suggest practical measures that may contribute to the improvement of the registration practice of States and international organizations, notably, a recommendation to States and international organizations to publish their registries on the Internet.

I request to the Secretariat to establish those links from the on-line index of the United Nations Register of Objects Launched into Outer Space to

registries of States and international organizations that have been published on the Internet.

A recommendation to States and international organizations to designate focal points and a request to the Secretariat to publish the contact details of the focal points on the on-line index of the United Nations Register of Objects Launched into Outer Space.

The publication of registries on the Internet and the establishment of those links will facilitate the access to information on space objects and a verification of its accuracy.

The designation of focal points and publication of contact details will facilitate communication between States and international organizations as well as between the Secretariat and States and international organizations.

The establishment of direct contact between those responsible for the operation of registries is likely to be of assistance in case of queries with respect to information that has been provided.

Finally, it goes without saying that it remains the prerogative of States and international organizations to designate a focal point and communication procedures.

Thank you.

The CHAIRMAN (*interpretation from Spanish*): I thank the distinguished delegate of The Netherlands for his statement.

I see no other speaker on my list at the very least. Do I see no other requests? I think everybody has an opportunity to request the floor should delegations so wish and I, therefore, close our examination of this agenda item and we will take up the examination of the same agenda item number 11 tomorrow, that is practice of States and international organizations in registering space objects.

Proposals to the Committee on the Peaceful Uses of Outer Space to be considered by the Legal Subcommittee at its forty-sixth session (agenda item 12)

We shall now turn our attention to item 12, Proposals to the Committee on the Peaceful Uses of Outer Space to be Considered by the Legal Subcommittee at its Forty-Sixth Session. And this will be the fiftieth anniversary of the launch of the first Sputnik and, therefore, ladies and gentlemen, I open

this agenda item _____ (*not clear*) and I would like to remind delegates that in paragraph 148 of the Report of the Legal Subcommittee on its forty-fourth session last year, contained in document A/AC.105/850, in that paragraph 148, the Subcommittee noted that the sponsors of the following proposals for new items to be included in its agenda, intended to retain their proposal for possible discussion at its subsequent sessions.

Firstly, review of the Principles governing the use by States of artificial Earth satellites for international direct television broadcasting, with a view to possibly transforming the text into a treaty in the future, proposed by Greece.

Secondly, review of existing norms of international or applicable to space debris proposed by the Czech Republic and Greece.

Thirdly, discussion on matters relating to remote sensing, proposed by Chile and Colombia.

Fourthly, space debris, proposed by France and supported by member and Cooperating States of the European Space Agency.

And fifthly, review of the Principles of Remote Sensing with a view to transforming it into a treaty in the future, proposed by Greece.

There you have a considerable number of proposals but very few proposing countries, very few sponsor countries which is rather contradictory.

At first sight, two points could be merged into one if a respective discussion were to take place with this delegation. Of course, this is a very personal observation.

However, we have only had proposals from four or five countries.

I, therefore, invite delegations that wish to take the floor under this agenda item to request the floor.

Unless I see any requests for the floor, I will consider that these are the agenda items that will be examined.

Might I ask delegations that have made proposals to agree on matters in order to make sure that there is no overlapping. Remote sensing appears twice, for instance, the question of space debris appears twice as well. Perhaps the delegations might be in a position

to consult with each other by way of achieving agreement on these matters which would streamline the work of our Committee considerably. These are, of course, very important issues when it comes to space debris, for instance. The Scientific and Technical Subcommittee has done remarkable work in this area.

And as regards the Principles of Remote Sensing, we have got the 1996 Principles, that was when they were adopted. Apologies, 1986. So there is food for thought here.

And, of course, we have got the question of international direct television broadcasting.

This _____ (?) to a historic General Assembly resolution. That resolution was historic because consensus was broken and, therefore, this point should be reviewed in order to achieve consensus.

Therefore, might I put my question again? Are there any requests for the floor?

I recognize Brazil.

Mr. _____? (Brazil) (*speaker unknown – no speakers list for this meeting*) (*interpretation from Spanish*): Thank you very much Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Chairman, you have asked us whether other delegations wish to present or add items to the list that you have just enumerated, new items to be included in the agenda of the forty-sixth session. We do have such a proposal which is currently the object of informal consultations with other delegations. We wish to present this proposal to the Subcommittee for examination tomorrow. I was anxious simply to indicate to you the interest of my delegation and to convey to you that my delegation is currently consulting with other delegations by way of garnering the opinions of other delegations in this regard.

Thank you very much.

The CHAIRMAN (*interpretation from Spanish*): I would like to thank the representative of Brazil.

Personally, I am sure that Brazil has been convening meetings on this for several days already. I am sure that your proposal will be no surprise to no one. I indicated at the beginning of this session's meeting that I hope that we will have the texts tomorrow morning so that we can discuss the matter

then. I would be grateful to you for the addition of agenda items because the more we have, the more we can thoroughly discuss this.

The Czech Republic has the floor.

Mr. K. KOPAL (Czech Republic): Thank you very much Mr. Chairman. Mr. Chairman, the Czech Republic sponsored many years ago already the point that is now listed under sub-paragraph (b). I believe because the distinguished representative of Greece, or the delegation of Greece has been co-sponsor of this point. I cannot consult with whether to maintain it or not but for any event, on behalf of the Czech delegation, I would like to keep it on the list of possible items for the consideration by the Working Group.

And if you allow me, I will still have another suggestion.

At the Space Law Symposium that was held at the beginning of the session of this Subcommittee last Monday afternoon, I had the duty to summarize the views that had been raised at this Space Law Symposium and at the end of my summary. I also mentioned the possibility to think about the inclusion of an item along the lines of the title of this Symposium, it means "Legal Aspects of Disaster Management and the Contribution of the Law of Outer Space". I raised it on my own initiative. It is not an official proposal of the Czech Republic or any other delegation. But I bring it to the attention of this Subcommittee and I would like also to ask the Working Group to consider this initiative that was done during the Space Law Symposium.

Thank you very much.

The CHAIRMAN (*interpretation from Spanish*): Thank you very much Professor Kopal. I am sure that your proposal will be duly taken on board.

I would now like to give the floor to the representative of the Republic of Korea.

Mr. _____? (Republic of Korea) (*speaker unknown – no speakers list for this meeting*): Thank you Mr. Chairman.

My delegation could welcome such an initiative to hold an informal consultation about possible harmonization of new agenda items under agenda item 12.

In addition to that, I just would like to follow up only a clarification my delegation sought the other day. Let me again remind you of some of the languages within the provisional agenda which we adopted at the very beginning of this Legal Subcommittee.

I would like to highlight agenda item number 7, Information on the Activities of International Organizations Relating to Space Law, and agenda item number 11, Practice of States and International Organizations in Registering Space Objects. According to my delegation, it seems to be, maybe better somehow reflect the exact situation as my delegation earlier suggested. Maybe we can consider including some languages within agenda item number 7, say "information on the activities of international organizations and non-governmental entities or non-governmental organizations" whatever. We are flexible on this. My delegation would like to somehow try to accommodate the exact situation rather than some negative interpretation of the agenda item.

Thank you very much.

The CHAIRMAN (*interpretation from Spanish*): Thank you very much distinguished representative of Korea.

I would like to say two things. I have always said that delegations could consult if they have similar views. One could concentrate our efforts and better in that fashion and you can hold such consultations with whoever you wish. You should be able to discuss things with other delegations because the matters that we have here can be changed. Possibly some delegations would prefer to retain the items or the order that we have. You could always meet delegations outside the room, in corridors, we have to serve the deadline and that is Thursday morning.

For the other matters, I suggest that you consult within the Commission.

(*Interpreter*): The Chairman breaks off.

Now, on 7, which we have some interest. Possibly we could certainly have this next year as an agenda item. There is a General Assembly resolution on this. Would any delegations have any points to make?

Belgium, you have the floor.

Mr. _____? (Belgium) (*speaker unknown - no speakers list for this meeting*)

(interpretation from French): Thank you Mr. Chairman. I would like to make a general comment on behalf of my delegation. Here, we are referring to items for the Legal Subcommittee. We know that there are some issues which are eminently within the purview of the Scientific and Technical Subcommittee. As Chairman of the Legal Subcommittee, I would like to put a question to you.

There are some cross-cutting items, some issues which need to be handled both from the scientific and technical angle and as well as from the legal angle.

Our delegation is concerned that sometimes there is only a unilateral approach given. It is not that we have any miracle solution to propose but I wonder how the new Bureaux, next to the Committee of the Whole, will be able to ensure exhaustive coverage of all the aspects of a given issue. You referred to the agenda items for next year and among them there are several that are cross-cutting that really should be addressed from both the scientific and technical as well as the legal angles.

Could we, together, with the Scientific and Technical Subcommittee and the Committee of the Whole, try to work up a consistent comprehensive approach so that we could subsequently transmit to the General Assembly a very comprehensive way of dealing with this?

The CHAIRMAN *(interpretation from Spanish):* Thank you very much Belgium. You have certainly properly interpreted my thoughts. This is a personal view on my part. International contemporary law is faced with new challenges because of globalization, inter-dependency, the emergence of new players on the world stage and it is true that because of this, one needs a law that would comprise many aspects. You have spoken about cross-cutting approaches. The Scientific and Technical Subcommittee has items to deal with and once they have analyzed issues, our Subcommittee can then work on that same terrain and then that is transferred to COPUOS which refers it on to the General Assembly. That is what happens and that is the ideal.

However, one can cast one's mind back to the history of the Commission and on some issues we have made good progress, less on others and the proposals, for example, we see that there is a certain amount of redundancy and incomplete coverage. I certainly agree with what you have said. We have to work on the basis of these basic tenets of philosophy. I do not want to specifically limelight any given issue and I do not

want to counter certain delegations views that certain issues are more important than others.

I do not know whether I have correctly sensed your drift, Belgium, but in any case I see that the Ambassador of Colombia wishes to take the floor. He has it.

Mr. C. AREVALO YEPES (Colombia) *(interpretation from Spanish):* I have the impression that this issue referred to by the Ambassador of Belgium is certainly relevant. The interrelationship of issues between the two Subcommittees. This requires a very complete and detailed coverage. This is obvious otherwise the point would not have been made. The Commission itself should ensure that such comprehensive coverage is afforded. It is incumbent upon it to do so to ensure that, first, the Scientific and Technical Subcommittee considers the things, then we and then the Commission. I believe that possibly an effort could be made for the next session of the Committee to see exactly how issues and the way they are dealt with could be best interwoven between the two Subcommittees.

Thank you very much.

The CHAIRMAN *(interpretation from Spanish):* Thank you Ambassador of Colombia.

I believe that here we certainly have a point that is of interest to all delegations.

I have no further speaker on this or do I?

The Republic of Korea you have the floor.

Mr. _____? *(speaker unknown – no speakers list for this meeting):* Thank you Mr. Chairman. I have to apologize for taking the floor again with respect to exactly the same issue. My delegation is of the view that is the Legal Subcommittee. This is not something else, another Subcommittee. Legal Subcommittee means when we use some of the terminologies, we should be very careful about the various consequences so our humble opinion is there are clear differences between the concept of international organizations in agenda item number 7 and that of agenda item number 11. The other day we rather briefly touched upon that issue. There was no strong objection from the floor so my delegation interpreted that silence as affirming the interpretation. And then today it seems an appropriate occasion so now we are proposing rather poorly(?). My delegation does not find any clear process on that so we are just still wondering what kind of discussion

or decision was taken on that matter or is there any difficulty? I would like to seek a clarification from you.

Thank you very much.

The CHAIRMAN (*interpretation from Spanish*): Thank you very much Republic of Korea. We have taken note of your question.

If we agree, we are going to be submitting what has been said to the Committee and then this will be reflected in the United Nations resolution. But certainly do engage in the consultations that you wish to enter into and then next year, within the Legal Subcommittee, we can add the item that you have suggested. I believe that your proposal contains very relevant serious points from a conceptual point of view and I think that we could take your proposal in under 7 and 11.

Fine. Do you wish us to continue speaking about this matter? In any case, you can have consultations on this tomorrow and the day after and in the report we will be reflecting your proposal, certainly. Thank you.

I have no further speakers.

We are now going to be adjourning this session to enable the Working Group on Agenda Item 11 to meet. I will tell you what we will be doing tomorrow.

We will meet at 10.00 a.m. and resume on agenda item 11.

We will also be continuing our consideration of item 12, Proposals for New Items.

And now the Working Group on Item 11 is going to be meeting. We (they?) will be meeting tomorrow morning at 9.15 a.m. in C-0713.

Now I would like to call upon Mr. Kai-Uwe Schrogl of Germany to chair the meeting of the Working Group on Agenda Item 11.

I would like to inform you that the Western and Other States Group, WEOG, will be meeting in C-0713.

The meeting is adjourned.

The meeting closed at 4.25 p.m.