
Committee on the Peaceful Uses of Outer Space:
Legal Subcommittee
Fifty-third session

Script

896th meeting
Friday, 4 April 2014, 10.14 a.m.
Vienna

Chair: Mr. Kai-Uwe Schrogl

The meeting was called to order at 10.14 a.m.

Mr. Kai-Uwe Schrogl (Chair) Good morning distinguished delegates, I now declare open the 896th meeting of the Legal Subcommittee of the Committee on the Peaceful Uses of Outer Space.

This morning, I would like to continue with the adoption of the report of the Legal Subcommittee. But before doing so, the observer from the European Space Agency has asked for the floor for a brief announcement. You have the floor.

Mr. Soucek (European Space Agency) Thank you very much, Chair. Good morning to everybody. This is just a very short positive information to positively start this day — that yesterday night, the European Space Agency successfully launched the Sentinel 1 mission, Earth observation mission, that will be the first one of the Copernicus Earth Observation Programme that we are implementing in cooperation with the European Union. And this mission will certainly allow all our international partners to further rely on European Earth observation capacities.

Let me just quote four sentences of the press release that was released yesterday night: “The 2.3 ton satellite lifted off on a Soyuz rocket from Europe’s space port in Kourou, French Guiana, at 23.02 Central European Summer Time. After 617 second burn, the fragat upper stage delivered Sentinel into a sun-synchronous orbit at 693 km altitude.”

And now two sentences that tell you a bit more what the satellite is actually doing: “It is a C-band radar mission that will provide all weather, day and night, imagery of land and ocean surfaces in near-real time. It will allow citizens, policymakers and service providers to access key environmental data on a routine basis. It will ensure continuity with the European ENVISAT Satellite, which stopped working in 2012 after 10 years of service. Data from the Sentinel satellite will be provided on an free and open basis.”

So I just wanted to share with you this positive news that the first of the long series of Sentinel missions has been safely delivered to space yesterday night. Thank you very much.

Mr. Kai-Uwe Schrogl (Chair) I thank Mr. Soucek, representing the European Space Agency, for this announcement.

Let us now turn to the adoption of the report. You have before you addenda 3 and addenda 4. And I think you had enough time to read the documents so that we can proceed with the adoption. But before doing so, we have to return to two elements which we left open. One is a short announcement by the Secretariat that will we add one side event in the respective paragraph dealing with these issues. The Secretariat.

Mr. Hedman (Secretariat) Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Yes, distinguished delegates, in the first part of the report, L.294, in paragraph 30 we, the Subcommittee expresses gratitude to the side events that have been organized. And there we have the lunchtime seminar organized by Japan, Canada, United States and the meeting organized by ESPI as an evening event. And the suggestion is to also add the Saturday workshop organized by the University of Vienna that delegations recall. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Kai-Uwe Schrogl (Chair) Thank you. Is this acceptable? So we amend this paragraph, thank you.

We then turn to another addendum we would like or should provide to the document L.294 addendum 2. This would be a paragraph 8 bis, which we requested to be provided by the Russian Federation. May I ask the Russian Federation whether you can provide us now with the text of this paragraph 8 bis.

Mr. Kornatskiy (Russian Federation, translated from Russian) I do apologize but we did hand in the text yester evening to the Secretariat. We will submit the text though when it’s ready.

[Change in translators] The text was submitted to the Secretariat last night. I don’t have it with me right now. When it’s presented to us we will be happy to comment.

Mr. Kai-Uwe Schrogl (Chair) Thank you. The text is before us and I will ask the Secretariat to read it out for your consideration.

Mr. Hedman (Secretariat) Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Yes, delegations should then refer to document L.294 addenda 2, and it's a proposed paragraph for 8 bis on the section on General Exchange of Information on Non-legally Binding United Nations Instruments on Outer Space. And the paragraph as proposed reads as follows:

Some delegations expressed the view that the exchange of information under the agenda item would clarify the goals, acceptability, applicability and effectiveness of non-legally binding instruments.

I read it again:

Some delegations expressed the view that the exchange of information under the agenda item would clarify the goals, acceptability, applicability and effectiveness of non-legally binding instruments.

Thank you.

Mr. Kai-Uwe Schrogl (Chair) Thank you, Secretariat. Any objections? I see none. So we adopt this paragraph 8 bis contained in addendum 2.

Now we turn to document L.294 addendum 3. It contains VII, Capacity-building in space law and IX, General exchange of information and views on legal mechanisms relating to space debris mitigation measures.

Do all delegations have this document before them, addendum 3?

So we start with the adoption of this part.

Paragraph 1?

Adopted.

Paragraph 2? France.

Mr. Dufresne (France, translated from French) Yes, thank you, Chairman. On this paragraph we would like to have France listed as one of the States that took the floor. Thank you.

Mr. Kai-Uwe Schrogl (Chair) Thank you, France. Indeed, you made a statement yesterday. We will include that. Any other remarks?

So it's adopted, as amended.

Paragraph 3, containing subparagraphs (a) to (c)?

Adopted.

Paragraph 4, containing subparagraphs (a) to (c)?

Adopted.

Paragraph 5?

Adopted.

Paragraph 6?

Adopted.

Paragraph 7?

Adopted.

Paragraph 8?

Adopted.

Paragraph 9?

Adopted.

Paragraph 10?

Adopted.

Paragraph 11?

Adopted.

Paragraph 12?

Adopted.

Paragraph 13?

Adopted.

Paragraph 14?

Adopted.

Paragraph 15?

Adopted.

Paragraph 16?

Adopted.

Paragraph 17?

Adopted.

Paragraph 18?

Adopted.

Paragraph 19?

Adopted.

Paragraph 20?

Adopted.

And paragraph 21?

Adopted.

We turn now to IX, General exchange of information and views on legal mechanisms relating to space debris mitigation measures, taking into account the work of the Scientific and Technical Subcommittee.

Paragraph 22?

Adopted.

Paragraph 23?

Adopted.

24?

Adopted.

25?

Adopted.

26?

Adopted.

27?

Adopted.

28?

Adopted.

29?

Adopted.

30?

Adopted.

31?

Adopted.

32?

Adopted.

33? Mexico on 32.

Ms. Ramirez (Mexico, translated from Spanish) Thank you and good morning to everyone. Mr. Chairman, I'm concerned about this type of agreement. You know better than I do how the Legal Subcommittee was born. The objective of setting up the Subcommittee was to promote the objectives of our treaties and the Scientific and Technical Subcommittee was set up to support the Legal Subcommittee. So here in paragraph 33 we read: "The view was expressed that the Legal Subcommittee should cooperate with the Scientific and Technical Subcommittee in developing binding rules for space debris mitigation.

It's actually the reverse, Mr. Chairman. It is our function, first and foremost, to cover these issues. It's not that we should cooperate with the Scientific and

Technical Subcommittee in developing binding rules in this case for space debris mitigation. We should develop those rules and the Scientific and Technical Subcommittee should support us in that function. So I suggest saying "we invite" as we did in some of the other paragraphs. Of course it's joint work, but we should always remember how the Scientific and Technical Subcommittee was set up and how the Legal Subcommittee was set up, in what order and with what objective. Thank you very much.

Mr. Kai-Uwe Schrogl (Chair) Thank you, Mexico. You know that this was a view which was expressed by a delegation. You would now like to change the paragraph and replace "cooperate with" with something like "that the Legal Subcommittee invites the Scientific and Technical Subcommittee in cooperating in the development of binding rules for space debris mitigation". Something like that? You did not provide a wording, so please provide a wording of your own, how you would like to change the paragraph and then we can decide whether we amend it.

Ms. Ramirez (Mexico, translated from Spanish) It seems to me, Mr. Chairman, that I shouldn't waste the Subcommittee's time, but it should be the reverse. And we need to take that into account. In previous paragraphs we were saying that we should work jointly and that is very acceptable. But to tell us that we should cooperate with the Scientific and Technical Subcommittee in developing binding norms, that is putting the cart before the horse. This is the reverse of what it should be. Just stick to the legal framework.

What you suggested seems fine. Invert the logic of this. Thank you.

Mr. Kai-Uwe Schrogl (Chair) Thank you, Mexico. Venezuela.

Mr. Parra (Venezuela, translated from Spanish) Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Our delegation did speak about this, did express a view on this. And I think the language referred to by the distinguished delegate of Mexico, is fine. This is joint work. Cooperation of the two Subcommittees and our delegation did say that this Subcommittee should step up or increase its cooperation with the Scientific and Technical Subcommittee. And that was also said by GRULAC, unless I'm mistaken, and other delegations.

So it should be something like "some delegations", rather than "the view was expressed" maybe. Thank you.

Mr. Kai-Uwe Schrogl (Chair) Thank you, Venezuela. Chile.

Ms. Alvarez (Chile, translated from Spanish) Thank you, Mr. Chairman. It seems to me in the

Spanish version it's much simpler. The English paragraph said the Legal Subcommittee should cooperate with the Scientific and Technical Subcommittee. In the Spanish version, it says there needs to be cooperation between the Legal Subcommittee and the Scientific and Technical Subcommittee. And this is what our colleague from Mexico said. That's the reverse of what can be inferred from the English language here. They're both important Subcommittees, the Legal Subcommittee and the Scientific and Technical Subcommittee and they must cooperate. They must work together. What can be inferred from the way it's written here is that one of them needs to endorse or adopt the findings of the other. And that's not correct. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Kai-Uwe Schrogl (Chair) Thank you, very much appreciate the intervention of Chile, which will bring us to a good compromise, I guess. It could read that "some delegations expressed the view that the Legal Subcommittee and the Scientific and Technical Subcommittee should cooperate in the developing of binding rules for space debris mitigation". Ok? Good.

Can we adopt this paragraph as amended? We can. Thank you.

We continue with 34. Chile.

Ms. Alvarez (Chile, translated from Spanish) Yes, I'm sorry to take the floor again. The Spanish version also needs to be changed. The translation leaves a bit of ambiguity. So what you said in English is fine, but then the Spanish would need to be adapted also. Thank you.

Mr. Kai-Uwe Schrogl (Chair) Thank you. The Secretariat will take care of that. Yes, all languages will be aligned of course.

We are now at 34.

Adopted.

35?

Adopted.

36?

Adopted.

37?

Adopted.

38?

Adopted.

39?

Adopted.

40? China

Mr. Shang (China, translated from Chinese) Thank you, Mr. Chairman. With regard to the Chinese version, paragraph 40, second line, there's a word missing in the Chinese version. That is "carry out" and we think this word should be added in the Chinese version.

In addition, "the English version be integrated into" in Chinese, means adapted into or adopt. So we believe in order to keep the Chinese version in line with the English version we need to make some change to the translation. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Kai-Uwe Schrogl (Chair) Thank you, China. That will be taken care of.

40 then?

Adopted.

41?

Adopted.

42?

Adopted.

43?

Adopted.

44?

Adopted. I see Venezuela.

Mr. Parra (Venezuela, translated from Spanish) Thank you, Chair. Our delegation, under this agenda item, expressed a view regarding sustainable development of nations. And I'd like to suggest a wording for this paragraph that would read more or less in the following way:

The view was expressed that it is necessary to promote the sustainable development of nations that, with a view to promoting sustainable development of nations, and environmental policy must be pursued that must be in keeping with international treaties to protect the environment and the biosphere of Earth and that such policies or treaties should include space debris mitigation guidelines.

But we will later submit the precise language to the Secretariat. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Kai-Uwe Schrogl (Chair) Thank you, Venezuela. And just trying to figure out where we could place such a paragraph. But maybe you have an idea. In any case, I would request you to hand in to the Secretariat the precise wording. Also a proposal on where to place it in this part. And then we will adopt it when we have the exact wording before us. Yes, if you

can do that immediately so that we ... Yes, sure ... Ok, we then, since it will obviously only be in Spanish, we will do the following: you now read it out please again, slowly so that we can adopt it and find already a place for it so that this issue then is solved. Can you please read it out again?

Mr. Parra (Venezuela, translated from Spanish) Thank you, Chair. I would suggest that we read it later. We are working on the text right now. So to make sure we have a really good finished text I need a little more time. Thank you.

Mr. Kai-Uwe Schrogl (Chair) Ok. So we will then continue our consideration of document L.294, addendum 4. This contains VIII and XII. Does everybody has this document, addendum 4 before her or him?

Ok, then we can start. XIII is the Review and possible revision of the Principles Relevant to the Use of Nuclear Power Sources in Outer Space.

Paragraph 1?

Adopted.

Paragraph 2?

Adopted.

Paragraph 3?

Adopted.

Paragraph 4?

Adopted.

Paragraph 5?

Adopted.

Paragraph 6?

Adopted.

Paragraph 7?

Adopted.

Paragraph 8?

Adopted.

Paragraph 9?

Adopted.

Paragraph 10?

Adopted.

Paragraph 11?

Adopted.

Paragraph 12?

Adopted.

We turn now to XII, Proposals to the Committee on the Peaceful Uses of Outer Space for new items to be considered by the Legal Subcommittee at its fifty-fourth session.

Paragraph 13?

Adopted.

Paragraph 14?

Adopted.

Paragraph 15, comprising subparagraphs (a) to (c)?

Adopted.

Paragraph 16?

Adopted.

Paragraph 17?

Adopted.

Paragraph 18?

Adopted.

Paragraph 19?

Adopted.

Paragraph 20?

Adopted.

Paragraph 21?

Adopted.

Paragraph 22? There I would like to make a small change. You know that I presented that paragraph yesterday. And after rereading I would suggest to simply make a small editorial change and this would delete a [...] mentioning of too many considerations, discussions, deliberations. So that I would propose that we take out "in the deliberations" and the paragraph would read:

"The Subcommittee also agreed that under that agenda item Member States could, as appropriate, also take into consideration the discussions on other non-legally binding instruments on outer space, as well as the relationship between legally binding and non-legally binding instruments."

Is that acceptable? The Russian Federation.

Mr. Gudnov (Russian Federation, translated from Russian) Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Listening to the Russian interpretation I heard "take into account the discussion". I don't think that is in compliance with the understanding we reached here. It is not about taking into account, it's about having a discussion. I

think this would be more accurate in terms of the understanding reached here. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Kai-Uwe Schrogl (Chair) Thank you, Russian Federation. I did not mention “taking into account”. It must have been an issue of [...]. “Taking into consideration the discussion” — that is the original text. Is that acceptable to you? Yes.

Mr. Gudnov (Russian Federation, translated from Russian) No, Mr. Chairman. “Take into consideration” doesn’t work either. We think it shouldn’t be “take into consideration” or “take into account”. It should be “to have a discussion on the issues listed here”. In our opinion, this paragraph was not much larger than other paragraphs, but it has to be accurate in terms of what our objective would be on this issue.

Once again, as I said in the second line, in the English version I suggest striking the phrase “take into consideration the discussions” and instead [translator’s note: the Russian delegate probably means “to have discussions”] “to have discussions”. Thank you Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Kai-Uwe Schrogl (Chair) Thank you, Russian Federation. So I would read out what the Russian Federation proposed, together with my proposal and that new paragraph would read:

“The Subcommittee also agreed that, under that agenda item, member States could, as appropriate, have discussions on other non-legally binding instruments on outer space, as well as the relationship between legally binding and non-legally binding instruments.”

Would that be acceptable to delegations? Japan.

Mr. Hamada (Japan) Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman. I think that I have no objection at all. But if the intention of the Russian delegation is to make it clear that we can discuss. So rather than “have discussions” I think it’s clear saying “member State could, as appropriate, discuss other non-legally binding”. I think it is much easier, isn’t it? This is my proposal.

Mr. Kai-Uwe Schrogl (Chair) Thank you, Japan. Indeed that would even facilitate the wording. Is that acceptable to delegations? So we take up that proposal. And it would read:

“The Subcommittee also agreed that, under that agenda item, member States could, as appropriate, discuss other non-legally binding instruments on outer space, as well as the relationship between legally binding and non-legally binding instruments.” China.

Mr. Shang (China, translated from Chinese) Thank you, Mr. Chair. We don’t have any objections

on this paragraph. However, this reminds me of the issues that we have in paragraph 19.

In paragraph 19: “some delegations expressed the view”. I think, first of all, they should talk about the objectivity of the agenda item as well as the working methods under this agenda item. Therefore, we suppose that in paragraph 19 we only add one word, that is on the second line should be: first. We should add the word first. So according to our discussion we should first discuss the objective and methodologies under this agenda item. This is very important to all of us. Thank you, Chair.

Mr. Kai-Uwe Schrogl (Chair) Thank you, distinguished representative of China. May I ask for a clarification? When we look at the English text would your proposal mean that you would replace the word “further” in the third line by “first”? Thank you.

Mr. Shang (China, translated from Chinese) Thank you, Mr. Chair. No, we propose to simply add one word, first, that is first. We would like to add “first” before “further”. Thank you.

Mr. Kai-Uwe Schrogl (Chair) Ok, I understand. It means that you would add the “first” before the “further”, which would then read: an outcome of the work under the item should first be further elaborated and clarified? Yes, ok. But we have not yet finalized our deliberations on paragraph 22. Can I then ... I see that we adopt this paragraph. So it’s adopted. And we return to paragraph 19 with the addendum of the Chinese delegation: should first be elaborated and clarified. I see no objections, so it’s adopted, as amended.

And we continue with paragraph 23, which contains the proposed agenda, with all the items, through to agenda item 13. So the whole paragraph 23?

I see no objections. So it’s adopted.

24?

Adopted.

25?

Adopted.

26?

Adopted.

27?

Adopted.

28?

Adopted.

29?

Adopted.

30?

Adopted.

31?

Adopted.

32?

Adopted. 32. 32? Egypt.

Mr. Ismail (Egypt) Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman. Just a minor change to the last line. Instead of “implemented” could be “possibly considered for further deliberations”.

Paragraph 1?

Adopted.

Mr. Kai-Uwe Schrogl (Chair) Thank you, Egypt. Objections against this amendment. I see none. So it’s adopted with this amendment, proposed by Egypt.

33?

Adopted.

34?

Adopted.

35?

Adopted.

36? The United States.

Mr. Hodgkins (United States) Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Mr. Chairman, on paragraph 36 I guess there are a couple of questions concerning how we are going to proceed. My delegation right now is having a rather difficult time determining what exactly we are going to be discussion in these intersessional consultations in view of paragraph 31 that, where we have “some delegations expressed the view that the structure of the agenda should remain unchanged”. We have paragraph 32 where some positive elements that were welcomed by delegations concerning the proposal from Germany. And paragraph 33 where the view was expressed that the proposal by Germany should be seen as one suggestion for improving the methods of work in the Legal Subcommittee. So, my question is, in paragraph 36 we are asking Germany to lead intersessional consultations, making use of the opportunities provided by COPUOS and the S and T Subcommittee and to build on the progress that had already been made. So what exactly in these consultations will be the subject of discussion? Is it going to be CRP.30, or is it going to be CRP.30 and

then other proposals that have been raised and other ideas that have been raised in the course of our deliberations, including the possibility that the structure of the agenda would remain unchanged, as reflected by delegations in paragraph 31? Thank you.

Mr. Kai-Uwe Schrogl (Chair) Thank you, United States. German delegation.

Mr. Wennholz (Germany) Thank you, Mr. Chairman. And thanks to the distinguished delegates of the United States for this question.

So, just to briefly elaborate on what we are planning to do. The intersessional consultation that we intend to do will depart from the document or will be based on the document that we have distributed as our CRP.30. This should be a basis for discussions for open discussions taking into account all the concerns, wastes and possibly further concerns to be made by consultations, taking use of the opportunities provided by the margins of the main committee and the Scientific and Technical Subcommittee. Thank you.

Mr. Kai-Uwe Schrogl (Chair) Thank you. Venezuela.

Mr. Parra (Venezuela, translated from Spanish) Thank you, Chair. We would like to emphasize the fact that from our point of view there’s a bit of a contradiction between paragraph 31 and what it says in paragraph 36. A number of delegations in the Subcommittee explicitly stated that they want to maintain the status quo. And paragraph 36 suggests the possibility of reaching an agreement. So it seems as a contradiction here.

Either keep the status quo or reach an agreement. We understand the issue and our delegation did make a statement to the effect that these are not only formal issues but there’s a need for political will to include more subjects, more issues, to broaden the discussion in this Subcommittee. And that, of course, is related to the text that we are going to propose later. Thank you.

Mr. Kai-Uwe Schrogl (Chair) Thank you. United States, has the response from the German delegation satisfied your request for further information?

Mr. Hodgkins (United States) Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Yes, it does. But I just want to strike a cautionary note here, which is if our discussions are going to start with the premise that we are going to work from CRP.30 and that there is some way of massaging that document to make it acceptable to all delegations, I think that’s going to be rather difficult given the view that have been expressed, as reflected here in the report. Now, we are certainly prepared to participate in these intersessional consultations, but I

don't think that we're at a stage where the CRP.30 is really the fundamental basis for our deliberations. And I just want to make sure that, as we proceed in the, that delegation here, including the delegation of Germany, who's put a considerable amount of work into this, understand that we are still a ways away from what we would consider to be a consensus on how to restructure the Subcommittee. But with that, I would not object to paragraph 36 as drafted. Thank you.

Mr. Kai-Uwe Schrogl (Chair) Thank you. I ask the representative of Venezuela, you identified some mismatch between one paragraph and the other paragraph, you said that it's not logic. But anyway, these are two separate issues which are dealt with and two different expressions. The expressions which are statements of situation and the position of today. So positions can also change. But, having said that, would you accept paragraph 36, even if it's in, from your perspective, contradiction with 31?

Mr. Parra (Venezuela, translated from Spanish) Thank you, Mr. Chairman. We would accept the paragraph if it can be lightened up a little. That the Subcommittee is asking the German delegation. Maybe we should say instead, "the view was expressed that Germany could continue intersessional consultations". Something like that. Make it a little less pre-emptory, rather than "the Subcommittee requested Germany". So: "The view was expressed that Germany might continue intersessional consultations" and then continue as written. Thank you.

Mr. Kai-Uwe Schrogl (Chair) Thank you. Egypt. First was Algeria, then France.

Mr. Quzerouhane (Algeria) Thank you, Mr. Chairman. In order to accommodate conservation delegation, including my own delegation, I propose the following: in the fourth line, we will delete after 2015, "to build on the progress that had already been made". And in the fifth line, we will also delete "reach an agreement". And this part of the paragraph will read as follows: With the view to possibly decide on the proposal presented by Germany by the 54th Session of the Legal Subcommittee in 2015. Thank you, Chairman.

Mr. Kai-Uwe Schrogl (Chair) Algeria. France.

Mr. Dufresne (France, translated from French) Thank you, Chairman. Listening to the proposals from some of our distinguished colleagues we have a comment we'd like to make.

Some countries did request the status quo to remain unchanged. However, over the past two weeks a large number of delegations called for a change to be made. So it's more than just, actually some delegations

expressed the view that there should be a discussion on how we work within the Legal Subcommittee. We would share the view of the US and all delegations to the effect that we do need to have extensive consultations in order to be able to make a decision. And before we make a decision to even just make progress.

Now with respect to the restructuring of the agenda and the sequence of our work, well our view is that progress can be made. We can move forward. But this would require consultations to be carried out beforehand. There was an opinion expressed by many delegations, including our own, and this should be reflected, and this would be achieved if we were to use the phrasing, some delegations.

Mr. Kai-Uwe Schrogl (Chair) Thank you, France. Egypt.

Mr. Ismail (Egypt) Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman. Hearing now the comments from the US, Venezuela, Algeria from one side, and my French neighbour here as well as the clarification by the German delegation, I see that we would need three things. First, and foremost, is to have open-ended consultation on this issue. Secondly, we need a consensus in order to reach an agreement. Third is to somehow reposition this paragraph after paragraph 33 in order to have some coherence in the sequence of the deliberations and discussions, per se.

So first, I would ask to reorder this paragraph and position it after paragraph 33 to become 34, so that we would have the three different views after each other in 31, 32 and 33. And then, what is to be done with the German proposal?

Secondly, to reformulate this paragraph in order to accommodate all the view expressed in 31, 32 and 33. And I would rather go for the following formulation and I'll read it in dictation speed so that those who would want to write it down:

The Subcommittee invites Germany to carry out further open-ended consultations to further elaborate its proposal contained in documents (and we can take it from paragraph 28, the L.2893, Rev.1 and the CRP.30), for the purpose of reaching a consensus on its proposal.

I hope it's clear. Thank you.

Mr. Kai-Uwe Schrogl (Chair) Thank you very much. Did everybody have the opportunity to write down the proposal by Egypt. Yes, I see everybody has done that. Thank you very much. Next on my list is the Netherlands.

Mr. Oosterkamp (Netherlands) Thank you, Chairman. As was expressed before by my delegation,

the Dutch delegation would also like to make progress for restructuring the LSC to get a better output, as stated before and what was said by my distinguished French colleague I can fully support.

Mr. Kai-Uwe Schrogl (Chair) Thank you, Venezuela.

Mr. Parra (Venezuela, translated from Spanish) Thank you, Mr. Chairman, with respect to the proposal made by our Egyptian colleague, we don't oppose it. However, we feel that we need to modify the first part of the paragraph. So, "Some delegations invited the German delegation to", and then we would continue as Egypt proposed. Thank you.

Mr. Kai-Uwe Schrogl (Chair) We heard indeed a number of positions on that. I don't want to, let's say, let the whole discussion pass by again. The discussion of this topic where almost all delegations participated and where all delegations showed a vivid, very vivid, interest in this. So I see that the Subcommittee as a whole took an interest in the conduct of that discussion. So I think nobody would deny that.

Now we have to see how we continue this discussion. This discussion which is based on the German proposal. But as we have heard, should not be determined in any way to very specific point of conclusion. So we have to bring these two things together. That the Subcommittee as a whole has an interest in this. And that we have to be careful and not determine anything.

So I think that the proposal provided by Egypt is an excellent proposal. It takes up the positive as well as the cautionary elements of what has been discussed. And I would like to ask the Venezuelan delegate whether, in this spirit of compromise, he could also say and accept, yes, it is the Subcommittee as a whole which is saying we want this debate, let us have this debate. But, be cautious not to go too far. Would that be an option for you?

Mr. Parra (Venezuela, translated from Spanish) Thank you, Chair, for the question. Our delegation would have a proposal with regard to paragraph 28. Regarding the German proposal, we would suggest saying "the Subcommittee noted with interest the proposal by Germany", and the rest as it stands.

And the, on paragraph 36, which would be 36 bis, we would suggest saying "some delegations invited Germany to continue intersessional consultations" and then the paragraph would be as proposed by Egypt.

We certainly recognize the fact that this proposal invigorated the debate, and many delegations showed great interest, both in favour and against. Thank you.

Mr. Kai-Uwe Schrogl (Chair) China.

Mr. Shang (China, translated from Chinese) Thank you, Mr. Chair. We are of the view that the distinguished delegates from Egypt and Venezuela have raised a very important proposal. We hope that efforts can be made to reach a consensus which is acceptable to all. We hope, in line with the proposals made by Egypt, we do a small change to the beginning part of the paragraph. I will read in English.

[Delegate speaking] We may change the starting part of the distinguished delegate of Egypt to read as: "In the discussion of the Subcommittee, Germany was invited", and then to continue. I don't why that is acceptable to you or not. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Kai-Uwe Schrogl (Chair) Thank you, China. Any other delegations wishing to contribute?

Indeed it is a difficult situation when you have a situation where some delegations can mirror two delegations, but also the whole Subcommittee minus one. And this is an issue we have to face and to see how we then can find a compromise for that. And we have heard another proposal for a compromise. And I have seen the Republic of Korea asking for the floor. Maybe even adding a further proposal for compromise.

Mr. Yee (Republic of Korea) Thank you, Chairman. Concerning this matter, how to make the compromise on para. 36. So [...] discussion on this specific issues. Some [...] the leadership of Germany to be continued on the, through the intersessional consultations. So between the Venezuelan proposal and the Egyptian proposals, I believe some distinguished delegate of China proposal would be closest to the atmospheres and the contents we have had on this matter. So this [...] the views expressed by the distinguished delegate of China. Thank you.

Mr. Kai-Uwe Schrogl (Chair) Thank you very much. So I turn to the distinguished delegate from Venezuela, whether he could accept the Chinese proposal? Yes. But I would of course turn to the German delegation because it will certainly rest on the German delegation to accept the compromise on this matter. The German delegation.

Mr. Wennholz (Germany) Thank you, Mr. Chairman. We thank all the delegations who provided input for this discussion, which we followed with great interest and we would be ready to go along with this proposal; the version as last made by China. Thank you.

Mr. Kai-Uwe Schrogl (Chair) I thank the German delegation. So I would read out the paragraph, as amended by China and Egypt, and I will read that

out in a moment in order so that we can then adopt this paragraph, as amended.

Distinguished delegates, I would read out the paragraph as we have taken note of. So with this provision. It would read:

In the discussions of the Subcommittee Germany was invited to hold open-ended intersessional consultations, making use of the opportunities by the sessions of the Committee on the Peaceful Uses of Outer Space in 2014, and the Scientific and Technical Subcommittee in 2015, in order to further elaborate on its proposal contained in document CRP.30, with a view to reaching a consensus on that proposal.

Egypt?

Mr. Ismail (Egypt) Thank you, Mr. Chairman. The reformulation that you just read is acceptable. However, that was not, I presume, the Egyptian proposal as amended by China. The exact proposal was, as amended by China, was that the discussions of the Subcommittee, “Germany was invited to carry out further open-ended consultations, to further elaborate on its proposal as contained”... and then you named the document ... “, for the purpose of reaching a consensus on that proposal”.

The main reason why the sentence naming those sessions was taken out is that we don't want to confine it only for open-ended consultation during the sessions. Maybe the delegation of Germany would like to carry out open-ended consultations at any point in time, which somehow this restricts such activity to be undertaken. So that was the main purpose of not naming when those consultations should be carried out.

Mr. Kai-Uwe Schrogl (Chair)

Mr. Ramirez (Mexico, translated from Spanish)

Mr. Kai-Uwe Schrogl (Chair)

Mr. Matter (Switzerland)

Mr. Kai-Uwe Schrogl (Chair)