
Committee on the Peaceful Uses of Outer Space:

Legal Subcommittee

Fifty-third session

Script

890th meeting
Tuesday, 1 April 2014, 10.08 a.m.
Vienna

Chair: Mr. Kai-Uwe Schrogl

The meeting was called to order at 10.08 a.m.

Mr. K. U. Schrogl (Chair) Good morning distinguished delegates, I now declare open the 890th meeting of the Legal Subcommittee of the Committee on the Peaceful Uses of Outer Space.

This morning, we will continue our consideration of agenda item 11, 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. We will also continue and hopefully conclude our consideration of agenda item 12, General exchange of information on non-legally binding United Nations instruments on outer space and continue and hopefully suspend our consideration of agenda item 13, Review of international mechanisms for cooperation in the peaceful exploration and use of outer space pending discussions in the Working Group on that item. We will also continue our discussion of agenda item 14, Proposals to the Committee on new items for consideration by the Subcommittee.

During lunchtime, there will be a GRULAC meeting on matters related to the Committee, from 1 p.m. to 2 p.m. in meeting room C0713/15. Also during lunchtime, there will be an EU coordination meeting on matters related to the Committee, from 2 p.m. to 3 p.m., in meeting room C6.

Distinguished delegates I would now like to continue our consideration of item 11 on our agenda, General exchange of information and views on legal mechanisms relating to space debris mitigation measures. The first speaker on my list is the distinguished delegate from Japan. You have the floor.

Mr. S. Fukushima (Japan) Thank you Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Chairman, Distinguished Delegates, on behalf of the Government of Japan, I am pleased to address the 53rd session of the Legal Subcommittee of COPUOS regarding domestic mechanisms used by Japan in the mitigation of space debris activities.

Mr. Chairman, enshrined within Japan's "Basic Space Law" enacted in May of 2008, is the notion that space exploration and utilization should be carried out with consideration for the preservation of space environment. The "Basic Plan for Space Policy", published in June 2009 under the "Basic Space Law" and renewed in January 2013, states that it is necessary for Japan to observe space objects in order to understand the population of debris, and to make efforts to limit the generation of debris, as well as to conduct research and development of technologies to remove existing large debris.

The Japan Aerospace Exploration Agency (JAXA), which plays a core role in Japanese space activities, established the "JAXA Space Debris Mitigation Standard" in 1996. The current version of the Standard complies with the United Nations Space Debris Mitigation Guidelines adopted by the General Assembly in 2007, and with the ISO 24113 "Space Debris Mitigation Requirements", established by the International Standardization Organization (ISO) in 2010.

Mr. Chairman, in JAXA's domestic mechanisms for space debris mitigation, spacecraft and launch vehicle design and operation plans are reviewed at the end of each development phase to ensure compliance with the "JAXA Space Debris Mitigation Standard", and eventually with the UN Space Debris Mitigation Guidelines. These technical reviews are conducted and confirmed at the managerial level.

In accordance with the UN Space Debris Mitigation Guidelines and ITU recommendations, all Japanese commercial and JAXA geosynchronous satellites have been transferred outside of the protected region for the geosynchronous earth orbit (GEO) to preserve the GEO region. Concerning spacecraft operated in the low Earth orbital (LEO) region, JAXA will terminate spacecraft operations once the propellant is ensured to be sufficient to conduct disposal manoeuvres in order to reduce its orbital lifetime within 25 years, or by using natural force to limit the spacecraft's orbital lifetime and to comply with the UN Space Debris Mitigation Guidelines.

Furthermore, in order to avoid collisions among operating satellites and other objects, JAXA analyses collision probability daily using its own tools, and those provided by the United States via "Close Approach Notifications" and will conduct collision avoidance manoeuvres if necessary.

Ground safety from re-entering objects is also being considered. I am pleased to be able to present recent examples of the successful controlled re-entry of mission-terminated space systems. Last year, Japan successfully conducted controlled re-entry of the second stage of H-IIB launch vehicle No.4 and its payload, the 4th H-II Transfer Vehicle (HTV) known as KOUNOTORI.

Mr. Chairman, Japan is engaged in research and development work in cooperation with universities. Current research focuses on technologies for (a) observation of smaller objects, (b) protection from impact of small debris, and (c) active and efficient removal of mission terminated spacecraft. Active removal is especially important because collision among debris, followed by a chain reaction of collisions, will become a dominant factor leading to an increase of debris in the future. In addition to this issue, we recognize that there are several issues which need to be solved by international cooperation in the near future.

Mr. Chairman, we encourage all Member States operating and launching satellites to report their status of implementing the UN Space Debris Mitigation Guidelines domestically as it will contribute to improving transparency and confidence building among Member States. Thank you for your kind attention.

Mr. K. U. Schrogl (Chair) I thank the distinguished delegate from Japan for her statement. Next on my list is the distinguished delegate from Venezuela. You have the floor.

Mr. M. C. Para (Venezuela, translated from Spanish) Yes thank you Chair. As regards environmental management, the Bolivarian Republic of Venezuela has historically been characterized by implementation of policies intended to protect and maintain both the near and far environment of planet Earth to the benefit of present and future generations.

On this basis our constitution establishes in its preamble respect for the ecological balance and protection of natural resources as the common and indissoluble heritage of humanity, as well as setting out a chapter dedicated to environmental affairs.

Consequently the text of the constitution develops at the necessary length the rights and duties

towards the environment of each generation, highlighting the need to maintain effective development of environmental security in the industrial sector in all its branches. From this point of view, and as regards the national mechanisms relating to measures to reduce or mitigate space debris, the Bolivarian Republic of Venezuela, in the design phase of the satellite platform Venesat-1 Simón Bolívar, it demanded that there be sufficient fuel to carry out the various operations so that it could return to appropriate levels, thinking about past situations and avoiding further space debris.

This being the case, the delegation of the Bolivarian Republic of Venezuela considers that what has been taken up in the guidelines to reduce space debris as included by the General Assembly in resolution 62/217. Nonetheless this is solely one step in the technical and legal process which states must address to overcome such debris.

At the moment, the global trend, pressed forward by the need to develop and promote the sustainable development of peoples, means that norms in this field including guidelines to reduce space debris respond to the broad ranging environmental policies which are part of international treaties in the field, notably to protect the environment and the planet's biosphere as well as to guarantee social, cultural and economic development in harmony with the environment, where the use of resources of the environment by current generations should not compromise the heritage of future generations.

For this reason this delegation is of the opinion that continuing to improve and perfect the current guide for mitigation of space debris and carrying out an appropriate legal analysis by this Subcommittee should continue. The lack of clear requirements and the shortfall of binding norms is a problem for these particular areas and for countries which traditionally have handled technological resources in an uncontrolled way, and which in time require restrictions for other states, which quite legitimately aspire to make use of technology as a mechanism to enhance the living conditions of their peoples.

Finally, this delegation repeats its wish that this Subcommittee increase its interaction with the Scientific and Technical affairs Subcommittee and looks favourably at the adoption of the issue of the general exchange of information and opinions on legal mechanisms on debris mitigation and similar affairs, bearing in mind the work of the Subcommittee on technical and scientific matters and hopes that this action will promote frank discussion and promote the drafting of binding international standards in these issues. And in conclusion Chair, as regards the

compendium on standards for mitigating space debris adopted by the states and international organizations, which was devised following the work done by Canada, Czech Republic and Germany, we think that this is a step in the right direction to address this issue. And along these lines Chair, my delegation thinks that this text that you read out yesterday afternoon, which was adopted by the Subcommittee, should be distributed so that it remain clear what we adopted and help us when it comes to preparing the report, thank you.

Mr. K. U. Schrogl (Chair) I thank the distinguished delegate from Venezuela for his statement, are there any other delegations wishing to speak on this agenda item? I see none so we will therefore continue and hopefully conclude our consideration of agenda item 11, 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 this afternoon. Distinguished delegates, I would now like to continue and hopefully conclude our consideration of agenda item 12, the General exchange of information on non-legally binding United Nations instruments on outer space. The first speaker on my list is the distinguished delegate of Germany. You have the floor.

Mr. P. Wennholz (Germany) Thank you Mr. Chairman. Mr. Chairman, distinguished delegates, the German delegation welcomes the new agenda item on non-legally binding United Nations instruments on outer space. Although not legally binding these instruments have their special value as expressions of political commitment and best practices. Since the adoption of the United Nations space treaties, new space law instruments have predominantly been formulated as soft law. The German delegation is of the opinion that the resolutions and principles adopted within the United Nations General Assembly and its subordinate bodies should be given adequate importance in the interpretation of general legal terms.

The Sample Draft Questionnaire formulated by the Japanese delegation under this agenda item deals with different non-legally binding United Nations instruments on outer space. In this respect, the International Charter on Space and Major Disasters is an example for the implementation of the United Nations Remote Sensing Principles X and XI. In 2010 the German Aerospace Centre (DLR) joined the Charter as its eleventh member.

Please allow me to briefly raise a further important issue that is relevant to the present agenda item and also to the future work of UNCOPUOS and its subcommittees. We would like to draw attention to

the recent developments relating to best practice instruments concerning outer space activities. There are three best practice instruments under consideration in three different fora, two of them outside the framework of UNCOPUOS. All these instruments are linked to the issues — sustainability, security, confidence-building measures and space traffic management. The International Code of Conduct for Outer Space Activities, initiated by the European Union, is currently in the final stage of negotiation. Furthermore, the Group of Governmental Experts on Transparency and Confidence-building measures in Outer Space Activities finalized its report in the course of last year. This group was established pursuant to General Assembly Resolution 65/68. The advancement of the two initiatives comes at a time when the Working Group on Long-term Sustainability of Outer Space Activities is about to finalize its report and recommendations.

All three initiatives act on crucial issues of the enhancement of space law. Although all of them have different focusses ranging over sustainability, security and transparency and confidence-building, they are to a certain extent interrelated with each other. In fact, the process of their implementation, further evolution and convergence may eventually lead to the development of a space traffic management system. There are also areas in which the proposals apparently overlap, for example when it comes to the various information and notification requirements that are considered in respect to items such as space policies and orbital data on space objects.

Germany welcomes the progress that has been achieved with all the three initiatives as well as the visibility that the important individual topics have obtained in this respect. At the same time, it is our desire that, in implementing and developing the three initiatives, an establishment of new mechanisms in parallel to and outside of the scope of the currently existing institutional arrangements shall be avoided. The established and accepted roles of the Office for Outer Space Affairs as focal point for information exchange — as mentioned in the Space Benefits Declaration — and of UNCOPUOS as the central forum for all matters relevant to the peaceful uses of outer space need to be preserved. This is necessary in order to retain efficiency and consistency and to achieve widespread acceptance among states and international organizations for any new mechanisms that are to be established as a result of the three initiatives.

We want to underline the great importance of non-legally binding United Nations instruments on

outer space for the development of best practice of outer space activities and due diligence standards.

Mr. Chairman, distinguished delegates, given this great importance, I would like to conclude by drawing your attention to the German delegation's reform proposal that we will have the opportunity to discuss in more detail later this morning. This proposal for a new structure reflects this great importance, as non-binding instruments figure very prominently as a standing agenda item with respect to working group. In our view, such a standing working group with associated preparatory groups is the most efficient way of dealing with this area from 2016 onwards. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. K. U. Schrogl (Chair) I thank the distinguished delegate from Germany for his statement. Next on my list is the distinguished delegate from Portugal.

Ms. M. E. Goncalves (Portugal) Thank you Mr. Chairman. The Portuguese delegation also welcomes the introduction of this new item in our agenda. As is well known, non-legally binding instruments, commonly soft law, have been a most relevant part of space law. For more than 30 years, public international law that has developed in this domain has been formally non-binding. The role of soft law has often been regarded as more appropriate than so-called hard law particularly in science and technologically based, and evolving domains as is the case of outer space law.

Though formally voluntary, the sets of principles and guidelines adopted by the United Nations should not, and in fact are not in our view less important for the peaceful uses of outer space than the treaties and international conventions. This recognition came out clearly from yesterday's exchange of views on the guidelines on space debris mitigation, we believe. So, in our view, non-legally binding instruments for outer space should receive an attention somehow equivalent to the attention the Legal Subcommittee is assigning, for many years, to formal public international law, namely, through a regular review of their acceptance and their implementation by States and international organizations.

Thus, the proposal presented by the delegation of Japan is most welcome by our delegation, since it may provide an opportunity to rise the United Nations Member States' attention to these non-legally binding instruments, facilitate mutual learning on ways that States are implementing these instruments, and therefore encourage implementation.

In view of the importance and specificity of this topic, the Portuguese delegation would prefer that it is

not diluted in the mandate of an already existing working group. For the same reason, we would also favour leaving the option open to keep the topic in the agenda for more than one year, if this is agreeable.

To conclude, taking into account the alternatives for follow-up suggested by the Chairman yesterday, my delegation would like to suggest that the Legal Subcommittee considers the possibility that this topic be tackled by a preparatory group as referred in the German proposal for a renewal of the structure of the agenda that we will be addressing in item 14. In fact following what has just been also suggested by the delegate of Germany. Thank you very much.

Mr. K. U. Schrogl (Chair) I thank the distinguished delegate from Portugal for her statement. Next on my list is the distinguished delegate from Italy.

Ms. N. Bini (Italy) Thank you Mr. Chairman. Italy expresses its appreciation for this single issue agenda item 12, General exchange of information on non-legally binding United Nations instruments on outer space, since we acknowledge the growing importance of non-legally binding United Nations instruments in complementing and enhancing existing international space law provisions. Moreover, we underline that such instruments represent the achievement of substantive elaborations of COPUOS and its Subcommittees.

Mr. Chairman, my delegation would like to share with the Legal Subcommittee our experience in implementing the two United Nations Resolutions touching upon the registration of space objects.

Before acceding to the Registration Convention in 2005, Italy provided information on objects launched into Outer Space under the 1961 Resolution number 1721 B "International Cooperation in the peaceful uses of Outer Space" for the registration of such objects into the Registry carried by the United Nations. In 2005, Italy adhered to the 1975 Registration Convention by Law number 153/2005. Under that Law, the Italian Space Agency (ASI) has been entrusted to establish and maintain the National Registry. To this end, ASI has elaborated a Regulation to set up such a Registry and to define the detailed procedures for the registration of objects launched into Outer Space. This Regulation has been approved by the national competent authorities.

Mr. Chairman, this Regulation takes into duly consideration the provisions contained in the United Nations General Assembly Resolution 62/101 "Recommendations on enhancing the practice of States and Intergovernmental Organizations in registering space objects" in several aspects. I will only mention a few of them. As an example, Italian natural or legal

persons carrying out launch activities, in addition to those requested by the Registration Convention, are required to provide information relevant to any change of status of the space object and the approximate date of re-entry, if it is possible to define. Finally, the Regulation deals with change in supervision of the space object, in both cases when a space object annotated in the National Registry is transferred to foreign subjects or if natural or legal persons of Italian nationality acquire the supervision of a space object already in orbit.

Mr. Chairman, my delegation would like to take this opportunity to inform that the Italian Registry of objects launched into Outer Space will be publicly available on the ASI web site in the forthcoming days. In the website, there will be also a Form, to be filled in by the concerned natural and legal persons carrying out launch activities, which has been drafted taken as a model the form elaborated by OOSA for the United Nations Registry.

As provided for under art. II of the Registration Convention, Italy will officially inform the Secretary General of the United Nations of the establishment of such a Registry. Thank you Mr. Chairman.

Mr. K. U. Schrogl (Chair) I thank the distinguished delegate from Italy for her statement. Next on my list is the distinguished delegate from Venezuela. You have the floor.

Ms. A. Campos (Venezuela) Yes thank you very much Chair. The Bolivarian Republic of Venezuela acknowledges completely the importance of the United Nations instruments when it comes to outer space. These have served as a support instrument to complement and bolster existing United Nations treaties, and to help States adopt appropriate measures and include them in the national legislation.

Nonetheless, given the nature of these instruments which in their essence are made up of United Nations documents, and these include these various principals and are supposed to lay down patterns for behaviour which are not strictly binding measures we need to acknowledge this from a purely legal point of view. These reflect the principles that the states agree upon in the moment of their adoption and lay down patterns for behaviour since they're not binding they simply provide moral rules and we're concerned that these non-binding norms may not guarantee sustainable regulation of outer space. For this reason this delegation is of the opinion that continuing in the forthcoming sessions of this subcommittee we should analyse this to ensure that these non-binding instruments take on a binding nature and serve as binding instruments. Thank you.

Mr. K. U. Schrogl (Chair) I thank the distinguished delegate of Venezuela for her statement. Are there any other delegations wishing to speak? Yes I see the Russian Federation.

Mr. V. Gudnov (Russia) Yes thank you Chair, the delegation of the Russian Federation is in favour of this proposal to maintain this item on the agenda on the exchange of information. What's more, we'd like to foresee the option of having not just a general exchange of information but also of creating a working group which could give an assessment on the applicability of such a mechanism and the option of promoting new proposals. So it's with great satisfaction that we followed the adoption by the European Union of a code of conduct on space affairs.

But to respond to what was said by the delegate of Germany, this draft has yet to be fully adopted because new proposals have been made in the Russian Federation and other countries with its BRICS partners has made its own proposals and we would like that such an important document as this code of conduct, being examined in the context of the United Nations, given that it should reflect the interests of all countries not just of those States currently conducting space activities, and this must be born in mind internationally, and all proposals made by a country should be reflected.

We'd also like to point out in line with the principle of the United Nations General Assembly Office for Space Affairs and following the work of experts we think that we should take measures in this field and we think that this Legal Affairs Subcommittee should be involved in this work. Thank you Chair, thank you delegates for your attention.

Mr. K. U. Schrogl (Chair) I thank the distinguished representative of the Russian Federation for his statement. Next on my list is the Netherlands.

Mr. Oosterkamp (Netherlands) Thank you Chair, the Dutch delegation would like to say that in the near future we could not expect one outer space treaty so that underlines the importance of the non-binding instruments which are already soft-law for thirty years. We welcome the Japanese proposal on this subject and we think it's important to put this agenda item not for one year but for a multi-year programme. And what was said by the German delegation, it would be good to put it in a preparatory group to prepare and later on in a working group and expert group and it would also be good under this item to discuss what was said by the Russian Federation to discuss European Union code of conduct. Thank you.

Mr. K. U. Schrogl (Chair) I thank the distinguished delegate from the Netherlands. Any other

delegation wishing to speak? Yes I see the Republic of Korea.

Mr. Lee (Republic of Korea) Thank you Mr. Chairman. Good morning distinguished delegates. Concerning this item of agenda on the General exchange of information on non-legally binding mitigation instruments on outer space. So we appreciate some of the Japanese delegations proposals to make such very detailed proposals concretized in the document of CRP 29.

My country, the Republic of Korea, also considering and giving some due diligence on the importance of the non-legally binding United Nations instrument on outer space it spread over on the CRP 29 documents. Mr. Chairman sir, I would like to suggest a question through you to the Japanese delegation on these proposals made on the CRP 29. According to the proposals the very concretized specific risk of occasional [...] to the proposals. If I understand this item of agenda is a general exchange of information, not on each Member State's implementation of non-legally binding instruments.

According to the Japanese delegation such a concrete questionnaire is a precious [...] Member State phase to submit a very detailed information on the implementation of a non-binding United Nations instrument on outer space. It would be considered as a kind of a pure review some processes to being done in other international forums like human rights values of United Nations. I would ask the Japanese delegation what is the background on these proposals?

Mr. Chairman my other items I would like to suggest is about the Legal Subcommittee but as far as I observe these committees involve so many cooperative measures, policy related or some technology or science related works. So we should find out according to my observations, find out the ways and means to legalize these non-binding instruments on space activity into a fully-fledged catalogue of space treaties systems. As I already suggested we should find out the system of containing this kind of non-binding documents into some very important international treaties [like OSCE] as an integral part of the legal norm. Mr. Chairman sir, my last comment on the duration of our continuing of some discussion on this item of agenda, in this respect I would like to share some of the Chinese delegations concerns already expressed last days. Thank you Mr. Chairman.

Mr. K. U. Schrogl (Chair) I thank the distinguished delegate of the Republic of Korea. Next speaker on my list is Mexico.

Ms. R. M. Ramirez (Mexico) Yes thank you Chair. Yes I find it rather difficult to address this issue,

nonetheless we have to be aware that treaties evolve out of documents that we might call soft-law or non-binding law. Thinking about things which sometimes come out of the United Nations General Assembly, I agree with what was said by the distinguished delegation of Venezuela and also the delegation of the Republic of Korea in that here within the Legal Subcommittee we have to work to do our best to try and flesh out treaties which at the moment are perhaps non-binding agreements.

Now, Chairman I'm speaking on this because we have spoken in various directions. In the opinion of Mexico we can accept that we are dealing with non-binding measures which have come out of the United Nations General Assembly. But I'd like us to deal with things here as well, such as international code of conduct, which is a document which is being addressed outside of this forum and hence that would be a non-binding document.

So on the other hand Chair, I don't think that has been exhausted it's still under discussion but let me emphasize Chair that here, under this agenda item, I think we should maintain an ongoing working group on this particular agenda item to address non-binding measures which have evolved out of the work of the United Nations General Assembly and its own Legal Subcommittee but let's not bring in, for our discussions here, factors such as the code of conduct which has been dealt with outside the United Nations, thank you Chair.

Mr. K. U. Schrogl (Chair) I thank the distinguished delegate of Mexico. Next on my list is Cuba.

Ms. I. Cabanas (Cuba) Thank you very much Chair, our delegation is grateful for the proposals made by various delegations here present and we'd like to repeat the importance that we think non-binding measures have to compliment legally binding instruments under the law of conventions and we think that this issue should continue to be discussed within this Subcommittee in order to come up with new binding instruments to help to improve the international legal framework governing outer space affairs. Thank you.

Mr. K. U. Schrogl (Chair) I thank the distinguished delegate from Cuba for her statement. Next on my list is Japan and I would like also to ask Japan whether you are ready to respond to the question posed and asked by the Republic of Korea? You have the floor.

Ms. A. Ito (Japan) Thank you Mr. Chairman. In response to the comment made by the distinguished delegation of Korea, Japan is of the view that the

proposed questionnaire is intended to facilitate the discussions towards the next session of the Legal Subcommittee and we are of the view that certain criteria is helpful to further the discussion. The sharing of experiences and specific measures in line with the agenda item that have been agreed in the COPUOS session last June. Thank you very much.

Mr. K. U. Schrogl (Chair) I thank the distinguished delegate from Japan for her statement. Next on my list is Brazil.

Mr. Rypl (Brazil) Thank you Mr. Chairman. I would like just very briefly to express support to the statements of the delegates of Mexico, Venezuela and Cuba and other delegations that have expressed their view of the need for this agenda item to be maintained in the Subcommittee and also extend it to include all these instruments that have been discussed outside COPUOS, and with a view to analysing the possibility of transforming, as appropriate, the instruments that are relevant, transforming these instruments into binding instruments.

We believe this is very important as we pointed out on other occasions in the past week. We cannot afford to allow the themes that belong to this committee, that are part of our mandate, to be taken away from us in a sense because of our inaction or inability to agree on the importance of discussing.

We feel that in many cases the idea of only discussing or devoting extensive time to the discussion of non-binding instruments is a result of the very difficulty on agreeing of the need for a new treaty for revision of the treaties. We've seen this on several occasions and in past sessions too, but still I believe from the statements that we've heard that the delegations are starting to realize that we can no longer delay this type of discussion so I urge other delegations to consider this possibility and we hope that perhaps next year, next session, we will be ready to take up the approach of discussing new binding instruments, revising treaties in a more consistent manner. Thank you.

Mr. K. U. Schrogl (Chair) I thank the distinguished delegate from Brazil. Next on my list is the United States.

Mr. B. Israel (U.S.A.) Thank you Mr. Chairman and thank you colleagues for what I think has been a very productive and invaluable discussion on this agenda item and we would like to again express our gratitude to Japan for having proposed this discussion at the last session of the Legal Subcommittee and we also think there would be merit in continuing this agenda item for another year.

I've listened closely to the many interventions on this agenda item and would like to offer some additional thoughts further to the statement we made on this agenda item yesterday morning.

One is that a number of delegates have spoken about the relationship between legally non-binding mechanisms and then binding mechanisms further down the road, and of course while States may decide at a later time to actually formalize their agreements, embodied in a non-binding arrangement in say the process of negotiating a treaty at a later time, well that certainly is the case and we've seen that before.

May I suggest that there is value in having non-binding instruments as a tool in our toolbox precisely because they are legally non-binding. This is not to say that they are even voluntary or without some force. We, the United States, take non-binding commitments to be serious commitments, what we say we're going to do we will do, which is not to say that their nonconformity with them incurs international legal responsibilities. That is a distinction, but the distinction in the practical world might not be so much. But, as many of our roles when we're not here in Vienna, is to facilitate international cooperation working with our governments to facilitate this cooperation. Having a tool in our toolbox of non-binding arrangements is a very useful tool and has proven to be useful many times throughout the history of international cooperation and governance of outer space. We mentioned some examples yesterday in our statement particularly in the case of remote-sensing, both with remote-sensing principles and COPUOS and subsequently with the disaster charter and so I would suggest and urge respectfully that we not lose sight of this value of having non-binding arrangements as such through a focus of trying to focus on how we can jump from non-binding arrangements to things that are legally binding. Thank you Mr. Chairman.

Mr. K. U. Schrogl (Chair) I thank the distinguished delegate from the United States. Next on my list is Nigeria.

Ms. A. Raji (Nigeria) Thank you Mr. Chairman. The Nigerian delegation would like to welcome the Japanese proposal on this agenda item and we wish to express support for the item to be retained on the agenda of the Legal Subcommittee at the 53rd session in 2015. Thank you.

Mr. K. U. Schrogl (Chair) I thank the distinguished delegate from Nigeria for her statement. I see a request for the floor from Japan.

Ms. A. Ito (Japan) Thank you very much Mr. Chairman. We would like to thank for the different

interventions by a number of delegations. We would like to say that Japan is of the view that, first, it should be examined the current overview of different non-legally binding instruments, and how different instruments are followed by Member States, and what measures are actually taken, before going into the discussions of whether we should make non-legally binding instruments into binding instruments. Thank you very much.

Mr. K. U. Schrogl (Chair) I thank the distinguished delegate from Japan for her statement. Next on my list is China.

Mr. Z. Shang (China) Thank you Mr. Chairman. I would like to make two comments at this point. First we have noted that all delegations are interested in this issue. It shows the importance of this issue. But we seem to be talking about different things in different directions, because we have heard a lot of new proposals. This shows that this issue is very complex because the various issues of the Subcommittee are linked with this issue. The work of COPUOS is also linked to this issue.

Secondly, we are of the view that discussions on this issue should be guided by the following basic principle, we must ensure the efficiency of our work and the consistency of our work without adding to our workload. We discuss progress on this issue, after all we have too many questions to answer. We are not sure whether we can answer so many questions in a questionnaire.

In this connection, we have noted that the proposal of the German delegation concerning renewal of the agenda structure of the Legal Subcommittee which has an agenda item dedicated to the non-legally binding legal instruments, and with a proposal concerning the establishment of working groups for this purpose. At the same time we have also noted that at last year's Legal Subcommittee session we had decided to first address the purpose of this issue so we suggest that we discuss the next step concerning this issue after we have discussed the German proposal. Thank you Mr. Chairman.

Mr. K. U. Schrogl (Chair) I thank the distinguished delegate from China for his statement. Are there any other delegations wishing to speak? Yes I see France.

Mr. P. Clerc (France) Thank you Mr. Chairperson. Following on from yesterday's statement, we fully support the proposed item 12 on the agenda of the next meeting of COPUOS, so non-legally binding instruments. The aim here would be to share information on practices, national practices in this area. This agenda item will enable us to have a

useful exchange of experience. It will enable us to make the best use of the existing legal framework in its entire scope. It's equally important that States should provide as detailed information as possible in response to the questionnaire that has been conveyed to us. Thank you.

Mr. K. U. Schrogl (Chair) I thank the distinguished delegate from France for his statement. Are there any other delegations wishing to speak?

Distinguished delegates, first of all I should say that we had a very substantive debate today, we had not such a good start with this item before but now I see that there is a large interest, there is substance and there have been a number of ideas presented for being covered under this agenda item.

At the same time I see that, and I requested you to think about it, that a way forward with this agenda item is not yet, let's say met, with a consensus. There are a lot of different ideas of how to proceed and how to continue with this item, or I would say less with this item than with the topic as such, so we will now conclude the formal deliberations on this item.

I will propose to you that I will lead informal consultations on the way forward, how to proceed with this agenda item, because it has been made clear and it is obvious I guess that this item and the question of how to proceed is closely linked with agenda item 14, and therefore the best way to look into that is to see how to better connect these two issues and find a solution which is comprehensive and which is then satisfactory for all the views which have been expressed. Is that a procedure which you would support? I see no objections. So we therefore conclude our consideration of agenda item 12, General exchange of information on non-legally binding United Nations instruments on outer space. Venezuela has asked for the floor.

Mr. M. Para (Venezuela) Thank you Chair, I listened attentively to your proposal. Our delegation would like to have a little clarification as to how these informal consultations will be organized, so how we continue discussing item number 12 of our agenda.

Once again in our opinion this type of decision should be taken within this room, making use of the interpretation. We don't think that this issue could be discussed later. In our opinion we think we should take all the time allotted to us and try to move forward step by step and address in a differentiated way the respective subjects we have on the agenda before us. Thank you.

Mr. K. U. Schrogl (Chair) Well I can assure you distinguished delegate from Venezuela that we will do

that in full transparency and decisions will be taken here in this room, at this point in time I don't see the opportunity, even if we continue until lunchtime, for a conclusion of this debate, this is why I would like first, to have informal consultations with various delegations having participated in the debate, and then return with that to here to this room which will be under agenda item 14 to fully discuss the item and find a conclusion in, what I said, a comprehensive way, looking at it from the perspective of that single issue item and putting it into the context of any other proposals we have in the context of the agenda for 2015.

So this ends the deliberations on agenda item 12 and we will move now to continue and hopefully suspend our consideration of agenda item 13, the review of international mechanisms for cooperation in the peaceful exploration and use of outer space. The first and so far only speaker on my list is the distinguished representative of France.

Mr. P. Clerc (France) Thank you Mr. Chairperson. On item 13, I'd just like to recall that France attaches great importance to cooperation in the exploration and peaceful use of outer space, because it's only through such cooperation that we can guarantee for future generations a safe environment in which international peace and security would be assured, and this in conformity with one of the objectives of the 1977 treaty.

France welcomes the creation of a working group on mechanisms of international cooperation for the peaceful exploration and use of outer space. This working group will facilitate the exchange of information on cooperation mechanisms established by Member States both bilaterally and multilaterally and my delegation will actively participate in the work of that group.

We will not go in detail into the kind of cooperation that France has established. We have European multilateral cooperation via our participation in the European Space Agency and the mechanisms of that cooperation were outlined yesterday by the representative of the ESA yesterday.

We would like nevertheless to point out that half of France's space exploration budget goes to the European Space Agency. This makes France the Agency's number 1 contributor financially. Still at the multilateral level, internationally this time around, France participates in cooperation with the International Space Station and we are a State party to the intergovernmental agreement of January 1998. Bilaterally now, France's space cooperation takes the form of a large number of framework agreements between our space agency, CNES, and our foreign

counterparts, and also intergovernmental agreements on space cooperation. These two types of cooperation, we have them with our European partners, Germany, Italy and the UK, for example, and also with our international partners, the US, Russia, China, Japan, Canada, India and others.

These framework agreements both intergovernmental and interagency enable the conclusion between agencies of agreements and arrangements for the implementation of specific projects and programmes. These projects and programmes are implemented in various areas such as space exploration, the development and operation of space systems, and related infrastructure.

The development of space applications and services that use space systems and whose outputs are of direct economic value in the area of Earth observation, meteorology, sustainable development, telecommunications, satellite navigation and Earth engineering.

We also have the dissemination of knowledge on outer space and space activities to the general public and to professional users, then we have the training of students in technical and scientific courses. By way of illustration in 2013 CNES signed around 15 cooperation agreements with international partners.

At the legal level these agreements we are seeing increasing standardization within the agreements, we are seeing that the applicable legal regime differs very little from one agreement to another or from one partner to another. The applicable clauses on legal liability, intellectual property, or confidentiality are relatively harmonized now and this is facilitating the establishment and implementation of such cooperation arrangements.

However this state of affairs should not, at the same time, be construed as implying that there is no further need to continue improving the legal framework for international cooperation. My delegation will speak in detail of this at a later stage. Thank you.

Mr. K. U. Schrogl (Chair) Are there any other delegations wishing to speak? There are none. I previously announced that we would spend our considerations on this item but we have received a request from one delegation to speak in the afternoon. So we will continue our considerations and hopefully suspend them. Our considerations in the afternoon on agenda item 13.

Distinguished delegates I would now like to reopen the General exchange of views since we have received the request from one delegation. With your

permission the representative of Libya would like to make a statement under agenda item 4, the General exchange of views. You have the floor.

Mr. E. A. Ganbour (Libya) Thank you sir. As it is the first time I take the floor we would wish, like other delegations, to congratulate the Chairman and his team for their election. We are confident that they will conduct our business ably. Appreciation should also go to them for their efforts in order to crown this session with success.

Sir, as we stress the importance of the way forward in the evolution and promotion of the international legal system, based on the existing principles and treaties, in order to further transparency and confidence-building in space activities, in order to allow all states to benefit from them in an equal manner with particular attention to the interest of the developing countries.

However, we stress the importance of the equal and easy access to outer space for all nations on an equal footing and without discrimination, irrespective of their level of technical and scientific development. In addition we have to pay attention to the rational and equitable utilisation of outer space, without any hegemony and by the promotion and exchange of expertise between developed and developing countries, as well as providing assistance to the developing countries in order to maintain the sustainable and long-term safety and integrity of outer space in a transparent manner.

It is important that CESA should implement the guidelines on the mitigation of space debris established by the COPUOS, as the future of space activities hinges on the mitigation of outer space. The Subcommittee should attach more attention to the problem of the possible collision between space debris and space objects, especially those carrying nuclear or power sources and all the relative issues that have to do with space debris. Attention should not be excluded on the space debris in outer space but also on its unregulated return to the Earth. Therefore, international norms and rules should be ameliorated in order to ensure human and infrastructure safety.

In closing it is important to intensify international, regional and national efforts in order to activate and enhance national efforts in order to mitigate the space debris. I thank you sir.

Mr. K. U. Schrogl (Chair) I thank the distinguished representative of Libya for his statement and with that we conclude our consideration of agenda item 4, the General exchange of views.

I would now like to continue our consideration of agenda item 14 on our agenda, which is proposals to the committee on new items for consideration by the Subcommittee. As delegations are aware under this agenda item we will consider two elements namely proposals for new items and organisational matters. The first speaker on my list is the distinguished representative of Germany. You have the floor.

Mr. P. Wennholz (Germany) Thank you Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Chairman, distinguished delegates, the German delegation is very grateful for the opportunity to further elaborate on several points that were raised following our presentation of our proposal for renewal of the structure of the agenda and organisation of work of the Legal Subcommittee last Friday.

First of all, we would like to thank delegations for expressions of support, appreciation and also for the very constructive feedback received in the form of many questions which to us were very helpful. With this presentation we aim at providing clarifications in response to these most appreciated questions. It will address the following points, first the agenda setting under the new agenda structure, the status and nature of the preparatory groups under the phased approach, the status of the working groups and its interrelations with the preparatory groups, and lastly some other issues such as the inclusion of a review clause.

Before entering into the details allow me to reiterate and emphasize the overall purpose of our proposal. It is about making more efficient use of the time and resources available to us for the Legal Subcommittee, thereby maintaining and strengthening the Legal Subcommittee as a main intergovernmental forum to develop space law. The basic means to achieve this goal are a new simplified and more inclusive agenda structure and a phased approach to make more efficient use of the two weeks available for this session.

That said I would like to start with our presentation, apologies in advance for the slides being in English only, but as I will proceed slowly reading out each point, I think that translation for each point is guaranteed and every delegation will be able to follow.

So, allow me to start with the first slide, and the first topic, which is agenda setting under the new agenda structure. So the first point under agenda setting is the question by whom and how topics are identified for the agenda. The responses that topics are mainly identified in the course of deliberations in the Working Groups but also by the Plenary in course of the General Exchange of Views.

Topics can be proposed by the Working Groups to the Plenary, these proposals would include the duration of the Preparatory Groups and also the question who will be the Chair of the Preparatory Groups, so topics can be proposed including duration of Preparatory Groups. The basic rule would be a duration of one year with a possible extension to be decided by Plenary each time.

The decisions on topics to be discussed in the Preparatory Groups are taken by the Plenary under the agenda item Adoption of the Report, there will be no separate agenda item on New Items as is the case today under this present item.

The Plenary will take care about the equal distribution of topics for the Preparatory Groups that means that each two Working Preparatory Groups will be assigned to the two Working Groups.

The first set of topics for Preparatory Groups and respective chairs will be adopted in 2015 by the Legal Subcommittee's Plenary under current agenda item New Item, to start in 2016, so this should answer the question what will happen in 2015 concerning the preparation of this new structure.

So with that I'll move to the second slide, which concerns the status of the Preparatory Groups, also the nature of the Preparatory Groups, which as we are aware was an important point that raised questions from many delegations, so let me start by pointing out that participants in the Preparatory Groups are members of the delegations; Observers to the Legal Subcommittee can also participate as observers. I point out that the nature or the quality of observers participating as observers will not be changed and there would not change into an act of rule during the Preparatory Groups. They would remain but they could participate but as observers.

Delegations are invited to include delegates with scientific and technical background, thus improving synergies with the Scientific and Technical Subcommittee.

The Chair of a Preparatory Group is appointed by the Legal Subcommittee's Plenary and should be a personality very well acquainted with the Preparatory Group's topic.

As to the question what will be the output of the Preparatory Groups, the answer would be the output of a Preparatory Group is, or would be, a "Chairman's Report", such a Chairman's Report would have the following characteristics.

It would be a compilation of material containing views and assessments on the topic useful for the deliberations in the Working Groups.

The report would be drafted by the Chair reflecting the full range of discussions and limited to a volume of 3-4 pages, as larger volumes would not be feasible to be duly processed by the Secretariat. So the report will be drafted by the Chair in this way without, this concept implies that there is no necessity to reach a formal consensus within the Preparatory Groups as we are dealing with a compilation of material by the Chair, the Chairman's Report.

The Preparatory Group's Reports will be submitted to the Working Groups and also be annexed and according to our proposal be annexed to the Legal Subcommittee's Report.

The Preparatory Group's Reports would not express commitment by Member States, and are the non-exclusive basis for the deliberations in the Working Groups. We think this is an important point, that there would be the non-exclusive basis for deliberations so they would in no way limit this sequence of decisions to be made by the Working Groups subsequently. There would be a non-exclusive basis.

The next slide now deals with the Working Groups with the status of Working Groups and also the interrelation of Working Groups and the Plenary. So like under the cones systems, system participants in Working Groups will be members of delegations; observers to the Legal Subcommittee can participate as observers, this will remain essentially unchanged.

Concerning the Working Groups, the Working Groups are the place for exchange between Member States for preparing the decision-making in the Plenary. The Working Group's Reports will focus on conclusions and recommendations concentrated to around 2 pages. Deliberations in the Working Groups can also serve to initiate the drafting of new legal texts.

The Plenary remains the decision-making body of the Legal Subcommittee leading subsequently of course to COPUOS and the General Assembly.

Lastly under this point an example that might help to illustrate the advantage that we aim to achieve. For example the former Working Group on registration practice, as we believe, would have benefitted from an opportunity to be prepared by a preparatory group identifying options for additional registration criteria, out of which then, the working group would have selected appropriate ones for inclusion in the respective draft General Assembly resolution, forwarded by the Legal Subcommittee plenary to COPUOS.

We, as I said, hope that this example helps to illustrate that the way in which we intend to concentrate and also render deliberations and

proceedings more dynamic and more productive. So with that I conclude my explanations of Working Groups with the phased approach.

The last slides will deal with some other elements, first one being the subject of a review clause. We noted that several delegations expressed the desire to include a review clause and our point of departure for our proposal was to say that a review would of course be generally possible at any time, but as it was expressed we would see no problem in excluding or including an express reference to review, which might go into the direction that a review of the new mechanism could take place in 2018. At the earliest we figure that the year 2017 would be too early as this will be the year of the anniversary of the Outer Space Treaty as a main element of the Legal Subcommittee session. So we would propose the year 2018 for review.

The second point concerns the use of or the possibility to use conference services for the whole session, in particular with regards to the Preparatory Groups sessions. So the use of the conference services, including recording, for all activities during the session comprising the Preparatory Groups, the Working Groups as well as the Plenary would be fully guaranteed. I might reiterate that the Preparatory Groups will not take place in parallel, they will take place in a sequence. Each one, for each session of each Preparatory Group therefore guaranteed the full conference room technics and interpretation services, and also recording.

The third point concerns the [ESA] Symposium that we extended to be a full day event, which as I may say would be returning to a previous practice that was already in place some years ago. The extension of the duration of the symposium would not only benefit the content of the symposium, but would also provide the Secretariat with time for preparation of documentation and translation of the Preparatory Groups reports at the end of the first week. That is after the conclusion of the Preparatory Groups and before the second week where the Working Group's discussion will take place on the basis of input from the Preparatory Groups.

Then the General exchange of views would be scheduled for full two days on both Monday's of the session, thus providing the equivalent time as in the current structure; the item would however remain open during the second week for delegations that wish to speak then, that is later during the second week.

The current agenda item with associated Working Group on international mechanisms of cooperation would, in 2016 and 2017, take the place of one of the Preparatory Groups.

So with that I would conclude my presentation that was hopefully helpful in clarifying the points raised in Friday's questions, and we the German delegation would be happy to respond to your feedback and also to possible further questions. May I conclude with reiterating it is our firm conviction that, we are firmly convinced that the proposal will lead to a strengthening and increase in relevance of the Subcommittee. Thank you very much for your kind attention.

Mr. K. U. Schrogl (Chair) I thank the distinguished delegate from Germany for his statement and explanation of the proposal responding to the discussion we had yesterday. Next on my list of speakers is the distinguished representative of South Africa. You have the floor.

Mr. Mhlanga (South Africa) Thank you Chairperson.

South Africa attaches great importance to the work of the Legal Subcommittee, in particular its role in the development of new norms and rules in space exploration and use.

In the above-context, we wish to take this opportunity to thank the German delegation for their Proposal for the Renewal of the structure of the agenda and organisation of work of the Legal Subcommittee.

Chairperson, my delegation is of the view that it will be important to retain in the current method of work within the Legal Subcommittee as it continues to enjoy broad support from many Member States. However, we wish to state that any need to reassess the work of the Legal Subcommittee may be conducted in the near future. I thank you.

Mr. K. U. Schrogl (Chair) I thank the distinguished delegate from South Africa for his statement. Next on my list is Algeria.

Mr. M. Ouzerouhane (Algeria) Yes thank you Chair. Rather than the working methods, what we think is problematic is above all the absence or the weakness, the absence of will to make this into a genuine forum for development of space law. But that should not hinder us from considering in a positive way any proposal likely to make this Subcommittee's work more productive.

Hence we thank the German delegation for its proposal intended to restructure our agenda and the work of the Legal Subcommittee, and we think it's a sound basis for the discussion. As to the contents of this proposal my comments will be of two types, those on aspects of which are likely to lead to satisfying solutions, bring about some changes to the presentation and the drafting of the text, and those which are more

fundamental in nature because they relate to the very nature of the Subcommittee as an intergovernmental body for deliberation.

Thus, on the first aspects the less problematic ones, without being exhaustive and thinking about the points related to delimitation and definition of outer space, which rather than being thought about under item 3 of our agenda relating to non-binding instruments, we think that these should be dealt with under item 1 of our agenda also intended, according to the wording, to the progressive development of space law.

Now, as I mentioned non-binding legal instruments, I'd like to point out after talking about application, which in this context suggests an obligation, we prefer to talk about implementation which is more appropriate. That is in the French, I think it's more complicated in English to come up with an equivalent term, perhaps implementation.

As I said, this relates to those aspects for which we are likely to come up with a swift and acceptable solution to everyone. But more fundamentally let me underline the fact that if we organize the work of a Subcommittee around or through the filter of the Working Group, which itself bases its work on Expert Groups, this poses a serious problem. That is to see that these Working Groups in the long-term will substitute the Subcommittee and make it rather pointless in the long-term, and this poses a problem because the proposals, including those to be examined, we think should be dealt with rather within this Working Group. And what's more, from this point of view what will stop us tomorrow from the result of the work of the Working Group will be for example submitted directly to the approval of the Committee, under the guise of effectiveness and avoiding duplication.

However important it may be, a Working Group should not be systematic, it should meet an occasional need on a given issue where we need particular expertise, and which would end once a mission entitled to it by the Subcommittee has come to an end. On this significant point Chair my delegation is of the opinion that we should stick by the current system. Thank you.

Mr. K. U. Schrogl (Chair) I thank the distinguished delegate from Algeria for his statement. Are there any other delegations wishing to speak? I see Kenya.

Mr. S. N. Mwachuri (Kenya) I thank you Mr. Chairman. Mr. Chairman, given that this is the first time we take up the floor, my delegation is pleased to see you Chair the session and we assure you of our cooperation.

My delegation would like to associate itself with the statement issued by South Africa, in our view the current work programme needs to be maintained as it is and any proposals for working schedules can be made within the current structure. I thank you Mr. Chairman.

Mr. K. U. Schrogl (Chair) I thank the distinguished delegate from Kenya for his statement. Any other delegations wishing to speak? Yes I see Nigeria.

Ms. A. Raji (Nigeria) Thank you Mr. Chairman. The Nigerian delegation would like to thank the German delegation for the proposal on this agenda item and would like to briefly state here that we would love to see this status quo on the Legal Subcommittee maintained. Thank you.

Mr. K. U. Schrogl (Chair) I thank the distinguished delegate from Nigeria. The delegate from Egypt.

Mr. M.A.H. Ismail (Egypt) Thank you Mr. Chairman. At the outset let me thank the German delegation for their proposal on the renewal of the structure of the agenda and organization of the work of the Legal Subcommittee. Egypt takes note of this proposal, however it also recognizes that it lays a good basis for initial discussion on the renewal of the structure of the Legal Subcommittee. However Egypt is of the position of retaining the current format on agenda of the Legal Subcommittee and keeping the status quo for the time being. Thank you very much.

Mr. K. U. Schrogl (Chair) I thank the distinguished delegate from Egypt. Any other delegations wishing to speak? Yes the Netherlands.

Mr. V. D. Oosterkamp (Netherlands) Thank you Chair. I would like to say that we are in favour of the German proposal in full from the beginning, we think it's important to get a more efficient and better output of this group and the German proposal is a good way forward to get that. It is also good that it be accompanied by the review clause so that we can see in a certain time that it works, so we would give a warm support for the German proposal.

Mr. K. U. Schrogl (Chair) I thank the distinguished delegate from the Netherlands Chile.

Ms. T. Alvarez (Chile) Thank you very much Chair. As said before my delegation's concerned by the lack of effectiveness and efficiency shown by this Subcommittee in recent sessions, and in recent years we haven't achieved very visible or tangible results.

Hence we think that the German proposal would instil new life in our work. I don't think it will continue along the same way in which we achieve nothing. We

need new agreements, we need to achieve progress in developing space agreements and the German proposal takes up many of our interests.

Above all, I'd like to express our thanks to the flexibility of the German delegation in incorporating their proposal. Various of the points that some of our delegations had raised, for example, the review mechanism for 2018, we think that this bolsters the proposal. I think it is a very positive one that perhaps we should continue evaluating. Perhaps we should look at it a little more positively so that we could work on that basis in the future. Thank you Chair.

Mr. K. U. Schrogl (Chair) I thank the distinguished delegate from Chile for her statement. Are there any other delegations wishing to speak? I see the Czech Republic.

Ms. M. Smuclerova (Czech Republic) Thank you Mr. Chairman. The Czech Republic fully supports the reform proposal of Germany and we believe that the enhancement of the working methods of the Legal Subcommittee and the strengthening of the efficiency of the work of the Legal Subcommittee will help to tackle essential issues in our space community and support our common endeavour to react effectively and efficiently to new challenges in outer space, so we would like to invite delegations to concentrate more on the proposal and maybe to discuss it further. Thank you.

Mr. K. U. Schrogl (Chair) I thank the distinguished delegate from the Czech Republic for her statement. Next on my list is the Republic of Korea.

Mr. Lee (Republic of Korea) Thank you Chairman. I appreciate the detailed explanations given by the distinguished delegate of Germany on the renewal of the structure of our work.

So Mr. Chairman my observation would be that the structure of our debate would be divided into some organs like Preparatory Groups or Working Group and Plenaries. So I have some concern on some possible duplications or redundancy of our debate on some same item of agenda or some arguments. So I would like to suggest some such a three steps of the hierarchy should be the register, as appropriate in order to give more concentration on our debate on the Plenary. Another of my observations is about the division of the items of agenda, according to the German suggestions expressed in the L.293, some second group of agenda item is entitled as the status and application of the non-binding instruments. So as I [...] express some this Legal Subcommittee should concentrate on some legal issues, legal matters and in this context I would like to suggest that the title of the second group of item of agenda should be, as already expressed by the delegate

of Germany, the progressive development of space law, some decision my suggestions and we shouldn't discuss these matters together with the other relevant issues like some general exchange of views on the non-binding space related document, this morning we discussed in a way of populations and the split of some cooperations by way of panel or some plenaries to make up some very well balanced and appropriate results. Thank you Mr. Chairman.

Mr. K. U. Schrogl (Chair) I thank the representative of Korea for his statement. Next on my list is France.

Mr. P. Clerc (France) Thank you Chair. I'd like to recall, on behalf of the French delegation, the support we provide to the German delegation to rationalize the work of this Legal Affairs Subcommittee, and of course we are attentive to the need to try and attract consensus for such reform. We welcome the adaptations and proposals just made and the clarifications made by Germany about their proposal. So I'd just like to recall the support from my delegation for that proposal. Thank you.

Mr. K. U. Schrogl (Chair) I thank the distinguished delegate from France for his statement. Next on my list is the United States.

Mr. K. Hodgkins (U.S.A.) Thank you Mr. Chairman. Mr. Chairman, my delegation greatly appreciates the presentation by the delegation of Germany, and in some instances the explanations answered some of the questions that my delegation raised earlier.

In other aspects it just raises more questions. I think that from our viewpoint we have to make a fundamental decision here. Is this an intergovernmental body representing states that are in the position to advance space law, create space law, either at the national or international level? Or is this going to be a body where we hand over many of these decisions to Preparatory Groups, whose work, at least in my understanding, has no real status in that there is no consensus reached in these Preparatory Groups?

Our second point is that Preparatory Groups either represent the views of Member States or they represent the views of the participants in those Preparatory Groups. If it's the former that is representing the views of Member States then why would we add this extra layer of work if you will? Why wouldn't we just go directly to the Working Groups and the Plenaries as we do today? So while we're open to discussing further this proposal we really want to get better clarity on the direction that we want to take with this Subcommittee because in our view the proposal

here takes the Subcommittee in really a different direction than where we have been today.

The other point that we'd like to make is, it's unclear what topics that we will actually be discussing, on the one hand it's proposed that we cluster the current agenda items under two Working Groups but then it's suggested that there'll be additional topics that will be taken up in the Preparatory Groups, but what will those topics be? What if we can't reach consensus on those topics? Then what would be the purpose of having the Preparatory Groups? Are we going to ask the Preparatory Groups to prepare material on say the definition and delimitation? What different views are going to be articulated in the Preparatory Group that would not be articulated in the Plenary or in the Working Groups?

So while we're interested in looking at inefficiencies we also don't want to make this process so cumbersome and inefficient that we accomplish nothing. So with that Mr. Chairman I hope that we have an opportunity to discuss this further. My one question procedurally at this point is — we saw the PowerPoint presentation, so as we move through the remainder of the week — what exactly are we going to be discussing in terms of a document? We have L.293/Rev.1 and now we have the PowerPoint, is the PowerPoint going to be incorporated into another Rev., to L.293, or would the PowerPoint be distributed to all members so that we can look at it in greater detail? Thank you Mr. Chairman.

Mr. K. U. Schrogl (Chair) I thank the distinguished delegate from the United States. Next on my list is Switzerland.

Mr. K. G. Brocard (Switzerland) Thank you Mr. Chairman. Allow me on behalf of the Swiss delegation to extend my congratulations to you on your election.

Mr. Chairman the Swiss delegation wishes to thank the German delegation for its proposal, a proposal which does have efficiency at its heart so the Swiss delegation therefore considers it favourably. Thank you very much.

Mr. K. U. Schrogl (Chair) I thank the distinguished delegate from Switzerland. Next on my list is Malaysia.

Ms. S. M. Sidek (Malaysia) Thank you Mr. Chair. As this is my first time taking the microphone I would like to welcome you and to ensure you of our full cooperation.

As you know, Malaysia is in full support of efficiency in the working of this Committee. We thank the Germans for preparing a very extensive paper,

nevertheless we would associate ourselves with our colleagues from the United States in getting a bit more information on the new proposed hierarchy as we would feel that is a duplication of work and we would need further clarification as eloquently put by our colleagues from the United States. Thank you.

Mr. K. U. Schrogl (Chair) I thank the distinguished delegate from Malaysia for her statement. Next on my list is Japan.

M. Kobata (Japan) Thank you Mr. Chairman. First of all, we highly appreciate the German delegation for preparing very quickly the presentation of the revised proposal which incorporates the comments raised by some delegations last Friday.

Our delegation is of the view that this revised proposal could be the first step towards a study of the possibility for renewal of the structure of the Legal Subcommittee. We believe it would be very important to keep the discussion to seek the better way to revitalize the Legal Subcommittee.

We listened carefully to the view of the other delegations and we believe there are still some rooms to discuss many of the following points. First we need to specify more clearly the mandate, more clear mandate, the expected topics and methodologies of the Preparatory Groups. In order to evaluate how Preparatory Group would work and contribute to help the discussion of the Working Group. If the topics and the membership of the Preparatory Group would be similar as the current Working Group the Preparatory Groups do not have many valid value.

The second point, we should carefully consider the impact to reduce the date and time of the substantive discussion of the Plenary meeting, this Subcommittee is apparently the governmental bodies and the United Nations structure so we should consider how to revitalize the Plenary discussion as well. Plenary group, Plenary meeting is a decision making body so we should consider how to revitalize a Plenary discussion as well.

The third point, we should also carefully consider the methodologies of each Working Group because each Working Group should handle with the huge topics.

Finally, we are of the view that we are now still in the preliminary stage so we are pleased to continue to join the further discussion with other delegations. Thank you Mr. Chairman.

Mr. K. U. Schrogl (Chair) I thank the distinguished delegate from Japan for his statement. Next on my list is Austria.

Mr. P. Bittner (Austria) Thank you Mr. Chairman. I just wanted to briefly reiterate our support for the German initiative for the restructuring of the agenda. We think that the German delegation has put a lot of effort in answering the questions that have been raised and we see many of them already answered so the picture for us has become much more clear and we appreciate that and I think we could use the rest of the week further discussing this issue to come to a positive result. Thank you Mr. Chairman.

Mr. K. U. Schrogl (Chair) I thank the distinguished delegate from Austria for his statement. I have no more speakers on my list. I see China.

Mr. Z. Shang (China) Thank you Mr. Chairman. First of all I would like to thank the German delegation for its further explanations concerning its proposal after listening to the comments from other delegations.

We support all initiatives aimed at improving the efficiency of the work of the Legal Subcommittee, for revitalising the work of the Legal Subcommittee and improving the methods of work of the Legal Subcommittee. We have noted that the German proposal will contribute to implementing those objectives. Of course some delegations have asked specific questions concerning the German proposal. We have noted that the German delegation has answered some of those questions. We stand ready to continue further discussing the German proposal with other delegations so as to promote further progress in the work of the Legal Subcommittee. Thank you Mr. Chairman.

Mr. K. U. Schrogl (Chair) I thank the distinguished delegate from China for his statement. Next on my list is Portugal.

Mr. M. E. Goncalves (Portugal) Thank you very much Mr. Chairman. My delegation would also wish to thank the German delegation for this important proposal, which is clearly designed to improve the work of the commission and its efficiency, its relevance and I would wish to particularly emphasize the importance that we assign to the idea or to the will to strengthen, to deepen the dialogue between scientific and technical experts and legal experts, within the frame of our Legal Subcommittee.

Our reading of this proposal is in fact the following, the proposal is thought in its own terms to be discussed of course and then to be implemented, not today, not next year, in a few years and maybe there is a transition period whereby the topics, the items—which have been in the agenda for many decades in some cases, like the limitation of outer space and other items—could be considered in the old way so to speak and these ideas contained in the German

proposal could be thought mainly for new items. We have just referred today to the issue of the non-legally binding instruments and how the committee should address it in the future. In fact I insist our reading was that this proposal was thought mostly for new items to emerge in the deliberations in Working Groups, as well as in the Plenary item on General exchange of views and not necessarily for old items. If the German delegation could clarify this understanding of ours I would be very much appreciative.

Mr. K. U. Schrogl (Chair) I thank the distinguished delegate from Portugal for her statement. Next on my list is Mexico.

Ms. C. V. Bracho (Mexico) Thank you very much Chair. Since it's the first time that I'm taking the floor on behalf of my delegation I'm grateful to you for the way in which you are ably leading this meeting.

My delegation would like very much to thank the German delegation for the proposal submitted and also the way in which it has taken on board the comments made by various delegations in a revised proposal put forward today.

Chair, my delegation thinks that we need to revise the way in which we work in this Subcommittee and rationalize and be more efficient in our work on this issue, so we are very grateful for the work of the German delegation in putting forward this draft proposal for the agenda of this subcommittee.

Nonetheless Chair, my delegation is also concerned by the way in which we are going to work in these different sub-bodies, the Preparatory Groups and the Working Groups of the Subcommittee. I think as was mentioned by Japan we need to define just what the mandate is of each of these groups, and which topics, because if there's overlap then we'll just be doing more of the same unless there are clear delimitations. So we need to know whether the Preparatory Groups or the Working Groups are going to repeat national statements. In that case we wouldn't make any progress. I think that we need to have a different methodology, much more interactive and more dynamic in the Preparatory Groups, and much more specific on matters of greater and broader interest.

Now my delegation would also like to refer to the recent statement by the delegation of Portugal, that perhaps we can have a transitional period. Chair I don't know, we think that there are many issues which have been on the agenda for many years and we would like to see receive new impetus or vitality. So we should perhaps address them from a new aspect which might help inject a little more vitality into our work so we need maybe to have a transitional phase and help us to

reassess these things from a different perspective rather than the traditional one.

That's all for the moment Chair. My delegation would be very much in favour of discussing this proposal from Germany with the comments that we've made here, thinking about it, and also we could discuss this in a different format, more informally in the way that you said, before we take a decision in the next few days. Thank you Chair.

Mr. K. U. Schrogl (Chair) I thank the distinguished delegate from Mexico for her statement. Are there any other delegations wishing to speak? Venezuela please.

Mr. M. Para (Venezuela) Yes thank you Chair. Our delegation is always grateful for initiatives aimed at increasing the efficiency of this Subcommittee. So we think that the dynamism that we have here, the comments that we heard about these various things has been very valuable.

So we think that the issues that have remained on the agenda throughout the life of the committee, they have stayed there because they are the positions of given States, and they have without doubt political and legal and technical implications. Very broad reaching. Now if we want to revitalize the discussion by changing the format of the work we do in this committee, we could, if we're not careful, perhaps divert ourselves, which was certainly not originally intended. So we think that the general proposal without doubt contains some very attractive elements, but we look with some concern at the fact that a division is made of subjects, and within these subjects there are matters relating to the use of nuclear power sources for example, but we think it could be rather difficult. We don't know how in the future we could address these issues and ensure that our discussions still lead to binding regulations or rules, so from that point of view our delegation thinks that we need to talk at length about this proposal so that we can clarify or dispel all these types of doubts. Thank you Chair.

Mr. K. U. Schrogl (Chair) I thank the distinguished delegate from Venezuela for his statement. Any other delegations wishing to speak at this time? I see Germany. Maybe already being able to respond to remarks, questions and further requests for clarification.

Mr. P. Wennholz (Germany) Yes thank you very much Mr. Chairman. The German delegation has of course listened closely to what was said. We are thankful for all the comments made, for the expressions of support but also for the critical statements or the critical commentaries which we will surely use as a basis for further elaborating on a

proposal and working to make our central points even clearer.

So I will try to briefly pick up some of the points that were raised. As I said in a brief manner. So I think one central point that I should reiterate, that the character of the Legal Subcommittee — as a body for intergovernmental exchange, for exchange between government representatives — remains unchanged. We retain this principle and the Preparatory Group approach is by no means exclusive. As I said and I would like to reiterate because it is important, the Preparatory Groups will be open to all members of delegation and of course can take place under the participation and guidance of government representatives.

So one important point that was raised starting with the point on the agenda, one point raised, *inter alia*, by the distinguished delegate of Algeria was the fate of the agenda item on delimitation. We want to make clear that this proposal does not take importance or visibility away. Quite on the contrary, delimitation will remain a central issue under the new item, the proposal is in fact based on continuity. The new Working Group which will include the subject, there is a Working Group on non-binding instruments will be in continuity to the existing working group chaired by Brazil, and the creation of a respective preparatory group on delimitation under this Working Group. Reporting to the Working Group would indeed revitalize delimitation related discussions because — here I come to the central advantage of the Preparatory Groups — it's in adding, it lies in adding depth and providing the possibility to elaborate on certain technical issues that we believe will be of great benefit for the subsequent discussion in the Working Groups.

So while it may be true that the time invested for the Preparatory Groups leads to a shortening of mandatory discussions, of Plenary discussions, we believe that this time would be time well spent because it can be, because it is invested in more depth and more substantial discussions in the second week. So the Plenary discussions out of this approach would also take place in a more concentrated and thereby more dynamic manner. So I repeat, the time dedicated to the Preparatory Groups would be time well spent.

So we also took note of the comment made, *inter alia*, by the distinguished representative of Korea that there seems a certain danger of duplication of contents and we would respond to that — as was laid out in the presentation before — Working Groups and the Plenary remain in control over the contents to be discussed within the Preparatory Groups, so we do not see this danger of duplications.

So this would also answer questions with respect to the mandate of each of the groups, which we put a substantial effort in explaining with our presentation. That we of course would be happy to share with all delegations and we will talk to the Secretariat in order to provide to make it accessible, be it as a conference document or be it accessible to all delegations in a different way.

So with that again I would like to express my thanks for all your comments, comments made we will work on these issues and we will continue discussions with delegations and we will be working on leading up this proposal in achieving consensus for a proposal and we will continue working on it for the remainder of the session. Thank you very much Mr. Chairman.

Mr. K. U. Schrogl (Chair) I thank the distinguished delegate from Germany. Would any delegation like to react on the explanations, just put forward by the German delegation? I see none.

In summarising the debate I think I can say that the proposal led to an engaged debate, I must say, and this is a good sign since delegations are interested in the way the Subcommittee is working, are dedicated to the cause we are here for and want to find the right way in dealing with topics of relevance, and this is the very positive signal I get from this debate.

Now we have proposals, we have one proposal, we have heard a number of points which were from adding specific elements up to coming up with rather fundamental considerations, which would allow delegations at this stage not to agree to such a proposal. So we have the full spectrum but we have had a debate which showed there is a need to lead such a debate and there is a need to try to improve the working methods and the working of this Subcommittee. It's also a need to come up with ways and means of providing the Subcommittee with the opportunity to reach results, to reach output, and this unites I think all delegations.

Now we have heard as I said a lot of viewpoints. The German delegation will have to do a lot of work in integrating and reflecting all these points. It has also to approach delegations which are not convinced by the proposal and explain the proposal even further in more detail and possibly then also come to conclusions and a better understanding with such delegations.

So the German delegation has indicated that it's ready to do that and delegations have asked for the way forward in dealing with the topic and before I would make a suggestion, I see that Brazil is asking for the floor on this topic.

Mr. Rypl (Brazil) Thank you Chairman. Perhaps you will address exactly what my question will be. I

was going to ask you about the way forward because I see we are running, you know, short of time to finalize this discussion during this session. Perhaps a suggestion — and maybe the Chair or the Secretariat would like to enlighten us on that — would be to create a drafting committee with representatives of different delegations that have expressed very specific concerns. My delegation for one would be willing to contribute because I think we can all come up with suggestions of language and specific items that need to be included, because this is a daunting task you know that the German delegation has taken up and maybe this would be an interesting way to have greater engagement rather than perhaps just commenting on, well not a final product but I mean these temporary drafts we are looking at. I don't know what your thoughts on that matter would be. Thank you.

Mr. K. U. Schrogl (Chair) I thank the distinguished delegate from Brazil for this proposal and I would simply ask delegations about their reaction. If we establish such a drafting group could I have indications of delegations who would like to join such a drafting group? Just by a show of hands, so that it's not the one man delegation drafting group, maybe joined by Germany, I'm quite confident that they will join. Mexico would also be interested, Argentina, you are asking for the floor? Not joining the drafting group, oh OK you have the floor.

Ms. C. V. Bracho (Mexico) Thank you very much Chair. Sorry, I'm sorry if I've just confused things a little, my delegation would like to support both the proposal as you said initially to hold informal talks led by Germany or a drafting committee. My only concern would be that this drafting committee would have to be very clear about its goal and those elements to be addressed, so I'd suggest that first of all it discuss once we have those elements that then we move into drafting committee mode. That would be my suggestion. Thank you Chair.

Mr. K. U. Schrogl (Chair) Thank you Mexico. My question simply was whether there is a basic interest in such a drafting group. I have seen a number of delegations raising their flags so I see such a drafting group could be an option and would be in the interest of a number of states.

Now, you are absolutely right, before we decide on something like that — and we haven't decided yet, I've just made a kind of review here — we have to understand what will be drafted, indeed, and my suggestion is the following. We have before us the working paper and we have before us this PowerPoint presentation. None of these documents are appropriate, I think, being the basis for a drafting exercise. Now the basis for such a drafting exercise, in my view, could be

a kind of report language, which would translate the elements of the working paper and the analysis of the PowerPoint presentation into report language as if we would take a decision in this Subcommittee, which is then, or could constitute, the basis for a decision taken by the Subcommittee.

This would be in my view the basis for such a drafting exercise. Of course this does not bind anybody, the exercise, doesn't bind anybody then to agree to that consequentially, but I see this as the logical next step from the working paper, the PowerPoint presentation into a text which would then explain what it is, provide all the necessary information and background on the status as well the mandates, the composition, the way it's working and the goals of all this. So that would be my idea and the Chairman delegation should start working on that to constitute the basis and then we could go into an exercise together with interested delegations, plus then lead that into the debate again on agenda item 14. That would be my proposal on how to proceed and what the basis for such a drafting exercise could be. I see the United States has asked for the floor.

Mr. Hodgkins (U.S.A.) Thank you Mr. Chairman. Mr. Chairman I appreciate your proposal on a way forward but I would like to take one step back and maybe we could discuss exactly the basis on which we might be drafting some language.

In my recollection of the debate we had this morning we had positions stated that said we want to keep the status quo, to the other end of the spectrum which is the German proposal and then things in between. So what exactly would we be drafting? Would we be drafting report language expressing the various views? Some delegations express this view while other have an opposite view. Are we drafting something that tries to, in some way, codify if you will elements of the German proposal?

I just believe, and again we're quite open to your proposal and moving forward but I just want to make sure that we aren't expending a huge amount of time in an effort that will in the end really have only marginal results in terms of the way forward. So perhaps we could have a bit more clarity on the basis on which the discussions would take. Now I can say that in relationship to some of the conclusions that Germany has drawn in its PowerPoint and in L.293 my delegation doesn't necessarily agree with that, we don't necessarily agree that the Subcommittee has been a failure in terms of producing useful results and I can only point to the new agenda item this year, the agenda item we adopted last year on international mechanisms. I mean these are very important and very interesting topics.

So we're leaving the reader of our report quite potentially thinking that we've concluded the Subcommittee has not been doing its job and therefore it needs to be completely revamped, and we're not necessarily at that point, that is the United States, so this will be something very important to us in terms of what is actually drafted and the kind of underpinnings that exist for looking at ways of restructuring the agenda. Thank you Mr. Chairman.

Mr. K. U. Schrogl (Chair) I thank the United States for this statement. What will be drafted, you already indicated it, what should be drafted is where delegations could agree upon. The elements of the proposal, the way forward, the basic understandings of how to proceed and this is, let's say, done in a parallel way to the consultations the German delegation will continue to lead with these countries which you have indicated, have or are so far also opposing the proposal and want to remain with the status quo. So since this drafting and the product of the drafting is not automatically put forward to be adopted as part of the report it is an exercise which is way before a decision-making and this I think should be clear, that the character of this exercise is indeed at such a level. I see Venezuela.

Mr. C. Para (Venezuela) Thank you Chairperson. We would like to express gratitude to you Mr. Chairperson for your proposal, for your initiative.

However I'd like to reiterate the position of my delegation as expressed this week. We would like to have the discussions continue here within the Subcommittee in this room, we do not wish for there to be a parallel group organized to consider documents that could have such important major consequences for our work. My delegation would like to invite you to continue discussing this matter but we would like to propose that this should happen within the time that has been officially allocated to us for that purpose. Thank you.

Mr. K. U. Schrogl (Chair) I thank the delegation from Venezuela for this statement. While I'm appreciative of the proposal of a drafting group, I understand that it's possibly not the right way at this moment to proceed and would suggest the following, that the Chairman delegation will prepare up to our next meeting, which will be tomorrow morning, of this agenda item, elements which I have just pointed out how they could look like and consult that with interested delegations, which they will in any case do because they have announced to continue their informal consultations and then present this as a CRP under this agenda item to have a discussion in the Plenary on that so that full transparency is met.

The problem will be of course that this will only be in English but I think it's utterly impossible to have that in all languages by tomorrow. So we might settle on the understanding that, for tomorrow morning, the German delegation will prepare, together with other interested delegations, such elements which I have indicated for further discussion here in the Plenary under agenda item 14. Shall we proceed like that? I see the United States and then Mexico.

Mr. K. Hodgkins (U.S.A.) Thank you Mr. Chairman. I apologise for taking the floor once again, but I did want to be clear on the process and what we'll be looking at, in regards to L.293/Rev.1 and the PowerPoint that we saw, are those two documents now still the basis on which we'll be working or is it the German delegation is now going to prepare a different paper from which we would be working? So then we would be reviewing that as the basis for what's reflected in the report and what sets the basis for our way forward from this session onward. Thank you.

Mr. K. U. Schrogl (Chair) Thank you USA. Yes indeed this new paper would supersede the two other papers. This will then be the only basis for discussion, for further discussion.

Ms. C. V. Bracho (Mexico) Yes thank you very much Chair. I listened to the last few comments from some delegations about the way in which we are going to continue our work. In particular the concern expressed by the distinguished colleague from Venezuela that this discussion should be maintained in the current format and that we shouldn't move into informal discussions.

Bearing that in mind and also the concern expressed by the delegation of the United States, I wonder specifically whether that is a perception as to how about whether we need to, and how we can improve the work of this Subcommittee because if it had worked perfectly there would be no need to change the way we work. But if there is a perception among all committees of this Subcommittee that we could indeed improve things, then I think we need to continue to work on the German proposal. I think that's a crucial question which each member of the Subcommittee needs to put to him and herself, as to whether or not we continue down this track. So if there is this shared concern as you mention Chair, that there is indeed potential for improvement, I think there is from the perspective of this delegation then we could think about those two particular aspects which are perhaps the most controversial aspects in the German delegation. In other words no duplication of mandates between the Preparatory Groups and the other bodies, and on the other hand is how we structure the issues on our agenda, that if there is a commonly shared

sentiment that we could improve both the methodology and the way we structure our agenda then perhaps we could move forward in a positive way. Thank you Chair.

Mr. K. U. Schrogl (Chair) I thank the distinguished delegate from Mexico for her statement. Are there any other speakers? Egypt please.

Mr. M.A.H. Ismail (Egypt) Thank you Mr. Chairman. Just hearing the different views now in the room on the issue of the drafting exercise and whether or not we should go for such a formulation, Egypt is of the view that we should not be hasty in doing this. We should take our time, I mean this Legal Subcommittee has been for the past 53 sessions, which is more or less 53 years also, and formulating a whole reform for this Legal Subcommittee in the upcoming three days it's going to be extremely hectic and extremely impossible to be very frank.

I see merits in the German proposal, however, still a lot of comments have been raised within this morning's session, and it will be extremely difficult to accommodate all these comments and views within the upcoming three days or so to get a consensus per se on this kind of document which is supposedly going to be a Rev. 2 according to my understanding. Egypt is of the view that we would rather have such a transition per se on this specific issue for one, maybe two, sessions and we could all agree, as Member States, on such a formulation if there is to be such reform to the Subcommittee, and maybe within the Secretariat some note verbales can be sent to the different missions asking for their views on the German CRP after the end of this session, and gathering such views we could have some Plenary meeting next year or so on this issue, and somehow we can read some kind of an agreement on such reform. However, squeezing all our efforts and all our time into three days and trying to come up with some compromise, the format where there would be some consensus, I have some doubts on that to be very frank. I would rather go with what my US colleague just referred to, or alluded to, where this year's report can have different paragraphs on, and factual paragraphs on, the different views raised within this agenda item during this session and hopefully for the sake of accomplishing something next year we can hopefully reach something, I hope. Thanks.

Mr. K. U. Schrogl (Chair) I thank the distinguished delegate from Egypt for his statement. Are there any other delegations wishing to speak? I see none. So I would then ask the Chairman delegation to prepare, by tomorrow, such a new document, a CRP. I guess in English, which would constitute the basis for further deliberations and we will then see how far we

can go and proceed and what the still open issues might be at that point in time.

Thank you very much for this debate, I will now adjourn the meeting of the Subcommittee, before doing so I would like to inform delegates of our schedule of work this afternoon. We will meet promptly at 3 p.m. at that time we will begin our consideration of agenda item 9, which is Capacity building in space law and agenda item 10, Review and possible revision of the principles relevant to use of nuclear power sources in outer space.

We will also continue and hopefully conclude our consideration of agenda item 11, General exchange of information and use on legal mechanisms relating to space debris mitigation measures taking into account the work of the Scientific and Technical Subcommittee. We will hear two technical presentations this afternoon by the United Nations Office for Outer Space Affairs entitled Education Curriculum on Space Law and by a representative of Brazil entitled Developing a Provisional Draft of the Brazilian National Legislation for Space Activities and Non-Governmental initiative.

I will then adjourn the meeting so that the Working Group on International Mechanisms for Cooperation in the Peaceful Exploration and Use of Outer Space can hold its fourth meeting. I have the request for the floor from Mexico, from Chile. I apologise. Chile please.

Ms. T. Alvarez (Chile) Thank you Chair. Very briefly, I'd simply like to announce to GRULAC members that at one o'clock we'll have a coordination meeting in room 7O3 on the 7th floor. Thank you.

Mr. K. U. Schrogl (Chair) I thank the delegate from Chile for this announcement, and I would like also to inform delegations that the US delegation will hold a reception in the coffee corner area outside boardroom D on the 4th floor from 6-8 p.m. today. The meeting is adjourned until 3 p.m. this afternoon.