

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

564<sup>th</sup> Meeting  
Friday, 16 June 2006, 10 a.m.  
Vienna

---

*Chairman:* Mr. G. Brachet (France)

*The meeting was called to order at 10.21 a.m.*

**The CHAIRMAN** (*interpretation from French*): Good morning distinguished delegates, I now declare open the 564<sup>th</sup> meeting of the Committee on the Peaceful Uses of Outer.

This morning, we will continue and conclude our consideration of item 8, Report of the Scientific and Technical Subcommittee on its Forty-Third Session ...

*(first part not interpreted – taken from Chairman’s notes)*

... and especially the point on DMISCO.

We will then begin and conclude our consideration of agenda item 14, Other Matters, and we will then begin the adoption of the report of the Committee to the General Assembly, agenda item 15.

**Report of the Scientific and Technical Subcommittee on its forty-third session (agenda item 8)**

So distinguished delegates, on item 8, Report of the Scientific and Technical Subcommittee on its Forty-Third Session. The Conference Officers have just distributed a revised non-paper containing the paragraphs regarding the Disaster Management Space Coordination Platform which could be included in the report of the Committee to the General Assembly.

I would like to begin by giving the floor to the Director of the Office for Outer Space Affairs to

introduce this revision to the non-paper, distributed this morning. Mr. Camacho, you have the floor.

**Mr. S. CAMACHO-LARA** (Director, Office for Outer Space Affairs): Thank you very much Mr. Chairman. With your \_\_\_\_\_(?), I would wait a couple of minutes until the document gets distributed and delegations have it in front of them.

**The CHAIRMAN** (*interpretation from French*): Mr. Camacho will introduce this document to you.

**Mr. S. CAMACHO-LARA** (Director, Office for Outer Space Affairs): Thank you Mr. Chairman. The revised non-paper that is in front of delegations has additional text and also one main deletion that will point out that were \_\_\_\_\_ (*not clear*). And the changes that we have made on this non-paper take into account to the extent that we could integrate the comments that were made, the discussion that we had yesterday and the day before yesterday as well.

The first three paragraphs, as I mentioned before, are those paragraphs that are factual information and that we had in the non-paper yesterday.

The next paragraph is also a paragraph from the day before.

And the next paragraph we have changed the description of the responsibilities of the Director, taking into consideration the concern that there was with the expression “management”. So the restriction that you have in that paragraph is much more the

---

In its resolution 50/27 of 6 December 1995, the General Assembly endorsed the recommendation of the Committee on the Peaceful Uses of Outer Space that, beginning with its thirty-ninth session, the Committee would be provided with unedited transcripts in lieu of verbatim records. This record contains the texts of speeches delivered in English and interpretations of speeches delivered in the other languages as transcribed from taped recordings. The transcripts have not been edited or revised.

Corrections should be submitted to original speeches only. They should be incorporated in a copy of the record and be sent under the signature of a member of the delegation concerned, within one week of the date of publication, to the Chief, Conference Management Service, Room D0771, United Nations Office at Vienna, P.O. Box 500, A-1400, Vienna, Austria. Corrections will be issued in a consolidated corrigendum.



United Nations language that would be use for the role of the Director.

The next paragraph is just a name. We have not changed that.

The next paragraph has not been changed.

The position of some of the paragraphs have been changed, if you compare to the document that you had yesterday.

The next paragraph has been changed to reflect the intention of all the regional participation to be reflected. And, of course, I should indicate that the entire text that is in brackets continues to be in brackets so delegations can make comments on anything that they wish, of course.

Compared to the texts that was before you yesterday, the Advisory Board, the language that we had on the Advisory Board has disappeared. What we are suggestion in its place is there is a heading. We put some headings that eventually do not have to go into the draft report but to separate some of the issues. And we would be suggesting and in this regard, would be that the Committee would be the oversight for the Programme which would be within the Office for Outer Space Affairs.

The next two paragraphs are programme implications for the Office for Outer Space Affairs and this would be only referring to its capacity to deliver the results that correspond to the current Programme on the Peaceful Uses of Outer Space, the part that is the responsibility of the Secretariat.

The next point would be recommendations for further action. It is just to put them in the paragraphs which have been arranged in now a more or less chronological sequence and more or less because they are interactive parts among the substantive contents of the paragraphs.

And then a timeframe to reflect both the intention of the partners to launch the activities of DMISCO as soon as possible and taking into consideration the concern that was expressed by some delegations that the process itself moves at a slower pace, or could move at a slower pace.

Thank you Mr. Chairman.

**The CHAIRMAN** (*interpretation from French*): Thank you Mr. Camacho for your introduction of this new version of the non-paper.

I believe you have been able to familiarize yourselves with the document and I have taken note of two delegations which have asked to take the floor on this agenda item.

It is now my pleasure to give the floor to the delegation of Germany, Mr. Müller.

**Mr. K.-U. MÜLLER** (Germany): Mr. Chairman, Monsieur President, the German delegation examined the document presented yesterday to the Committee and had a short look across the paper presented today. We welcome the numerous interventions of delegations in favour of the paper presented yesterday and my delegation welcomes again the support given to the excellent report of the DMISCO Ad Hoc Working Group.

The German delegation reaffirms its support to the creation of DMISO or SPIDER and, hence, it would like to recall both previous intervention in which this delegation presented its proposal to host DMISCO in Bonn. The experts of the Ad Hoc Working Group came to the conclusions that it would be most efficient for an early start of DMISCO to take advantage of the offers received and use its synergies available in Bonn, Beijing and Vienna.

This delegation would like to recall that in Bonn, DMISCO will be able to benefit of synergies with United Nations entities relevant to the proposed work of DMISCO, for example, the ISDR Platform for the Promotion of Early Warning and the United Nations University's Institute for Environment and Human Security.

This delegation would like to repeat that Bonn is the home of German agencies performing work related to disaster management, namely the German Committee for Disaster Reduction, the German Technical Aid Agency and the Federal Office for Disaster Response.

Last, but not least, the Bonn area is home to the headquarters of the German Aerospace Centre, DLR, and the DLR Centre for Satellite-Based Crisis Information is a major partner of national, European and United Nations organizations when remote sensing data are needed for early warning, humanitarian aid and disaster management.

Let me conclude this intervention with the appeal to this Committee to recommend the creation of DMISCO and the early start of DMISCO in January 2007. We propose that this date be included in this

Committee's report, as it was done on the new paper, but I wonder whether the last passage, or as soon as it was practicable, could not be deleted.

Thank you Mr. Chairman.

**The CHAIRMAN** (*interpretation from French*): Thank you Mr. Müller for your statement on behalf of the German delegation.

Another request from the floor from Mr. Wolanski from Poland.

**Mr. P. WOLANSKI** (Poland): Thank you Mr. Chairman, distinguished delegates, I was very closely following words from the very beginning on the possibility of the creation of the new entity to deal with natural disasters, DMISCO. I do not want to go into details because we spent a lot of time during the whole week discussing this problem but I would like, on behalf of the Polish delegation, support that the Committee should recommend an early start of establishment of DMISCO or SPIDER.

Thank you very much.

**The CHAIRMAN** (*interpretation from French*): Thank you Mr. Wolanski for your statement.

I give the floor to the United States, Mr. Hodgkins.

**Mr. K. HODGKINS** (United States of America): Thank you Mr. Chairman. Mr. Chairman, I want to express my delegation's appreciation to the Secretariat for providing us with a new draft of the non-paper and I think we are making great progress and moving certainly in the right direction, although my delegation will still have several questions about some of the revised paragraphs.

But I did want to ask two specific questions dealing with the finances.

The first one is on Page 2 of the non-paper, in the eleventh paragraph, it says "the proposed Programme would require an annual operational budget of approximately \$1.3 million". And as I had noted in my intervention yesterday, that figure of \$1.3 million is reflected in document L.285.

However, in the report that was provided to us in CRP.13, in paragraph 18, it says that "based on the proposed Work Plan, the Expert Group reviewed and updated the previous estimate of resources required", as reflected in L.285. So my question then is do we

have a different estimate of resources required, based on paragraph 18 of CRP.3 or is it still the case that we think, or that the experts think that it is going to cost \$1.3 million a year?

My second question regards the mobilization of resources and I have not seen this reflected in the Work Plan or in CRP.13 and my delegation would like clarification because this is a fundamental question. In paragraph 85 of L.285, that paragraph states that the "resources for the core work to be carried out would come from the United Nations, three staff people", "contributions in cash from member States" and this is the provision that I have a question about, "and a membership fee, either fixed or based on use of the services of the proposed DMISCO". So my question is, is DMISCO going to be a fee for service programme? And what does that exactly mean and is that consistent with this being a United Nations programme, or have the organizers abandoned this idea? And that perhaps I am missing the point here but in my reading of that phrase in paragraph 85 of L.285, it says that "resources will be or expenses will be recouped through a membership fee, fixed or based on use of the services of the proposed DMISCO", which implies to my delegation that in order to take advantage of DMISCO, you have to pay a fee. And I do not have a strong feeling one way or another about this but that would have an impact on whether we want to call this a strictly United Nations programme or whether we would ask the experts to come up with a different framework in terms of getting resources for support of DMISCO.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to come back at a later stage to the non-paper as you go through it paragraph-by-paragraph but I did want to raise these general points at this stage.

Thank you.

**The CHAIRMAN** (*interpretation from French*): Thank you Mr. Hodgkins for your statement.

The Secretariat has taken note of your two questions and before I give the floor to the Secretariat to respond to them, I would like to quickly find out whether any other delegations wish to take the floor.

Brazil.

**Ms. C. L. RIBEIRO MOURA** (Brazil): Thank you Mr. Chairman. Brazil would like just to point out that the second page of this non-paper on the financial implications of establishing the proposed programme, we are very glad to note the last part of the

paragraph in the sense that the establishment of this system should not result in an increase of the total regular budget of the United Nations. One of our preoccupations is that we should not create new institutions that could result in an extra burden for developing countries.

Thank you.

**The CHAIRMAN** (*interpretation from French*): Thank you distinguished delegate from Brazil.

The Netherlands have asked for the floor.

**Mr. A. S. REIJNGOUD** (Netherlands): Thank you Mr. Chairman. Please let me wait until the answer of the Secretariat to reply to the questions that have been made. After then, I will make a statement.

Thank you.

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

The Islamic Republic of Iran had asked for the floor.

**Mr. M. N. ASL** (Islamic Republic of Iran): Thank you very much Mr. Chairman. Good morning distinguished colleagues. Mr. Chairman, I should thank the distinguished colleagues from the Secretariat for providing this non-paper. And we have the same view as expressed by our distinguished colleague from Brazil and I am happy to see that there would be no financial burden, any additional burden upon developing countries and member States.

However, Mr. Chairman, a question I have is about paragraph 5(?) which is about the staff of those offices. Could I ask you that maybe you provide us some clarifications if this staff would be provided locally or it would multi-national staff and, as I note from the paper, which is CRP.13, those who are the candidates for those offices would be able to provide partly staff, not all of the staff. So could I ask you maybe, it is the understanding that it would be a multi-national staff and in particular, what is important that we see that disaster management would manage about those countries most badly affected by the disasters. So it is expectation that these countries would, as appropriate, to present it in those offices so in order to give the full picture and provide much with those issues which, in particular, affected countries have, how it is the network. I am sure that I would not ask

about the specific debt we lose(?) about those special experts which are needed maybe from the developed countries but how will it with multi-national staff. But what is important is that this staff should be multi-national and also, in particular, having considered the equipment of staff from developing countries.

So that is something that I wanted to make to you. Maybe those who are the potential candidates could clarify it how they see if partly it is going to be recruited from their staff, how much of that staff would be depleted from the local and how much from the multi-national and by the Office for Outer Space Affairs.

Thank you.

**The CHAIRMAN** (*interpretation from French*): I thank the distinguished representative of Iran.

The Secretariat has taken note of all these questions.

Are there any other requests for the floor.

I see none.

I will, thus, hand the floor back to the Director of the Office for Outer Space Affairs to answer the questions, the very precise questions which have put to us by the United States and Iran.

**Mr. S. CAMACHO-LARA** (Director, Office for Outer Space Affairs): Thank you Mr. Chairman. I will not be able to answer all the questions but I will answer some of them again as I see them from the Secretariat's side.

The one that I cannot answer because I was not here is the difference in the text in the report of the Experts and in the study, the L.285. I do not really know what the experts did that led to that change in language. I anticipate that it was not a big change because in the discussions in which I was present, it was not an issue that was discussed very long or even mentioned. But that question then I would refer to any of the experts that might still be in the room.

With regard to the fee that is referenced in the study of the experts, what I would say here is that that document is a study from the experts and that at the time as it was being developed, it was not clear whether it should be a United Nations programme or it should be an entity outside of the United Nations. And one of the considerations of the experts was that a way

to finance DMISCO could be by having some type of a fee that would provide for the maintenance of DMISCO. Once it changed and became obvious that this was a United Nations programme, then that concept of charging disappeared. If it is a United Nations programme, then it would not charge for the services that it provides. The United Nations does not charge its services.

With respect to would the staff be multi-national and percentages that will be recruited locally or the rest of the world, the intention and the desirable status would be to have a multi-national complement of staff in each one of the offices.

The other thing that has been discussed is that participation by all countries would be welcome at each one of the offices. The question would be, where would the resources come at the time? In other words, DMISCO will not have sufficient resources to be hiring, at least at the level of resources that were done right now. Eventually, the resources increase through voluntary contributions and those contributions allow for hiring for periods of a year or two years, whatever the terms of that contribution might be, then the intention is that the hiring would be on a geographic distribution basis. It was discussed in the meeting of the experts and later in the meeting of those that are offering support. It would be desirable to have people from the regions because they have focal contact to the conditions that affect a particular region in types of disasters and in culture.

So the short answer to the question from Iran would be that, yes, the DMISCO is, in principle, international, as far as its staff, and limited only by available resources.

Thank you Mr. Chairman.

**The CHAIRMAN** (*interpretation from French*): Thank you Mr. Camacho for that additional information.

So I turn back to delegations to see if anyone would wish to take the floor at this time. I think that the United States delegation had indicated that they would like to come back to the text on a paragraph-by-paragraph basis. So I give the floor to the United States. Mr. Hodgkins, you have the floor Sir.

**Mr. K. HODGKINS** (United States): Thank you Mr. Chairman. I appreciate the clarifications that were provided by the Director of the Office for Outer Space Affairs. I still believe we need clarity from the experts on the budget because it is not entirely clear

what exactly the estimate is for DMISCO because that has a direct bearing on what portion of that total budget the United Nations would be expected to absorb and we should have some idea if we recommend this back to our governments to support, we should have at least some idea of what sorts of requests we will be faced with later this year in the United Nations budget cycle.

So I think the experts or representatives from the Experts Group should provide us with something a little bit more definitive and clear up this ambiguity of we had an estimate in February, then we revised it in June but we cannot tell you what that revised budget looks like.

Now the second point, and I appreciate the clarification on, which was this idea of a membership fee being proposed for DMISCO. I take the point that probably this is \_\_\_\_\_ (?) but this is indicate of an underlying problem that we have at this stage which is no basic principles or how DMISCO will be organized. And we had two different documents, CRP.13 and L.258(?) which you have in your non-paper which those two documents are being treated on an equal basis because we cross-referenced L.258(?) in the eleventh paragraph of the non-paper as outlining the operational costs which would include these questions of how you might be able to recoup the expenses.

I am not sure that we can solve that today but I am raising this as an issue for the Committee to have to deal with because we do not know, as this moves forward, we do not know what really are the underlying guidelines for how we will organize this activity because we have some contradictory notions reflected in L.285 and then in CRP.13 and I think that, again, we owe it to our governments to be able to answer some of these questions as people look through these documents.

Thank you Mr. Chairman.

**The CHAIRMAN** (*interpretation from French*): Thank you Mr. Hodgkins for this comment on this issue of a possible incongruity between the reference document, 285, CRP.13.

Would the Director of the Office for Outer Space Affairs have anything to contribute? Perhaps something which would reassure the delegations?

**Mr. S. CAMACO-LARA** (Director, Office for Outer Space Affairs): Thank you Mr. Chairman. I did a little bit of consulting with my colleague regarding the text that says that a re-evaluation of resources was done. His recollection is that what was

aimed discussed at the time is whether it might not be cheaper to recruit locally looking at the venues, as compared to the initial evaluation that was done in the study by the experts and reflected in the study.

What he indicated also is that the order of magnitude continued to be the same. So I cannot shed more light than that because that is all the information that I have.

Now with respect to the status of the two documents, the way I see is that L.285 is a study that was presented and represented a situation at the time. Since then, there have been a number of developments that have taken into consideration comments that have been made by members of the Committee and also by the experts at the meeting. CRP.13, which is the final report of the experts, I think would be the one that, right now, is under consideration. The first one was a guide in developing CRP.13. But I would consider that one to be the basis for how it is going to be organized, in particular because that reflects the coordination of the contributors that have made firm commitments to date, that is the coordination between Austria, China and Germany.

Now with respect to numbers, one of the guidelines that was in the document, the study to the L.285 is the identification of three experts. Now one of the things that, on the basis of that, we could estimate would be what would be the cost in United Nations terms, the cost for those three posts, and, something that was not included there but should be included, although it is not very much, would be the computer equipment that the person would need and the maintenance fees. There are small things like that would need to be added.

A calculation of costs like that would give something on the order of the difference that there is between that the estimate of what is being offered by the donors and that \$1.3 million. It would give on the order of \$450,000, some place in that range.

And then here what I would like to add to this is, as I indicated before, if the Committee were to make the recommendation, and this is presented to the Fourth Committee, there will be a programme implication budget document that is presented to the Committee. Before it gets to that point, the proposal will also be reviewed by the ACABQ, which is the Advisory Committee on Administrative and Budgetary Questions. This body would first review the programme implications and then that body would be making a recommendation. The Fourth Committee would receive the programme budget implications

from the PPBD, the Programme Planning and Budget Division, that is part of the Secretariat. That goes to the Fourth Committee. When the Fourth Committee recommends, then it goes to the Fifth Committee. When it goes to the Fifth Committee, then the programme budget implication that was presented in the Fourth Committee is converted to a Fifth Committee document. So then the Fifth Committee would then have again those lines(?).

At the stage where we are, it would, I can give you the costs of posts, local(?) standard costs. But exactly what the configuration will be when it is presented, the only thing that I would be able to say at this point, it would be of this order of \_\_\_\_\_(?). We are not in a position right now to indicate more. If you want to have a round figure, you could think 500,000. If you want to think 400,000, 450 which would be the difference between that 1.3 and the estimate of the contributions of the donors. That is about all that I would be comfortable in saying right now, with the detail that is provided, then that will depend on the Work Plan, not the Work Plan, the framework that has been presented in CRP.13 that actually the detailed work of what is to do and what activities are included. That has then an implication on what are the human resources needed and the support that is needed for that.

Thank you Mr. Chairman.

**The CHAIRMAN** (*interpretation from French*): Thank you Mr. Camacho for those clarifications and explanations.

We have a request for the floor from India. You have the floor Sir. Dr. Suresh for India.

**Mr. B. N. SURESH** (India): Thank you Mr. Chairman. ... (*no microphone*) on the revised non-paper, we strongly believe that it takes into account many of the issues raised by delegations yesterday. Two important questions which arise today is the one of the budget and it is indicated that there is some kind of mismatch. What I see from the documents, L.285 and CRP.13, as going through the paragraph 84, as paragraph 11 of what is the non-paper. As I see, I do not find any big difference and I may add that as one of the co-Chairs for the Working Group on this agenda, we have spent almost four to five days, the L.285 is essentially the document which summarizes the Ad Hoc Expert Group recommendations made during the Scientific and Technical Subcommittee and it was submitted to the Scientific and Technical Subcommittee. As well, the Scientific and Technical Subcommittee had \_\_\_\_\_ (*not clear*) an actions

for the Office for Outer Space Affairs to take and whatever actions they have taken, they have integrated all these inputs and provided as a base document for discussion in the Ad Hoc Expert Group. In fact, that formed a very good basis for the Ad Hoc Expert Group to proceed forward and the important input that had just come in this particular meeting is that, as I mentioned yesterday, to go for an open(?) network which would facilitate the better management or better execution of the task that is ahead of us.

So, based on that, there are a number of solutions which have come from several member States who participated very actively and, in fact, CRP.13 definitely will have such a variance with the L.285 to the extent the recommendations made by various member States which have been corrected and what is there in today is the consensus arrived in the Committee with all member States participating and that is the one which is CRP.13. I am sure it will have the variation in order to accommodate the various recommendations made by several member States.

And also this non-paper which is presented today, to a large extent, we believe, has addressed quite a few questions which arise and I think it has moved in the right direction. So with this kind of effort and commitment by several countries, I think we must see how to really go further without too much entering into the debate. I do not think we will become wiser by having debate for a longer time. I think the Committee has to take a step forward so that we move in the right direction so it means the requirements, as projected by all member States.

Thank you very much Mr. Chairman.

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

And we also have a request for the floor from the United States. You have the floor Sir. Mr. Hodgkins.

**Mr. K. HODGKINS** (United States of America): Thank you Mr. Chairman. I apologize for asking for the floor again but I did want to make several other points based on the clarification that the Director for the Office for Outer Space Affairs has provided us concerning the process this far considering the omnibus(?) resolution to the General Assembly. It is my understanding that if we were to agree to this non-paper and it was reflected in the report of COPUOS that most, if not all, of these paragraphs in the non-paper will be included in the General Assembly resolution.

When that does happen, this resolution will be reviewed for its budgetary implications and there will be an assessment from the Programme Planning and Implementation Division that there are budgetary implications and that as a result that that resolution may or may not go forward based on that decision because, again, the Fifth Committee, the ACABQ and the CPC all will have a say in whether or not the resources will be available for this activity. So we will be faced with the situation that if those groups decide that the budgetary implications for this year are such that that we cannot provide the funding for this activity then those paragraphs in the resolution will have to come out because they represent a budgetary implication that cannot be supported by the General Assembly. So I go back to the point that I made yesterday and the day before and that, in fact, what we are doing is we are placing the future of this particular activity in the hands of other committees with other interests that are not necessarily shared, that do not necessarily reflect the interests that are expressed here. So we have to decide if this is a risk worth taking or is there some other way we can make progress and get to the point where we want. But if we overreach and start asking for an increase in the Office for Outer Space Affairs budget of \$400,000, which is what is being suggested here, then my delegation is just concerned that the progress that we are trying to make, in fact will set us back and we have to think very carefully about that.

Thank you Mr. Chairman.

**The CHAIRMAN** (*interpretation from French*): Thank you Mr. Hodgkins for that statement and a reminder that there is a decision-making stage which is important and which will take place in New York during the discussion of the resolution.

I now give the floor to the Islamic Republic of Iran.

**Mr. M. N. ASL** (Islamic Republic of Iran): Thank you Mr. Chairman. Thank you to the distinguished Director from the Office for Outer Space Affairs for his explanation since \_\_\_\_\_ particular clarification that maybe about the equipment of the staff but two(?) principles should be highlighted in the non-paper \_\_\_\_\_(?) for where the language which could be able to provide to the Secretariat maybe during the break. However, these three principles that the first principle is that the staff should be kept to the minimum necessary for the proper discharge of the responsibilities of those offices. Second, which is also important, that only member States should serve those

offices. And the third point is that necessary consultations would be held with member States to ensure proper balance or geographical distribution in those offices.

These are three principles which we see that it could come in the proper way in the non-paper.

Thank you.

**The CHAIRMAN** (*interpretation from French*): Thank you to the distinguished representative of the Islamic Republic of Iran for that statement and suggestion.

Would anyone else like to take the floor?

Yes, the delegation of The Netherlands. I will come back to you. You have the floor Sir.

**Mr. A. S. REIJNGOUD** (Netherlands): Thank you Mr. Chairman. The Netherlands delegation would like to thank the Secretariat for the revised non-paper on DMISCO. The most important thing is to have the entity established as soon as possible. Actually we cannot afford any delay. As mentioned yesterday, every week a disaster is taking place and people are suffering.

Mr. Chairman, bearing in mind the time pressure, the discussions we had and replies of the Secretariat to the questions, The Netherlands can accept in principle the proposal to implement the entity as a programme of the Office for Outer Space Affairs as an open network and try to find a budget(?) within the United Nations. This means that the proposal must be phrased and formulated with great care and precision using concepts that are not familiar within the United Nations must be avoided, for example, the use of platforms or anything like that, for example, entities or platforms or a \_\_\_\_\_(?) group. There is probably an alternative for an entity or platform and that could be a coordinating mechanism.

Mr. Chairman, giving this proposal a chance does not mean that we do not have to think of alternatives. As yesterday mentioned, the so-called Plan B. My question to the Secretariat is what does the Secretariat think of the possibilities of a Plan B?

Thank you.

**The CHAIRMAN** (*interpretation from French*): Thank you to the distinguished delegate of The Netherlands. Actually your question goes back to the one of the United States which was to ask what

would happen if this comes to New York. So I would ask Dr. Camacho if he can maybe answer some of that for us.

**Mr. S. CAMACHO-LARA** (Director, Office for Outer Space Affairs): Thank you Mr. Chairman. It is, of course, correct that if the resolution does not go through then the entity would come, let us say, to a stop and then Plan B would be necessary to interventions related and the consequences.

Now one of the points I would like to clarify. I did talk yesterday to New York, to the Office of Programme Planning and Implementation, who verified that the processes I had mentioned to you was correct and there were things that I had not mentioned to you. And I asked about the bodies that we would need to consult. The reply that was given regarding the CPC, which is the Committee on Programme Coordination, was that if whatever programmatic changes are included do not affect the Strategic Framework of the Programme, the CPC would not need to review the proposal and since disaster management, space applications for disaster management, is something that is within the Strategic Framework of the Office, then there would be no need for the CPC to review it. Nevertheless, the ACABQ and the Fourth Committee and the Fifth Committee would.

In my view, as I mentioned yesterday, if we are going to try to get this entity to work, we will need to have also a coordinated support between the representatives of the governments to COPUOS and the representatives of the governments to the Fourth Committee and to the Fifth Committee.

With that coordination, I believe there is a possibility that it could go through. There is no guarantee but there is then a possibility. The way I see it personally is if we do not try then the answer is already no and then we have to start looking for Plan B immediately.

As to what Plan B might be, that question. If I was to propose something, then we would need to start almost from nothing because the concept under which the offers(?) being made right now by the Governments of Austria, China and Germany would then not exist and we would need then to make a different type of proposal. Of course, there would be the study of the experts which would still be there. So that type would be there. But it certainly would delay considerably that there was an alternative form in which it could be done and in the United Nations, it could be done outside of the United Nations, but in the United Nations that

would be a lengthy process that would take at least another year or maybe two years. So whereas it is desirable to have a Plan B, in my view, a Plan B means a delay of the order of minimum one year or two years and it has been said the lack of this support, particularly in developing countries, could have consequences that maybe should not have happened.

Thank you Mr. Chairman.

**The CHAIRMAN** (*interpretation from French*): Thank you Mr. Camacho, Director of the Office for Outer Space Affairs.

I now give the floor back to The Netherlands.

**Mr. A. S. REIJNGOUD** (Netherlands): Thank you Mr. Chairman and thank you to the Secretariat for their reply and I guess this reply should be an argument for the proposal in New York.

Thank you.

**The CHAIRMAN** (*interpretation from French*): I think the situation that was just described so clearly by the Director of the Office for Outer Space Affairs and the strategy proposed here is to move forward with this, accept the risk, as pointed out by our colleagues from the United States and The Netherlands and resolution of these financial activities, something that we will have to deal with later, but if we do not even make a proposal then we know that nothing will happen. So at least start. So we understand there is a risk but given the understanding of the context, as indicated by the Director of the Office for Outer Space Affairs, my understanding is that the risk is a reasonable one and the Committee is assuming its responsibilities by putting this proposal on the table, as we have it before us.

I would like to know if any delegations have any comments on the paragraphs because we do have a number of other items we have to address and, of course, we have to work on the report.

I do not see any requests for the floor on the details of drafting of each of the paragraphs. A number of comments have already been made in previous statements. I am here thinking especially of the comments made by our colleague from Iran which we will, as far as possible, attempt to incorporate into the report.

I do not have any other comments and with your permission, I would like to move on to other agenda items.

I see no other comments.

I propose that we consider this text, including the few small amendments the Secretariat will make which should be included in the report of the Committee.

#### **Other matters (agenda item 14)**

We now move on to agenda item 14, or should I say we have turned to agenda item 14 which we have looked at over the last few days on agenda item 14.

As you noted, a request for the floor by Canada. I thus give the floor to our friend from Canada.

**Mr. T. OUATTARA** (Canada): Thank you Mr. Chairman. (*Continued in French*) Mr. Chairman, Canada wished to voice the fact that it has reservations regarding the acceptance as new agenda item of the Brazilian proposal on international cooperation by promoting the use of geospatial data for sustainable development. And more specifically, (*continued in English*) ... in promoting the use of geospatial data for sustainable development.

(*Continued in French*) At the outset, this was to be a consultation initiated by the Brazilian delegation. The first proposal received by Canada, approximately three weeks ago, was a proposal which the Brazilian delegation put to us for subsequent discussions at the June session of COPUOS. It was, from that point of view, an exercise in consultation, nothing more. This first document, its objective was, and I will say it in English, (*continued in English*) ... proposal of a new agenda item to be considered by the COPUOS Legal Subcommittee at its forty-sixth session. (*Continued in French*) And the title was (*continued in French*) ...” in Capacity-Building for the Development of National Geospatial Data Infrastructures”.

(*Continued in French*) Although a number of delegations received the same document, it will be a pleasure for us to distribute it, this first document.

Canada assessed it in that light. We have not received any instructions other than to continue a serious exercise in discussion on the proposal brought to us by our Brazilian friends.

Once we arrived in Vienna, we received another document, on Tuesday, 13 June 2006,

specifically. This one was different from the first. The title was different but it remained a document which was a document for consultation discussions. For reference, this document was entitled "International Cooperation by Promoting the Use of Geospatial Data for Sustainable Development". This was confirmed. The spirit of consultation was confirmed by our colleague from Brazil in his introductory presentation of the draft proposal, yesterday, 15 June, in the morning session, under agenda item 14.

Again, it is in this spirit of consultation and exchange of views that we address this document.

Given the way in which our discussions have evolved, we took the necessary time to carry out an analysis of this second document by setting the first one aside and this last proposal is a very vague one in nature. Firstly, in the document it was to benefits for developing countries. This is an assertion which is noble in spirit but it has to be clarified with qualitative estimates. What benefits are we referring to exactly, for the benefits are many. In some places, it refers to capacity-building for the development of geospatial infrastructures. In other parts, it refers to the use of geospatial data for sustainable development.

What is this referring to exactly? These two topics are very different. What happened within the confines of COPUOS' Legal Subcommittee where this proposal was first made? What happened for this new proposal to return to us with a slightly different thrust? We need to know this for this might clarify a number of things but we simply do not. We are in the dark. What was the position on that Subcommittee? We do not know anything about this either. A great many countries present here were present in the Subcommittee. They know what is going on. We would like to hear their views on this.

Capacity-building calls on three pillars at the very least: human resources, financial resources, infrastructure and knowledge and expertise. What type of capacity-building are we referring to here specifically? To all three? Or to none of the three? Or perhaps to two of the three. We simply do not know. For this would lead to a commitment, a commitment which, for Canada, will be a real one, and we are referring here to a process of development aid, promoting development.

Mr. Chairman, Canada has engaged in an exercise of comparative studies. We have gone to see what GEOS proposed because we do know that GEOS proposes something at the level of capacity-building and I would invite all delegates to visit the website of

this Organization, which belongs to all of us. Turn to Page 8, Section 5.6, where we refer to capacity-building. It refers to the 10-Year Implementation Plan of GEOS.

Mr. Chairman, as a delegate and a member of this august assembly, we could not allow the risk of plagiarism which could undermine our credibility Sir. Is it not this Committee and this Subcommittee which had requested the Group of Experts on DMISCO to clarify a number of elements regarding duplications and overlap of existing international efforts? It is our Committee which did this. And the Group of Experts did this in a most outstanding way. We have to congratulate it for this.

Mr. Chairman, but yesterday, a delegation stated that having requested the advice of their expert on geographical space systems, he said that this was a very good topic. We, Sir, say that yes, it is an outstanding topic in geographical space data. We would want this delegation to come up with a point of view on the proposal and all of you experts gathered here in this room, could we all analyze and consult this document strictly within the framework of COPUOS' mandate, which is space. I would like other delegations to engage in an exchange of views. This is an open debate.

Sir, the two documents, that of April and June, are different ones. In less than two months, we can see a radical change as far as content is concerned and even as far as the trend is concerned. This is a problem for us. And in 48 hours, we are accepting a new proposal as a new item on our agenda. Yes, maybe we want it to, well, what we require here is sufficient time to analyze such a document. Forty-eight hours is unacceptable and insufficient. At the same time, we are being asked to provide clarifications to make sure there are no ambiguities or overlap with other initiatives.

We have a great many questions but one of them I shall voice.

If there is overlap or if there is conformity which already exists in other fora, what will be do? Are we going to remove it from the agenda? So why not move forward in a methodic way, check these things, seek information and then, once we have certainty, for this is the gist of it, when we have certainty, we can accept it.

Sir, but yesterday another delegation stated, and I shall para-phrase "that if Canada is not interested in this proposal because it is sufficient, we are the

developing countries consider it as being most welcome”.

Mr. Chairman, this is unacceptable because we consider this to be an insult to our country, to our Government, given the enormous investment which we have engaged in at an international level, especially as far as the support and assistance to developing countries is concerned.

Mr. Chairman, we do not want to destroy or dismantle a proposal just because it is a proposal, especially not when it is a proposal stemming from a country with which but two weeks ago, we have signed a Protocol of Understanding, with a short financing by Canada on FDI, which was what we were referring to here today. So we cannot understand this. What motivates us here is clarity. What motivates us here is responsibility. What motivates us is that we want to extricate or we want to leave this Committee and be able to act positively on all commitments which this Committee has undertaken. This is the very meaning of solidarity. Canada fully backed UNISPACE III and reports here, 16 June, is nothing more than one of the material forms which UNISPACE III takes. For Canada, UNISPACE III is a commitment. We believe in it. We joined it voluntarily, of our own free will. Every time we have an opportunity to do so in the various Subcommittees, or in the Committee itself under various items, we have given a number of examples of Canada's commitment.

What is important to us? We want to point out a number of facts.

A long time before this proposal was put to us, at the Global Summit on Sustainable Development 2002, our former Prime Minister Jean Cretien(?), had proposed to Africans to freely supply them with the RADSAT-I MOSAIC of Africa. It is not an easy thing to do but we are working, your humble servant which I am, and making sure that we are working on this project. We are providing African countries with the ways and means to enjoy this data.

Sir, a number of African countries have taken advantage of this. And today, still, we back the African Union and the United Nations Economic Commission for Europe in this field.

Since 2000, Canada, in partnership with six Andean countries, Argentina, Bolivia, Chile, Ecuador, Peru, Venezuela and, of course, Colombia, has established the MAGTAR(?) Project, which is the project which utilizes geo-science and space-based tools to protect the population by providing them up-

to-date data on natural disasters, including earthquakes, volcanoes, landslides and so forth. There is a website on this. I invite you to confirm my sayings. Over five years, Canada has devoted 35 million Canadian dollars to this.

Mr. Chairman, yes, we are committed, have invested ourselves in this project and we assist developing countries.

This year, and my dear friend, Felix Menicocci, can confirm this, the Canadian Space Agency and the Argentinian Space Agency, have signed a Memorandum of Understanding with an investment of two million Canadian dollars.

Sir, we stand shoulder to shoulder with developing countries and we are frustrated when we hear such comments from the official representative of States, especially when these are developing States. Understand how we feel.

Mr. Chairman, we are very active in the field of geospatial data infrastructure. We draw your attention the fact that we have sound experience of cooperation with developing States in this field. We do not want to kill off this initiative. We want to strengthen it. I will quote Thailand, India, Senegal, Chile and Brazil.

Mr. Chairman, we do want this proposal to be seriously assessed and taken into account. We have pointed out that other institutions and international fora, such as the Global Spatial Data Infrastructure Association, launched by USGS, United States Geological Survey, and others, whom I will not quote here, work on these topics which are at the very centre of the activities.

Mr. Chairman, it would be right that knowing this, Canada should speak out, or at least place this information at your disposal to draw everyone's attention to these facts. We have a duty of moral solidarity. We have never shirked it.

Mr. Chairman, we believe, quite sincerely, that the way to move forward, as proposed in the report, in under 48 hours, means that we will accept a new proposal without adequately accessing it. We do not know what the implications are. You place us in a very difficult situation, as a delegate of Canada, because our instructions are to consult, to engage in an exchange of views, nothing more. Today, we are in front of a *fait accompli*. It is a new agenda item but it leaves a bitter taste in our mouths and we did want to voice this quite explicitly.

Canada remains open for any discussions to improve this proposal and it is quite clear that we will transmit this document to all delegations, organizations which want to see it and this will show before history that Canada will have drawn the Committee's attention to the existence of similar initiatives so that no one can come to us in two years' time that it was our duty to avoid any overlap.

Mr. Chairman, it was our great pleasure to contribute, to bring our modest contribution to the Brazilian proposal. We thank them for having taken us into account in formulating it and for having asked for our point of view on this.

Thank you.

**The CHAIRMAN** (*interpretation from French*): I thank the delegate of Canada for his statement which develops Canada's stand on this issue, as voiced yesterday, and I thank you for drawing the Committee's attention to the fact that the Brazilian proposal concerns a field which is one where a number of international organizations are already quite busy, international organizations within the United Nations and outside the United Nations.

What can I say to the delegate of Canada? Is following his comment, a draft text on this agenda item, on this Brazilian proposal should I say, has been developed in close cooperation with the Secretariat which firstly aims to reflect all positions voiced during yesterday's discussions which incorporates, as far as possible, the concerns raised, especially those raised by the delegation of Canada. This text will be distributed, and I will have to check when it will be distributed. This text has been prepared. It will be available after lunch, the first thing after lunch.

And the important issue on which I wish to draw your attention, which is a decisive element, is that the first stage of the Work Plan presented by our friends from Brazil intends to take stock, in a realistic way as possible, of all work under way at international levels in various agencies, various committees with and within and outside the United Nations on geospatial data and on international cooperation in this field.

You will see that in the proposed text, this first stage, which is a stage of taking into account of understanding what we are dealing with, should enable the Committee to decide on our subsequent plan of work and perhaps amend it, correct it somewhat. This should enable us, to a large extent, to take into account the concerns voiced by the Canadian delegation, as

well as other delegations incidentally. And the text is not yet available. It is quite difficult to say any more at this stage. I would propose that we return to this agenda item when this text is presented and you will see that for the outstanding work carried out by the Office for Outer Space Affairs, we have a proposal which, I believe, incorporates the various positions voiced, as well as the concerns voiced.

France.

**Mr. J. Y. TREBAOL** (France) (*interpretation from French*): Thank you Mr. Chairman. I will be very brief, briefer than my friend, Mr. Ouattara, but I must echo some of his concerns because a few of us here believe that the Brazilian proposal is one which is similar to other proposals which have been proposed or presented to the Legal Subcommittee. We have had very little time to consider this, examine this new proposal so it is difficult for us to take a formal stand on it. We have no objections as to the principle. We want to be very clear on the objectives of this proposal.

I thank you Sir.

**The CHAIRMAN** (*interpretation from French*): I thank the distinguished representative of France.

And I give the floor to Brazil.

**Ms. C. L. RIBEIRO MOURA** (Brazil): Thank you Mr. Chairman. First of all, we would like to thank the colleague from Canada for his intervention in which, even though he places a reservation on the Brazilian proposal, he raises important questions which I think are very useful for the discussion of the proposal.

And I also thank your explanations on the paper that is going to be distributed with the suggestions for a way forward and especially the Work Plan and I think that once this paper is distributed, the delegations, including the Canadian delegation, will have a much clearer view of what or how the proposal is now.

I also thank the delegation of France for the points that they made and which I also wanted to make for the better information of the Canadian delegation.

This proposal was originally presented by Brazil at the Legal Subcommittee and, of course, the Canadian delegate is perfectly right, it was different and it changed because of the informal consultations

which were undertaken by the Brazilian delegation and Brazil was, of course, open to suggestions and that is why the present proposal has a different outlook.

We do hope that after the paper is distributed and duly analyzed, the ideas put forward by Brazil and also with contributions from other delegations might be incorporated in the agenda and we look forward to discussions with the Canadian delegation and others.

Thank you.

**The CHAIRMAN** (*interpretation from French*): I thank the representative of Brazil for her statement.

A request for the floor by Indonesia.

**Ms. E. MIRANDA** (Indonesia): Thank you Mr. Chairman. We have listened with great interest to the discussion on this agenda item and we have expressed our views yesterday. Of course, as one of the developing countries, Indonesia really appreciates the initiative that has been formed by Brazil. We can see the benefits of this capacity-building and we stand to feel the impact of this initiative in principle.

We would also like to thank the Secretariat for preparing the draft text that hopefully will contain all the concerns that we have voiced yesterday.

We just would like at this juncture to remind you to ensure that this new agenda item would be under the COPUOS mandate and there would be no duplication. We actually would like to have more time to ensure that the overlap of duplication that probably accessed(?) within this and the work of other international organizations. However, we are willing to wait for the Secretariat's draft text and we will wait until this text is out.

Thank you so much.

**The CHAIRMAN** (*interpretation from French*): I thank the distinguished representative of Indonesia on this agenda item.

This agenda item is one we will return to as soon as we have a text before us, which, if my understanding is correct, will be at the beginning of this afternoon.

Under agenda item 14, we had a discussion yesterday concerning the future role and activities of the Committee. This on a proposal which I made to you and was endorsed by all the members of the

Committee. The Secretariat has prepared a paragraph which summarizes the conclusions we reached.

This paragraph is currently an English draft paragraph. I shall read it and it too will be distributed at the beginning of this afternoon.

This paragraph will be included in the Committee's report which you will receive because you are receiving a report bit by bit. It will be included at the bottom of item 14. I will read it now. It is not very long.

I will read in English, of course, because I have it in English before me.

(*Continued in English*) "Future Role and Activities of the Committee. The Committee agreed to continue considering the future role and activities of the Committee at its fiftieth session. The Committee further agreed that the Chairman of the Committee could conduct intersessional open-ended informal consultations with a view to presenting to the Committee a list of elements that could be taken into consideration at its next session. Such elements should be based on the need to look into areas where the Committee and its Subcommittees have made progress and other areas where the Committee might need to focus more attention in the future, taking into account the evolution of space technology and the increased number of stakeholders."

(*Continued in French*) This, I think, aptly summarizes the conclusions we reached yesterday that I should consult you informally during the intersessionals to be able at the next session to have a number of quite detailed suggestions on the new elements the Committee should focus on, including, of course, the topics on which we have not achieved sufficient progress during preceding years, past years. This concerns both the scientific and technical aspects, as well as the legal ones. So it is quite broad in scope.

Again, this document, which summarizes the outcome of our debates, will be included in the Committee's draft report which we will consider later on this afternoon.

**Draft report of the Committee on the Peaceful Uses of Outer Space to the General Assembly (agenda item 15)**

We will now start our consideration of the Committee's draft report, agenda item 15.

You have before you, if I am not mistaken, document 266, Addendum 1. I would like to ask the Second Vice-Chair, the Rapporteur, from Burkina Faso, to please report on the drafting of this document before us.

**Mr. P. R. TIENDREBEOGO** (Burkina Faso) (Rapporteur) (*interpretation from French*): Thank you Mr. Chairman.

Distinguished representatives, I would like to present the draft report of the Committee on the Peaceful Uses of Outer Space to the General Assembly.

The draft report is in five parts. These have the symbols A/AC.105/L.266 and Addenda 1, 2, 3 and 4.

I understand that four sections have been distributed and are before the Committee for adoption.

The first part has the symbol A/AC.105/L.266 and contains the Introduction and Recommendations and Decisions, which contains the section "Ways and Means of Maintaining Outer Space for Peaceful Purposes".

The second part has the symbol A/AC.105/L.266/Add.1 and the second part contains the sections on "Implementation of the Recommendations of UNISPACE III", "Report of the Legal Subcommittee on its Forty-Fourth Session" and "Spin-Off Benefits of Space Technology: Review of Current Status".

The third part has the symbol A/AC.105/L.266/Add.2 and contains the sections on "Space and Society", "Space and Water" and "Recommendations of the World Summit on the Information Society".

The fourth part of the report has the symbol A/AC.105/L.266/Add.3 and contains the section on "Report of the Scientific and Technical Subcommittee on its Forty-Third Session", except for sub-section 7 "Space-System-Based Disaster Management Support".

The fifth and final part of the report will be available this afternoon and has the symbol A/AC.105/L.266/Add.4 and contains sub-section 7 on "Space-System-Based Disaster Management Support" of the section on "Report of the Scientific and Technical Subcommittee for its Forty-Third Session", as well as the section on "Other Matters".

Distinguished delegates, the draft report of the Committee, as introduced above, is thus before you for your adoption.

Thank you Mr. Chairman.

**The CHAIRMAN** (*interpretation from French*): I would like to thank the Second Vice-Chair, Rapporteur, for that information and introduction.

I will now begin our examination of the report on a paragraph-by-paragraph basis.

We will be looking then at Chapter I, which is L.266.

I am following the English version of the document. We will begin with Chapter I, Introduction, paragraph 1.

I think there will be no problems with that.

Section A, paragraphs 2 and 3.

Part B, Adoption of the Agenda. I do not think there is a problem with that either.

Paragraph 4, Section C, Election of Officers.

Paragraph 5, Election of the Chair and two Vice-Chairs.

Paragraph 6, Endorsement of the Elections by the Subcommittee.

Section D then.

No change in Section D.

Section E, paragraph 8. Mr. Hedman has the floor.

**Mr. N. HEDMAN** (Deputy Secretary, Office for Outer Space Affairs): Thank you Mr. Chairman. In paragraph 8 of document L.266, there will be inserted "Bulgaria". Bulgaria will be inserted.

Thank you Mr. Chairman.

**The CHAIRMAN** (*interpretation from French*): Paragraph 9. I apologize the microphone was off. There are some brackets for the numbers of the meetings but that is all. The Secretariat will add the numbers of the meetings.

No remarks on paragraph 9?

This paragraph is adopted.

Paragraph 10. This is about observers.

The Secretariat might add something there, whatever is in the brackets there.

Paragraph 10 adopted.

Paragraph 11. We continue with the observers. I think it is fairly complete but the Secretariat can just check that we did not forget any organizations who have the status of observer.

The French delegation would like the floor?

**Mr. J. Y. TREBAOL** (France) (*interpretation from French*): Thank you Mr. Chairman. I just wanted to point out that in looking at the French and English version at the same time, that we should point out some little differences to the Secretariat. There might be translation problems or translation problems with the acronyms of some of these organizations but we can ask them to look at that afterwards though.

**The CHAIRMAN** (*interpretation from French*): Thank you to the French delegation. Indeed, I would ask other delegations to also verify with their languages, Spanish, Arabic, Chinese and Russian and also to indicate to the Secretariat if there are any problems in terms of consistency between the various versions. I hope that it does not happen too often but thank you for any assistance that you might provide the Secretariat on this.

So paragraph 11 is approved.

Paragraph 12. Also approved. Indeed we mad Mr. Hashash(?) for a half day.

Paragraph 13. No problems there either.

Now we move on the Section F, paragraph 14. Paragraph 14 is factual. These are statements that were made.

*Approved.*

Paragraph 15. No problems with paragraph 15.

*Also approved.*

Paragraph 16 likewise. And in there, we are thinking the outgoing Bureaux.

*Paragraph 16 approved.*

Paragraph 17. I think we all agree with paragraph 17.

*Approved.*

Paragraph 18.

*Paragraph 18 is approved.*

Paragraph 19.

*Approved.*

Paragraph 20. I think that paragraph 20 can also be approved without reservations.

*Also approved.*

Paragraph 21. I see no one making any comments.

Paragraph 22.

*Approved.*

Paragraph 23.

*Approved.*

Paragraph 24.

*Approved.*

Section G. Paragraph 25 will have to wait until the end of today's session to be able to approve it. For the time being, there are still some intentions to be fulfilled but I think we will be able to approve it eventually but not right now.

Chapter II. Recommendations and Decisions.  
Section A. Paragraph 26.

*Paragraph 26 approved.*

Paragraph 27.

*Paragraph 27 approved.*

Paragraph 28.

*Paragraph 28 approved.*

Paragraph 29.

*Paragraph 29 approved.*

I am going to give the floor to the Secretariat.  
Mr. Hedman?

**Mr. N. HEDMAN** (Deputy Secretary, Office for Outer Space Affairs): Thank you Mr. Chairman. In paragraph 29, last sentence on Page 6, we had to change the website and the new website should read as follows: [www.unoosa.unvienna.org/](http://www.unoosa.unvienna.org/) and then comes the changes [wssd/judex.hotmail.html](http://wssd/judex.hotmail.html).

Thank you Mr. Chairman. I was a bit confused when I got this remark from you. Because judex, what is that? No, it should be index.

**The CHAIRMAN** (*interpretation from French*): I was going to ask you.

With those corrections at the end of paragraph 29, this paragraph is approved then.

Paragraph 30. I give the floor to the distinguished representative of Ecuador.

**Ms. R. VÁSQUEZ DE MESSMER** (Ecuador) (*interpretation from Spanish*): Thank you Mr. Chairman. I just wanted to request a change in the verb in the second line which is in the conditional. It should make it “will welcome”, instead of “would host”, be “will host”. No conditional, no “would” but rather “will host” because it is a fact that it is going to happen. If that could be changed please.

**The CHAIRMAN** (*interpretation from French*): Thank you for that clarification. I believe that we also need to put the future in other languages as well, as the English says “would be hosting” and “will be hosting”, I think, is what we need. And likewise change should be reflected in other languages.

The distinguished representative of the Czech Republic.

**Mr. V. KOPAL** (Czech Republic): Sorry Mr. Chairman but I would like to draw your attention that, in my humble opinion, in the English text, it is correct because, according to English grammar, after a past tense in the first sentence, it should be indeed “would” not “will”.

Thank you very much.

**The CHAIRMAN** (*interpretation from French*): Thank you to the distinguished representative of the Czech Republic for the excellent lesson in English grammar. I was not aware of that. However, I am not supposed to be able to speak that language so it is not really my problem.

So we will retain in English.

(*Interpreter*) The interpreter would like to point out that it still needs to be changed in the other languages. Perhaps it is a translation problem because in Spanish it is conditional and Ecuador is looking at the Spanish version.

**The CHAIRMAN** (*interpretation from French*): France has the floor.

**Mr. J. Y. TREBAOL** (France) (*interpretation from French*): Mr. Chairman, we are pleased to indicate that in the French version, the subtleties of the language were able to be conveyed.

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

We will continue with the paragraphs on a case-by-case basis but I would just like to indicate to delegations that the text that I read earlier about the future role of the Committee and its activities will be distributed forthwith as a CRP document or rather it is a small mistake on my part, let me take that back. The text I was speaking about earlier about the Brazilian proposal which I announced for this afternoon will ultimately be ready earlier and will be distributed in the next half hour so we will be able to look at that a little bit earlier. So that is for your information.

Now I am coming back to the draft report before us, this is L.266. We were at paragraph 30 which was approved with the change made in the Spanish version, as indicated by the distinguished colleague from Ecuador.

Paragraph 31. No remarks so it is approved.

Paragraph 32.

*Paragraph 32 approved.*

Paragraph 33. France has the floor.

**Mr. J. Y. TREBAOL** (France) (*interpretation from French*): I have a question Sir which is about both the English and French versions. I am not quite sure I understand “responsible” and

“international in the space arena”. It says “responsible and international character of the field of outer space” in paragraph 3. The problem is with the word “responsible”. Could we perhaps re-word this?

**The CHAIRMAN** (*interpretation from French*): We have taken note of the question. The Secretariat is verifying. It is checking that and we will come back to it.

So paragraph 33 is not approved for the time being. We will have to come back to it so that the Secretariat can find out where the wording came from on that and perhaps give us some background information.

Paragraph 34. No comments?

Paragraph 35. paragraph 35 indeed “the view was expressed”.

Paragraph 36.

*Paragraph 36 is approved.*

Paragraph 37. The Islamic Republic of Iran has the floor.

**Mr. M. N. ASL** (Islamic Republic of Iran): Thank you Mr. Chairman. Mr. Chairman, I do not have any problem with that section since it is the amalgamation of ideas around(?) the title of the Recommendations and Decisions which is not very \_\_\_\_\_(?) with decision but it is the traditional way which we give these issues that probably would not have any kind of observation with that.

Mr. Chairman, on that paragraph, paragraph 36, paragraph 37 sorry, the last line, the few two lines we do not have any problem but with the last line, in order to just give clarification, it has been taken from the statement which has been read out because I can see there is an odd concept there, as I am familiar with that, “development of disarmament(?) effective(?) mechanisms. Normally it should be the objectives of disarmament and non-proliferation. Normally, it is a phraseology I am not familiar with that. So I wanted to just get clarification. It has been taken(?) from these statements. It has been read out as in the verbatim records.

Thank you.

**The CHAIRMAN** (*interpretation from French*): Thank you to the representative of the Islamic Republic of Iran.

Now with regard to the question asked by the distinguished delegate of Iran, the Secretariat will check the terms used in the statement that was made on that item. In that way, we can be sure to correctly reflect what was actually said, what terms were used in the statement.

So we will not approve paragraph 37 for the time being. We will come back to it.

Paragraph 38 then. A question or comment? Mr. Kopal from the Czech Republic.

**Mr. V. KOPAL** (Czech Republic): Thank you Mr. Chairman. Mr. Chairman, this paragraph does not reflect the view of my delegation. However, I would like to draw your attention to the fact that it is too short and not quite understandable to me. “The view was expressed that the establishment of effective mechanisms, including legal(?) mechanisms”. What kind of mechanisms? What kind of legal provisions or other measures? It should be a little bit specified, otherwise it is a statement without any content.

**The CHAIRMAN** (*interpretation from French*): I think that the distinguished representative of the Czech Republic is correct here. It is a little mysterious and rather difficult to understand what has been conveyed here.

So once again, we will do the same thing. We will check the terms that we used and come back to this paragraph.

The Secretariat might appreciate it if you would be able to help us, perhaps propose wording that would be more understandable while correctly reflecting the view that was expressed by the delegation in question. Could you help us?

**Mr. V. KOPAL** (Czech Republic): My delegation was not the sponsor of this particular view and, therefore, it should be done by the authors of this idea.

Thank you very much.

**The CHAIRMAN** (*interpretation from French*): Thank you. The Secretariat will look at what was actually said.

So we will also come back to paragraph 38.

Paragraph 39. I do not think there is any problem with paragraph 39.

*It is approved.*

Paragraph 40. No comments?

*Approved.*

Paragraph 41. No comments?

Paragraph 42. No comments?

*It is approved.*

I give the floor to Mr. Hedman to come back to paragraph 33 and a couple of paragraphs that we were holding provisional.

So back to paragraph 33.

**Mr. N. HEDMAN** (Deputy Secretary, Office for Outer Space Affairs): My intention is now to come back to the three outstanding paragraphs of this section.

And the first paragraph, 33, and this is apparently an editorial matter because the text that the Secretariat sent down reads as follows.

“The view was expressed that in order to maintain the peaceful, responsible and international character of the space field, the Committee should promote greater transparency in the space activities being undertaken by various States.” So the character of the “space field” and not the “field of outer space”.

Would that be OK with delegations if we change it to “space field”?

OK, the second line is agreed “and international character of the space field”. OK?

**The CHAIRMAN** (*interpretation from French*): The question which had been put by the French delegation on this sentence was on the meaning of the word “responsible”. This refers to the responsibilities of the States which are involved in space activities. In any case, this sentence comes from one of the statements made by one of the delegations.

Paragraph 33 is thus adopted with this correction.

Paragraph 37. On paragraph 37, hereto this is a stand which was expressed by one of the delegations. The word used at the end of this paragraph is the word “effort”. We would replace “mechanisms” by the word

“effort” to clearly echo the stand of the delegation which made this comment.

Iran?

**Mr. M. N. ASL** (Islamic Republic of Iran): Thank you very much for the clarification but the word “development” is there? It is not changed because both words had been, at least for us, unfamiliar.

Thank you.

I hope that I am not making the life(?) very much more complex. We could drop the word “development” and everything is OK.

Thank you.

**The CHAIRMAN** (*interpretation from French*): I thank the distinguished delegate of Iran because this was exactly the suggestion which I was going to make on this paragraph. But as we want to be as close as possible to the positions voiced, this is perhaps what we should do.

Very well. The proposal, following consultations with the Secretariat and the outstanding suggestions made by our colleague from Iran would be to read the sentence as follows.

(*Continued in English*) “The view was expressed that the introduction of weapons into outer space would undermine the concept of the peaceful uses of outer space as well as the basis for and the very logic of disarmament and non-proliferation defaults(?).”

So we take out “development”.

(*Continued in French*): Any objections to such amendment to the sentence?

I see none.

Paragraph 37 is thus adopted.

We also heard a request for improvement in the drafting of paragraph 38. Mr. Hedman?

**Mr. N. HEDMAN** (Deputy Secretary, Office for Outer Space Affairs): Yes, thank you Mr. Chairman. Paragraph 38 is actually reflecting a statement that was made by a delegation so that is all I can say.

**The CHAIRMAN** (*interpretation from French*): We thus adopt paragraph 38 as it stands even

though it remains somewhat mysterious in nature and outlook.

*It is adopted.*

Let us now move on to L.266, Addendum 1.

The Director of the Office for Outer Space Affairs has just informed me that the Conference Room Paper on the item of the Brazilian proposal is now available. It is being distributed to you right now as we speak, CRP.18.

We continue consideration of the draft report. We turn to L.266, Addendum 1.

Chapter II, B.

The paragraph numbering starts at 1. We will consider them one-by-one.

Paragraph 1. I do not believe that there any problems with this.

*Adopted.*

Paragraph 2.

*Adopted.*

Paragraph 3. No comments?

*Adopted.*

Paragraph 4. No problems here either.

*Adopted.*

Paragraph 5. No comments?

*Adopted.*

Paragraph 6. No difficulties here either.

*Adopted.*

Paragraph 7.

*Paragraph 7 adopted.*

Paragraph 8. No problems either.

*Adopted.*

Paragraph 9. No difficulties here either.

*Adopted.*

Paragraph 10. No comments?

*Adopted.*

Paragraph 11. No difficulties here either.

*Adopted.*

Paragraph 12. No comments?

*Adopted.*

Paragraph 13. No comments?

*Adopted.*

Paragraph 14.

*Adopted.*

Paragraph 15.

*Adopted.*

Paragraph 16. Paragraph 16 refers to other paragraphs which have been considered this morning on the DMISCO proposal. So paragraph 16, I see no comments.

*Adopted.*

Paragraph 17. No comments?

*Adopted.*

Paragraph 18. No comments?

*Adopted.*

Paragraph 19. Where was I? 18, 19?  
Paragraph 19. No comments on 19.

*Adopted.*

Paragraph 20. No comments either.

*Adopted.*

Paragraph 21. No comments.

*Adopted.*

Paragraph 22. France on 22.

**Mr. J. Y TREBAOL** (France) (*interpretation from French*): I will return to paragraph 22 for there is something congruitous(?) between the French and English versions on paragraph 22. On 21, I apologize. We are currently considering it so if you can give us a few minutes to do this, we would like to return to it because there is differing information provided here in the two paragraphs.

**The CHAIRMAN** (*interpretation from French*): We will return to 21 in a few minutes.

Paragraph 22. No comments on paragraph 22.

*Adopted.*

Paragraph 23. No comments?

*Adopted.*

Paragraph 24. No comments.

*Adopted.*

Paragraph 25.

*Adopted.*

Paragraph 26. If there are no comments?

*Adopted.*

Paragraph 27. No comments?

*Adopted.*

Paragraph 28.

*Adopted.*

Paragraph 29. No comments either.

*Adopted.*

Paragraph 30.

*Adopted.*

We move on to (c) and (c) is Addendum 3. We will deal with it when we finish with the rest of Addendum 1.

(d), paragraph 31. No comments on 31?

*Adopted.*

Paragraph 32. I see no comments.

*Adopted.*

Paragraph 33.

*Adopted.*

Paragraph 34. The Secretariat will complete the list of States which made statements during the exchange of views which followed the presentation of the Legal Subcommittee.

With this clarification, 34 is adopted.

Paragraph 35. No comments?

*Adopted.*

Paragraph 36. No comments?

*Adopted.*

Paragraph 37. If there are no comments?

*Adopted.*

Paragraph 38. I see no comments.

*It is thus adopted.*

Paragraph 39. No comments either.

*Adopted.*

Paragraph 40. A request for the floor by the Islamic Republic of Iran.

**Mr. M. N. ASL** (Islamic Republic of Iran): Mr. Chairman, on that annex part of the Legal Subcommittee report, we made an intervention that to make it consistent with the thinking which we had about those advantages of adhering to the Liability Convention so I wanted to just make sure that it would be reflected in that part of the report, the annex part of the report or not.

Thank you.

**The CHAIRMAN** (*interpretation from French*): The Secretariat has informed that the issue raised by the distinguished representative of the Islamic Republic of Iran is taken into account in paragraph 49, on the next page.

We return to paragraph 40. If there are no other comments?

*It is adopted.*

Paragraph 41.

*Adopted.*

Paragraph 42. No comments?

*Adopted.*

Paragraph 43.

*Adopted.*

Paragraph 44. No comments.

*Adopted.*

Paragraph 45. No comments on 45.

*Adopted.*

Paragraph 46. No comments?

*Adopted.*

Paragraph 47. No comments?

*Adopted.*

Paragraph 48. No comments either.

*Adopted.*

Paragraph 49. Paragraph 49 is the one our colleague from Iran referred to. If there are no comments on 49?

*It is adopted.*

Paragraph 50. No comments?

*Adopted.*

Before we continue, we can return to paragraph 21 for just a second on which the French delegation had pointed out a possible discrepancy between the French and English versions.

**Ms. N. RODRIGUES** (Assistant Secretary, Office for Outer Space Affairs): Mr. Chairman, the French delegation is, in fact, correct, there is a discrepancy between the text in French and the

English. It was an edit that the Secretariat had sent quite late in the processing of the document and just not made it into the French version. We will align the French version to reflect the text as it appears in English currently.

Thank you.

**The CHAIRMAN** (*interpretation from French*): I thank you for this clarification. We thus return to adoption of the paragraphs. We were on Page 7 in the English version and we had reached 51, I believe.

No comments on 51?

*Adopted.*

Paragraph 52. No comments either.

Paragraph 53. No comments?

*Adopted.*

Paragraph 54. No comments?

*Adopted.*

Paragraph 55. No comments?

*Adopted.*

Paragraph 56. No comments?

*Adopted.*

Paragraph 57 now. No comments on 57.

*Adopted.*

Paragraph 58. No comments?

*Adopted.*

Paragraph 59. No comments.

*Adopted.*

Paragraph 60. No comments?

*Adopted.*

Paragraph 61. No comments?

*Adopted.*

Paragraph 62. No comments on 62.

*Adopted.*

Paragraph 63. No comments?

*Adopted.*

Paragraph 64. No comments?

*Adopted.*

Paragraph 65. No comments?

*Adopted.*

Paragraph 66. No comments either.

*Adopted.*

Paragraph 67.

*Paragraph 67 is adopted.*

Paragraph 68. No comments on 68.

*Adopted.*

Paragraph 69. No comments?

*Adopted.*

Paragraph 70.

*Adopted.*

Paragraph 71. No remarks for 71?

*Adopted.*

Paragraph 72. No comments?

*Adopted.*

Paragraph 73.

*Adopted. Approved.*

Paragraph 74. No comments?

*Approved.*

Paragraph 75. No comments?

*Approved.*

Paragraph 76. No comments?

*Approved.*

Paragraph 77. Any comments? None?

*Approved.*

Paragraph 78.

*Approved.*

Paragraph 79. No comments?

*Approved.*

Paragraph 80. No comments or questions?

*Paragraph 80 is approved.*

Paragraph 81. Any questions on paragraph 81? I see none.

*Approved.*

Paragraph 82. No comments on 82?

*Approved.*

Paragraph 83. No comments?

*Approved.*

Paragraph 84. No comments?

*Approved.*

Paragraph 85. No comments?

*The paragraph is approved.*

Paragraph 86.

*Approved.*

Paragraph 87. No comments?

*Approved.*

Paragraph 88. No comments.

*It is approved.*

Paragraph 89. No comments?

*Approved.*

Paragraph 90.

*Approved.*

Paragraph 91. Are there any comments?  
None?

*Approved.*

Paragraph 92. No comments?

*Approved.*

Paragraph 93. No comments on 93?

*Approved.*

Paragraph 94. No comments?

*Paragraph 94 is approved.*

Paragraph 95. No comments on 95?

*Paragraph 95 is approved.*

We can now move on to document L.266, Add.2. This is still Chapter II but now we are in Section F, Space and Society, and we will resume paragraph numbering from number one, paragraph 1, Add.2 of L.266.

Paragraph 1. No comments on paragraph 1.

*Approved.*

Paragraph 2. No comments?

*Approved.*

Paragraph 3. No comments on paragraph 3.

*Approved.*

Paragraph 4. The distinguished delegate of Italy has the floor.

**MR. A. GABRIELLI** (Italy): Thank you. In paragraph 4, item (f), the surname of the Italian delegate is not correct. It is Galoforo (Jaloforo?).

Thank you Mr. Chairman.

**The CHAIRMAN** (*interpretation from French*): I thank the distinguished delegate of Italy for that correction. In fact, that error was reflected in

several documents so we will have to correct throughout. I would ask if you would please convey our apologies and excuses to the person in question.

Now, paragraph 4 then can be approved, with that correction? No other comments?

Paragraph 5. No comments?

*Approved.*

Paragraph 6. No comments on paragraph 6?

*So it is approved.*

Paragraph 7. No comments?

*Approved.*

Paragraph 8. No comments?

*Approved.*

Paragraph 9. No comments?

*Approved.*

Paragraph 10. No comments? Yes, Thailand, the distinguished delegate of Thailand has the floor.

**Mr. K. LOUVIROJANAKUL** (Thailand): ... (*no microphone*) I am very sorry but a little bit back to paragraph 6, at the very last sentence, GISTA(?), stands for Geo-Informatics and Space but it is a technology development agency. Thank you.

**The CHAIRMAN** (*interpretation from French*): Thank you for that correction which will be introduced in the English version and the correction will be also made in other versions if necessary.

So with this correction, I think it can be approved and we can go back to paragraph 8, we had approved it.

Paragraph 9.

*Approved.*

Paragraph 10. No comments?

Paragraph 11. No comments?

*Approved.*

Paragraph 12. Any comments? No comments.

*Paragraph 12 is adopted.*

Paragraph 13 is approved.

Paragraph 14. No comments?

*Paragraph 14 is approved.*

Paragraph 15.

*It is approved as is.*

Paragraph 16. No comments on paragraph 16.

*It is approved.*

Paragraph 17. I give the floor to the colleague representing Brazil.

**Ms. C. L. RIBEIRO MOURA(?)** (Brazil): Go back to paragraph 9 and my colleague would like to make a technical observation in paragraph 9.

Thank you.

**Mr. C. E. DA CUNHA OLIVEIRA** (Brazil): Thank you Mr. Chairman. Mr. Chairman, in paragraph 9, we highlighted the achievements of the African Regional Centre for Space Science and Technology Education in the English language for Capacity-Building, for the Vocational Training in Space \_\_\_\_\_(?) Launch.

I would just like to see the clarification as regards why only the African Centre is singled out in this paragraph. And my proposal would be to highlight \_\_\_\_\_ of all Regional Centres as they all presume the same sort of activities of capacity-building in this way.

Thank you.

**The CHAIRMAN** (*interpretation from French*): Thank you to the distinguished colleague representing Brazil. We will verify that for you to see why it is just the Regional Centre for Africa in the English version that is singled out.

While we are waiting for an answer to the question put by the distinguished representative of Brazil, there are four Regional Centres for training and they are mentioned in part of the report that looks at space applications. Now we are in the part of the

report that addresses space and society and, more specifically, we are looking at the section on education. And I think that the African Regional Centre is mentioned here because, in the presentation, if I understood it correctly, he had provided specific information which are then reflected in this paragraph.

More specifically, the African Centre in the English version, they actually spoke at this item of the agenda, whereas the other people spoke under a different item of the agenda, Space Applications. That is why it is reflected here and not the other Regional Centres.

So we were at paragraph 17. Now the only thing we have to look at here is the numbering of the paragraphs.

*Paragraph 17 is approved.*

Paragraph 18. We have a request for the floor from India. Dr. Suresh, you have the floor.

**Mr. B. N. SURESH** (India): Thank you Mr. Chairman. I am sorry to come back. I think 17, the last, \_\_\_\_\_(?) to take the actions called for in paragraph 260 at that time. It is not very clear. It just hangs. Maybe you can make it a little more explicit.

**The CHAIRMAN** (*interpretation from French*): I give the floor to the Director of the Office for Outer Space Affairs.

**Mr. S. CAMACHO-LARA** (Director, Office for Outer Space Affairs): Thank you Mr. Chairman. That 260, instead of being a 260, it should be three dots only, paragraph number to be included at the correct type of number that it refers to and the paragraph that it refers to is the one that contains the work that was to be carried out at the end of the item this year, which is one of the paragraphs before that. It is either the second or third in the section on space education, paragraph 2. As these numbers will change when the report is integrated, right now it should have dot, dot, dot.

Thank you Mr. Chairman.

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

We were at Section G, Space and Water, and we were on paragraph 18 which was approved and now on paragraph 19.

Paragraph 19.

*Approved.*

Paragraph 20.

*Approved.*

Paragraph 21. No comments?

*Paragraph 21 approved.*

Paragraph 22. No comments on paragraph  
22?

*It is approved.*

Paragraph 23. No comments on paragraph  
23?

*It is approved.*

Paragraph 24. No comments on paragraph  
24?

*It is approved.*

Paragraph 25. No comments?

*Approved.*

Paragraph 26. No comments?

*Approved.*

Paragraph 27. I give the floor to the  
distinguished representative of India, Dr. Suresh.

**Mr. B. N. SURESH** (India): Thank you Mr. Chairman. We would like to add just after “adapting aimed at mapping”, it goes “west(?) lines, monitoring water(?) etc.”. We would like to add “monitoring of surface water bodies, \_\_\_\_\_(?), command areas, groundwater prospects, forecast of \_\_\_\_\_(?), glacier inventory”, then you continue. These are important areas which are coming under water. We can do the text separately.

**The CHAIRMAN** (*interpretation from French*): I thank you Dr. Suresh. So Dr. Suresh will supply these additional application areas that he would like to see in this paragraph to the Secretariat and no doubt the Secretariat will ensure that the changes are introduced into this and other language versions.

So with that additional information, paragraph 27 is approved.

Paragraph 28. No comments on 28?

*It is approved.*

Paragraph 29. No comments on 29?

*Approved.*

Paragraph 30. No comments?

*Approved.*

Paragraph 31. No comments?

*So it is approved.*

Paragraph 32. I see no request from the floor.

*It is approved.*

Paragraph 33. No comments?

*Approved.*

Paragraph 34. No comments?

*Approved.*

Paragraph 35, Section H. Paragraph 34, are there any comments? No comments?

*Approved.*

Paragraph 36. No comments?

*Approved.*

Paragraph 37.

*Paragraph 37 is approved.*

Next is Other Matters which comes under Addendum 4 and we will consider it under that. In the meantime, we can look at paragraph 38 which is about the schedule of work of the Committee and its subsidiary bodies. And I just want to reassure you that the Scientific and Technical Subcommittee is actually scheduled to meet in February not March. So you have to correct the text you have before you. So the Scientific and Technical Subcommittee will meet from 12 to 23 February 2007. The Legal Subcommittee from 26 March to 5 April, no mistake there, and the Committee from 6 to 15 June.

So delegations have, no doubt, noted the change for the Scientific and Technical Subcommittee which is in February not March.

So with those corrections, paragraph 38 can be approved, I think.

*Paragraph 38 is approved.*

We will now stop consideration of the report at this time. We will continue later with Addendums 3 and 4 this afternoon.

I would like to give the floor to Saudi Arabia who has an announcement or something to say.

**Mr. M. TARABZOUNI** (Saudi Arabia) (*interpretation from Arabic*): Thank you Mr. Chairman. We looked at space technology applications yesterday under Space and Water and that coincided with an announcement by the Prince Halab(?) Abdullah Aziz, Sultan at the headquarters of UNESCO in Paris and he made a statement in which the Prince indicated that the problem of water resources is a vital problem in the modern world. He also demonstrated the Prince's interests, Sultan Abdullah Aziz, his interest in the Prince Sultan Abdullah Aziz, with regard to water and the importance of water. He also underscored the shortage of water resources which affects our planet. He is convinced that researchers can make a significant contribution and scientists can make a significant contribution as can people who are creative, who are innovative, innovative minds. And he is further convinced of the role that can be played by technology in this area.

This is why the Prince Sultan is pleading for the world to look at the issue of water resources and the Sultan Prince is awarding a prize, an award for four people to receive. So these are a total of five grants, four of which awards account for US\$138,000. So a total of US\$138,000 will be earmarked for each specific grant.

As to the fifth grant or award, that will be twice the amount or US\$270,000. These awards or grants will be earmarked for scientific innovation or creativity in science. This award takes into account contributions of scientists and all researchers regardless of whence they come, regardless of the country of origin, so that, of course, covers all countries in the world. And it is not reserved exclusively for citizens from Saudi Arabia or any specific country for that matter. This award is to be granted every two years. It was established in 2002. The Chairman, specifies the speaker, 2002. And when winning this award, the

person who receives the grant, when they have received it the first time were two United States researchers. They were the first two to receive awards in the first round. There were also two Egyptian researchers. And as to the fifth award, that was granted to the City of Sciences of King Abdul Aziz(?). This is the Science Research Centre.

And for all these reasons, I invite States, I invite all States to send information about the research under way in their countries in the area of water resource management so that their candidates may compete and possibly be awarded the Sultan Prince's award from Saudi Arabia for water research.

Thank you very much Mr. Chairman.

**The CHAIRMAN** (*interpretation from French*): I thank the representative of Saudi Arabia for that information about this initiative and, of course, I would like to take this opportunity to congratulate the Science and Technology, the City of King Abdul Aziz. I have actually been there on a number of occasions and I have seen the Remote Sensing Centre at the City for Science and Technology of King Abdul Aziz and I would like to congratulate you once again on this initiative.

I would propose that we adjourn at this time and we would resume with the consideration of the draft report this afternoon, given the time it takes to produce the documents that we are still mixing, I think, at 4.00 p.m. I think it might be better for us to resume at 3.30 p.m. and if we continue at the pace that we have kept up this morning, we might be free a bit earlier in the afternoon. Of course, I am not going to mention specifically why we need to be free but I am sure you all know.

Thank you.

The meeting is adjourned.

*The meeting adjourned at 13.20 p.m.*