



---

**Committee on the Peaceful  
Uses of Outer Space****Historical summary on the consideration of the question on  
the definition and delimitation of outer space****Report of the Secretariat****Addendum****I. Introduction**

1. At the fortieth session of the Legal Subcommittee of the Committee on the Peaceful Uses of Outer Space, in 2001, the Working Group on the agenda item “Matters relating to the definition and delimitation of outer space” agreed that the Secretariat should prepare, for submission to the Subcommittee at its forty-first session, a brief historical summary on the consideration of the question on the definition and delimitation of outer space in the Legal Subcommittee, indicating points of consensus, if any, that might have emerged over the years ([A/AC.105/763](#) and [A/AC.105/763/Corr.1](#), annex I, para. 11).
2. In response to that request, the Secretariat prepared a document entitled “Historical summary on the consideration of the question on the definition and delimitation of outer space” ([A/AC.105/769](#) and [A/AC.105/769/Corr.1](#)), which was made available to the Subcommittee and the Working Group at the forty-first session of the Subcommittee, in 2002.
3. At the fifty-eighth session of the Subcommittee, in 2019, the Working Group requested the Secretariat to update the historical summary to take account of the work done by the Subcommittee and the Working Group between 2002 and 2019 ([A/AC.105/1203](#), annex II, para. 9 (a) (i)).
4. The present summary, prepared by the Secretariat in response to that request, synthesizes the views expressed by States members of the Committee at the meetings of the Subcommittee and the Working Group in the period from 2002 to 2019. It also contains a list of documents that were before the Subcommittee and the Working Group in that period.



## II. Historical summary

### A. Views expressed by States members of the Committee

5. Some delegations expressed their support for the definition and delimitation of outer space and believed that the definition and delimitation of outer space would:

(a) Help to establish a single legal regime regulating the movement of an aerospace object and to bring about legal clarity in the implementation of space law and air law, as well as clarify the issues of the sovereignty and international responsibility of States and the boundary between airspace and outer space;

(b) Assist in addressing problems raised by scientific and technological progress, the commercialization of outer space, the participation of the private sector, emerging legal questions and the increasing use of outer space;

(c) Reduce the possibility of disputes arising between States;

(d) Provide for a clear understanding of the legal principles involved in the definition of space vehicles and in the further development of rules governing the responsibility and liability for aerospace systems;

(e) Assist in establishing a number of important definitions in national laws on space activities;

(f) Be important in determining the scope of application of air law and space law; certainty in the application of space law would encourage Member States to accede to the United Nations treaties on outer space;

(g) Be important for economic considerations of States;

(h) Raise the issue of finding a balance between the safety of States with regard to the use of space objects and the principle of freedom of exploration and use of outer space;

(i) Assist in eliminating the potential risk that the issue of the definition and delimitation of outer space might be dealt with by other international bodies for their own purposes, thus prejudicing a legal solution;

(j) Ensure the effective implementation of the principle of freedom of use of outer space for peaceful purposes;

(k) Create certainty in the sovereignty of States over their airspace and also enable the effective application of the principles of the freedom of use of outer space and of non-appropriation of outer space;

(l) Strengthen security and confidence in outer space activities;

(m) Effectively address the issue of the liability of States and other entities engaging in space activities, which has become particularly topical in the light of the current intensification and diversification of space activities;

(o) Become a prerequisite for the establishment of an effective safety regime for outer space activities;

(p) Allow the Committee and the Subcommittee to concentrate on developing and improving legal instruments that applied to activities that were not restricted to one single realm of space and create the legal certainty that was needed to provide commercial operators with the necessary assurances to carry out their activities;

(q) Help to define precisely whether an object was a space object, in view of technological progress and the development of vehicles for use in space tourism and commercial suborbital flights;

(r) Make it possible to demarcate clearly the sphere of influence of States and private actors, in view of the rapid growth of the commercial space sector;

(s) Make it possible to define in clear terms the spatial scope of application of international treaties concerning activities in airspace and outer space, which would prevent future claims by States to outer space or any part thereof;

(t) Be beneficial to States and valuable in safeguarding the proper governance of space activities at the international, regional and national levels;

(u) Enable the effective application of the fundamental principles of the United Nations treaties on outer space;

(v) Assist in providing clarity and certainty and reduce inconsistencies in the practice of States pertaining to activities conducted in airspace and outer space, including suborbital flights for scientific missions or human transportation;

(w) Facilitate compliance with and responses to matters related to the sovereignty and liability of States;

(x) Assist in defining an area of applicable law and consistently enforcing laws, rules and regulations;

(y) Provide greater clarity, not only to States, but also to other space actors, in such matters as the positioning of satellites and suborbital flights carried out for scientific or touristic purposes, as well as in relation to the responsibilities and sovereignty of States and other space actors;

(z) In the absence of the delimitation of outer space, a process might be initiated in national laws of States, as well as through bilateral agreements between States, aimed at the possible definition and delimitation of outer space. This might lead to the establishment of the delimitation of outer space by States according to their own judgment and in an uncoordinated manner.

6. Some delegations believed that the definition and delimitation of outer space was not necessary because:

(a) The current framework had presented no practical difficulties and had served everyone well, and activities in outer space were flourishing. Therefore, this framework should continue to be used until there was a demonstrated need and a practical basis for developing such a definition or delimitation;

(b) Any attempt to define or delimit outer space would be an unnecessary theoretical exercise that could unintentionally complicate existing activities. Moreover, the result might not be adaptable to continuing technological developments;

(c) The absence of such a definition had not resulted in any legal or practical problems;

(d) The differing legal regimes applicable in respect of airspace and outer space operated well in their respective spheres and the lack of a definition and delimitation of outer space had not impeded the development of activities in either sphere;

(e) It was not warranted, given the current level of the development of space technologies;

(f) The delimitation of outer space had already been defined from the perspective of natural sciences and could lead to unnecessary limitations on the regulation of space activities;

(g) The lack of a definition and delimitation of outer space had not hindered space exploration or discouraged States from becoming parties to the United Nations treaties on outer space;

(h) No legal arguments against the need to define and delimit outer space had been put forward in the Subcommittee;

(i) It was not needed for any practical purposes and it would be more useful to determine the scope of application of international space law by analysing the purpose of space missions;

(j) No evidence to suggest that the lack of a definition or delimitation of outer space had hindered or restricted the growth of aviation or outer space exploration and no specific cases of a practical nature had been reported to the Subcommittee that could confirm that the lack of a definition of airspace or outer space had compromised aviation safety;

(k) By defining outer space, the Working Group on the Definition and Delimitation of Outer Space would also define airspace, even if indirectly. This would raise the question whether the Working Group had been mandated to do so and would also raise practical questions, such as questions about the instruments that would be needed to implement the new definitions and how those instruments would be enforced;

(l) The establishment of the definition and delimitation of outer space in national laws did not warrant it in international space law or provide any evidence of the existence of an international standard;

(m) No problems existed that warranted the definition and delimitation of outer space. The absence of the definition and delimitation of outer space was not an oversight, but rather a choice that had been made by lawmakers who had dealt with the creation of current international space law. Furthermore, the definition and delimitation of outer space would reduce flexibility in the regulation of space activities and would be a potentially counterproductive move.

7. During consideration of matters relating to the definition and delimitation of outer space, some delegations made the following practical proposals and remarks on the subject:

(a) Current and foreseeable civil aviation operations would not exceed altitudes of 100–130 km, where there was a potential danger of collision with numerous spacecraft. In this connection, the boundary between airspace and outer space could be established in that range;

(b) The existing practice of operating spacecraft and satellites in orbit at a minimum perigee altitude of 100 to 150 km seemed to be acceptable to all States, and the divergent interests of States with regard to the definition and delimitation of outer space could be satisfied by the agreement to regulate the minimum orbital flight level between 100 and 150 km, while recognizing that operations at less than that flight level should be subject to agreements among States whose space objects overfly the territory of other States;

(c) The delimitation of outer space could be established at an altitude of 100–110 km above mean sea level so that space objects might enjoy the right of innocent passage through foreign airspace during launching and return to the Earth;

(d) The rationale for the delimitation of outer space and airspace at between 100 and 110 km above sea level was based on comprehensive considerations, including scientific, technical and physical characteristics, namely, the atmospheric layers, aircraft altitude capacity, the perigee of the spacecraft and the Karman line;

(e) An altitude of 110 km above sea level might be considered as the delimitation of outer space;

(f) Zero gravity above a certain altitude over the Earth could not be used as an argument for the establishment of a border, as that condition could also be created under certain circumstances in the Earth's atmosphere;

(g) The physically intangible and imprecise environment of outer space made it difficult to practically define its geographical limits;

(h) In certain cases, an altitude-based criterion for delimitation could be considered, as it would provide for an objective element in order for an activity to qualify as a space activity. That could be the case, for instance, for sounding rockets that were not designed to place a payload in orbit but might nevertheless reach considerable altitude;

(i) The definition and delimitation of outer space should be based not on the criterion of altitude or the place of an object but rather on a functional approach, as space law would apply to any activity aimed at putting a space object into Earth orbit or beyond in outer space. The functional approach was fully consistent with the Convention on Registration of Objects Launched into Outer Space, the Treaty on Principles Governing the Activities of States in the Exploration and Use of Outer Space, including the Moon and Other Celestial Bodies, and the Convention on International Liability for Damage Caused by Space Objects, as their provisions did not include the criterion of altitude. Altitude should not be a determining criterion for determining whether an activity was an outer space activity; rather, that should be determined a priori according to the function of the space object and the purpose of the activity. Therefore, it would be appropriate that the legal framework applied to suborbital flights be determined not by the criterion of altitude but according to the characteristics of the activity and the legal issues arising from it;

(j) It was important to be aware that some experts promoted the establishment of a special area or stratum between outer space and airspace in the interest of creating a separate legal regime for suborbital flights which would exclude the application of international space law to nuclear weapons and weapons of mass destruction, and that therefore such attempts and proposals should be vigorously opposed and rejected;

(k) A functional approach should be taken in relation to the exploration and use of outer space;

(l) The application of a functional approach would have a negative impact on the sovereignty of States over their national airspace;

(m) It would be preferable to focus on the function and purpose of an object rather than on its location in order to determine if and when space law would govern its activities;

(n) In considering matters relating to aerospace objects, a significant issue was the question of whether Member States wanted to preserve the principle of absolute sovereignty over their national airspace as a peremptory norm of international law;

(o) The definition and delimitation of outer space to be made by States in the future should not prejudice national security and the sovereignty of States and regulations regarding the definition and delimitation of space should also take into account regulations regarding airspace and should be based on the protection of nations' sovereignty and the promotion of the exploration and use of space for peaceful purposes;

(p) A mixed approach, based on combining functional and conceptual approaches to the delimitation of outer space, should be employed in order to achieve further progress on the matter;

(q) For the effective solution of matters relating to the definition and delimitation of outer space, it was essential to establish forward-looking laws based on a compromise between spatial and functional approaches;

(r) Neither spatial nor functional approaches could any longer be regarded as viable solutions to the problem, and the issue thus had to be approached from another angle, perhaps by combining both spatial and functional methods, or by some other means;

(s) The main problem in the elaboration of the term "outer space" was in the establishment of a certain conditional border, which would define those legal regimes that would be applicable to the areas around it. In that connection, neither of the

existing approaches, whether spatial or functional, would be able to resolve, on its own and in full, the regulation of existing and prospective models of flights in relation to: (i) the principle of indivisibility and non-appropriation of outer space; and (ii) the protection of national interests and the sovereignty of States;

(t) A single regime for the navigation of space objects is necessary;

(u) It would be important to consider the possibility of establishing a special regime that would contemplate passage rights through national airspace for space activities as long as they were deemed to be peaceful, in conformity with international law and respectful of the sovereign interests of the territorial State or States concerned;

(v) The definition and delimitation of outer space is a problem of defining the scope of validity and application of air law and space law and this legal problem should be resolved by giving consideration to various criteria, in particular to the definition of a stable orbit of a space object;

(w) When the distinction between aircraft and spacecraft was less certain, owing to the unique function and operation of an object, the Subcommittee could address regime mechanisms that might or might not be necessary to ensure the safe and secure transition between the respective legal domains governing airspace and outer space;

(x) Before the definition and delimitation of outer space could be developed, it would be necessary to analyse the technical aspects of air and outer space transport systems and the means of delivery of objects into outer space, prospects for the development of aerospace objects capable of missions in air and outer space, and data on the use of the only existing prototype of such an aerospace object, namely, the space shuttle;

(y) The elaboration of a set of principles or guidelines for the launching and operation of aerospace objects could contribute to meeting the present requirements of clarity and legal security in that field;

(z) Many provisions of the United Nations treaties on outer space addressed the situation where space activities were carried out in national or international airspace and, although the exercise by States of their sovereignty over their national airspace could not hinder the freedom of exploration and use of outer space, the wording of the second paragraph of article I of the Treaty on Principles Governing the Activities of States in the Exploration and Use of Outer Space, including the Moon and Other Celestial Bodies, could imply that access to outer space, despite being a necessary condition for exploring and using it, would not benefit from the same degree of freedom;

(aa) Alternative approaches should be taken to the elaboration of the subject matter, such as an examination of the terms "space object" and "space activities" or consideration of issues of liability for space activities;

(bb) The delimitation of outer space was closely connected to the management of space activities, and the Subcommittee and its Working Group could first concentrate on relevant matters that needed practical solutions, such as suborbital flights or launches from flying objects;

(cc) In the absence of the definition and delimitation of outer space, a common approach could be followed according to which confirmation of the launch of an object into outer space and the period of time during which it remained there would serve to define space activity;

(dd) When considering matters relating to the definition and delimitation of outer space, States should take into account recent and future technological developments, and the Scientific and Technical Subcommittee should also consider this subject;

(ee) The Working Group and the Subcommittee should endeavour to foresee hazardous circumstances arising from aerospace activities and legislate for them, as well as attempt to develop norms, bearing in mind various scenarios relating to the development of space technology and activities;

(ff) The constant evolution of technology gave rise to concrete case studies relevant to the long-standing debate on the definition and delimitation of outer space, and as science advanced, the law should follow. In that connection, the Subcommittee and the Working Group should devote particular attention to novel scientific developments, in particular those that increasingly intertwined aeronautic and astronautic activities;

(gg) It would be useful to examine the practical experience accumulated by States relating to the use of airspace and outer space and the activities of international organizations relating to the definition and delimitation of outer space;

(hh) The absence of consensus among member States on the matter of the delimitation of outer space was due to the absence of sufficient practice of States in the exploration and use of outer space, which would justify that exercise;

(ii) Matters relating to the definition and delimitation of outer space could be resolved within the context of the possible development of a universal comprehensive convention governing the activities of States in the exploration and use of outer space;

(jj) In order to resolve the problems relating to the definition and delimitation of outer space, a multilateral legal solution should be applied, which should be the result of an open and inclusive consultation mechanism among States to address the key issues, including an international framework for the registration, authorization and licensing of passage rights for commercial space activities during launch into and re-entry from orbit, keeping in mind that such activities raised legal questions relating to national security, State sovereignty, the safety of the local population and the protection of the environment;

(kk) The Subcommittee should cooperate with the International Telecommunications Union and the International Civil Aviation Organization to define special zones in airspace that could be used by aerospace objects capable of maneuvering in air and outer space for that part of their mission which passed through airspace;

(ll) Continuing the discussion of the delimitation and definition under the present methodology might not lead to concrete solutions and it would thus be preferable to consider, for example, other matters linked to the possible definition and delimitation of outer space;

(mm) Given the absence of consensus on the definition and delimitation of outer space, the Working Group could summarize the views and concepts that had emerged during its work over the years and present them as a report to the Subcommittee, with a view to the possible suspension of the Group's work until new developments in the exploration and use of outer space would justify the need for its definition and delimitation;

(nn) States clearly held divergent views not only on the need to define and delimit outer space, but also on what constituted the best way to do so;

(oo) The continuing practice of States in the exploration and use of outer space could lead to the creation in the future of a customary rule that could assist States in delimiting outer space;

(pp) The definition and delimitation of outer space should not lead to the revision or amendment of the United Nations treaties on outer space, which provided a solid and effective basis for the regulation of space activities;

(qq) The issue of the definition and delimitation of outer space required further careful analysis and the advantages of defining and delimiting outer space should first

be clearly defined, in order to ensure that such actions did not hamper technical progress in outer space;

(rr) The discussion on the definition and delimitation of outer space had not only a legal but also a political character;

(ss) A final decision on the matter of the definition and delimitation of outer space would be taken on a basis that would suit the interests of all States and the decision would not necessarily be similar to the current positions taken by States.

## **B. Documents prepared on the basis of submissions received from Member States of the United Nations and permanent observers of the Committee**

8. The following documents, prepared by the Secretariat on the basis of submissions made by States Members of the United Nations and permanent observers of the Committee, were before the Subcommittee and the Working Group during the sessions held from 2002 to 2019:

### **Forty-first session of the Legal Subcommittee (Vienna, 2–12 April 2002)**

Note by the Secretariat entitled “Questionnaire on possible legal issues with regard to aerospace objects: replies from member States” ([A/AC.105/635/Add.6](#))

Report of the Secretariat entitled “Historical summary on the consideration of the question on the definition and delimitation of outer space” ([A/AC.105/769](#) and [Corr.1](#))

Conference room paper entitled “Some differences between legal regimes of airspace and outer space”, prepared by the delegation of the Russian Federation ([A/AC.105/C.2/2002/CRP.10](#))

### **Forty-second session of the Legal Subcommittee (24 March–4 April 2003)**

Note by the Secretariat entitled “Questionnaire on possible legal issues with regard to aerospace objects: replies from member States” ([A/AC.105/635/Add.7](#) and [Corr.1](#) and [Add.8](#) and [9](#))

### **Forty-third session of the Legal Subcommittee (Vienna, 29 March–8 April 2004)**

Note by the Secretariat entitled “Questionnaire on possible legal issues with regard to aerospace objects: replies from Member States” ([A/AC.105/635/Add.10](#))

Note by the Secretariat entitled “Analytical summary of the replies to the questionnaire on possible legal issues with regard to aerospace objects” ([A/AC.105/C.2/L.249](#) and [Corr.1](#))

### **Forty-fourth session of the Legal Subcommittee (Vienna, 4–15 April 2005)**

Note by the Secretariat entitled “Questionnaire on possible legal issues with regard to aerospace objects: replies from member States” ([A/AC.105/635/Add.11](#) and [Corr.1](#) and [Add.12](#))

Note by the Secretariat entitled “Analytical summary of the replies to the questionnaire on possible legal issues with regard to aerospace objects” ([A/AC.105/C.2/L.249/Add.1](#))

Note by the Secretariat entitled “Analytical summary of the replies to the questionnaire on possible legal issues with regard to aerospace objects: preferences of member States” ([A/AC.105/849](#))



**Forty-fifth session of the Legal Subcommittee (Vienna, 3–13 April 2006)**

Note by the Secretariat entitled “Questionnaire on possible legal issues with regard to aerospace objects: replies from Member States” ([A/AC.105/635/Add.13](#))

Note by the Secretariat entitled “National legislation and practice relating to definition and delimitation of outer space” ([A/AC.105/865/Add.1](#))

Conference room paper entitled “Contribution of Belgium to the work of the Working Group on agenda item 8 (a), entitled ‘Matters relating to the definition and delimitation of outer space’” ([A/AC.105/C.2/2006/CRP.8](#))

**Forty-sixth session of the Legal Subcommittee (Vienna, 26 March–5 April 2007)**

Note by the Secretariat entitled “Questionnaire on possible legal issues with regard to aerospace objects: replies from member States” ([A/AC.105/635/Add.14](#) and [15](#))

Note by the Secretariat entitled “Analytical summary of the replies to the questionnaire on possible legal issues with regard to aerospace objects” ([A/AC.105/C.2/L.249/Add.2](#))

Note by the Secretariat entitled “National legislation and practice relating to definition and delimitation of outer space” ([A/AC.105/865/Add.2](#))

Note by the Secretariat entitled “Proposals of Member States concerning criteria for analysing the replies to the questionnaire on aerospace objects” ([A/AC.105/C.2/L.267](#))

Note by the Secretariat entitled “Questions on the definition and delimitation of outer space: replies from Member States” ([A/AC.105/889](#))

**Forty-seventh session of the Legal Subcommittee (Vienna, 31 March–11 April 2008)**

Note by the Secretariat entitled “Questionnaire on possible legal issues with regard to aerospace objects: replies from member States” ([A/AC.105/635/Add.16](#))

Note by the Secretariat entitled “National legislation and practice relating to definition and delimitation of outer space” ([A/AC.105/865/Add.3](#))

Note by the Secretariat entitled “Questions on the definition and delimitation of outer space: replies from Member States” ([A/AC.105/889/Add.1](#))

Conference room paper entitled “Questionnaire on possible legal issues with regard to aerospace objects: reply from Azerbaijan” ([A/AC.105/C.2/2008/CRP.4](#))

Conference room paper entitled “Questions on the definition and delimitation of outer space: reply from Azerbaijan” ([A/AC.105/C.2/2008/CRP.5](#))

Conference room paper entitled “Questions on the definition and delimitation of outer space: reply from Brazil” ([A/AC.105/C.2/2008/CRP.10](#))

**Forty-eighth session of the Legal Subcommittee (Vienna, 23 March–3 April 2009)**

Note by the Secretariat entitled “Questionnaire on possible legal issues with regard to aerospace objects: replies from Member States” ([A/AC.105/635/Add.17](#))

Note by the Secretariat entitled “National legislation and practice relating to the definition and delimitation of outer space” ([A/AC.105/865/Add.4](#))

Note by the Secretariat entitled “Questions on the definition and delimitation of outer space: replies from Member States” ([A/AC.105/889/Add.2](#) and [3](#))

Conference room paper entitled “Questions on the definition and delimitation of outer space”, containing replies from Qatar and Saudi Arabia ([A/AC.105/C.2/2009/CRP.11](#))

Conference room paper entitled “National legislation and practice relating to definition and delimitation of outer space: reply from Mexico” (A/AC.105/C.2/2009/CRP.15)

**Forty-ninth session of the Legal Subcommittee (Vienna, 22 March–1 April 2010)**

Note by the Secretariat entitled “National legislation and practice relating to the definition and delimitation of outer space” (A/AC.105/865 and Add.6 and 7)

Note by the Secretariat entitled “Questions on the definition and delimitation of outer space: replies from Member States” (A/AC.105/889/Add.5 and 6)

Conference room paper entitled “Concept of suborbital flights: information from the International Civil Aviation Organization” (A/AC.105/C.2/2010/CRP.9)

Conference room paper entitled “Matters relating to the definition and delimitation of outer space: reply of the Netherlands” (A/AC.105/C.2/2010/CRP.10)

Conference room paper entitled “Matters relating to the definition and delimitation of outer space: reply of Tunisia” (A/AC.105/C.2/2010/CRP.13)

**Fiftieth session of the Legal Subcommittee (Vienna, 28 March–8 April 2011)**

Note by the Secretariat entitled “National legislation and practice relating to the definition and delimitation of outer space” (A/AC.105/865 and Add.8–10)

Note by the Secretariat entitled “Questions on the definition and delimitation of outer space: replies from Member States” (A/AC.105/889/Add.7–9)

Conference room paper entitled “Questions on the definition and delimitation of outer space: replies from Member States”, containing the replies of Austria and El Salvador (A/AC.105/C.2/2011/CRP.10)

**Fifty-first session of the Legal Subcommittee (Vienna, 19–30 March 2012)**

Note by the Secretariat entitled “National legislation and practice relating to the definition and delimitation of outer space” (A/AC.105/865 and Add.11)

Note by the Secretariat entitled “Questions on the definition and delimitation of outer space: replies from Member States” (A/AC.105/889/Add.10)

**Fifty-second session of the Legal Subcommittee (Vienna, 8–19 April 2013)**

Note by the Secretariat entitled “National legislation and practice relating to the definition and delimitation of outer space” (A/AC.105/865/Add.12 and 13)

Note by the Secretariat entitled “Questions on the definition and delimitation of outer space: replies from Member States” (A/AC.105/889/Add.11 and 12)

Note by the Secretariat entitled “Questions on suborbital flights for scientific missions and/or for human transportation” (A/AC.105/1039 and Add.1)

Conference room paper entitled “Summary of information on national practices and legislation of States with regard to the definition and delimitation of outer space” (A/AC.105/C.2/2013/CRP.8)

Conference room paper entitled “Questions on the definition and delimitation of outer space: reply of Pakistan” (A/AC.105/C.2/2013/CRP.16)

**Fifty-third session of the Legal Subcommittee (Vienna, 24 March–4 April 2014)**

Note by the Secretariat on national legislation and practice relating to the definition and delimitation of outer space (A/AC.105/865/Add.14 and 15)

Note by the Secretariat on questions on the definition and delimitation of outer space: replies from Member States (A/AC.105/889/Add.13 and 14)

Note by the Secretariat on questions on suborbital flights for scientific missions and/or for human transportation ([A/AC.105/1039/Add.2](#) and [3](#))

Conference room papers on matters relating to the definition and delimitation of outer space: replies of the Russian Federation ([A/AC.105/C.2/2014/CRP.6](#)) and Uruguay ([A/AC.105/C.2/2014/CRP.13](#))

Conference room paper on the contribution of Turkey to the fifty-third session of the Legal Subcommittee ([A/AC.105/C.2/2014/CRP.26](#))

Conference room paper containing a summary of information on national practices and legislation of States with regard to the definition and delimitation of outer space ([A/AC.105/C.2/2014/CRP.27](#))

#### **Fifty-fourth session of the Legal Subcommittee (Vienna, 13–24 April 2015)**

Note by the Secretariat on questions on the definition and delimitation of outer space: replies from Member States ([A/AC.105/889/Add.15](#) and [16](#))

Note by the Secretariat on questions on suborbital flights for scientific missions and/or for human transportation ([A/AC.105/1039/Add.4](#) and [5](#))

#### **Fifty-fifth session of the Legal Subcommittee (Vienna, 4–15 April 2016)**

Note by the Secretariat on national legislation and practice relating to the definition and delimitation of outer space ([A/AC.105/865/Add.16](#) and [17](#))

Note by the Secretariat on questions on suborbital flights for scientific missions and/or for human transportation ([A/AC.105/1039/Add.6](#))

Note by the Secretariat entitled “Definition and delimitation of outer space: views of States members and permanent observers of the Committee” ([A/AC.105/1112](#) and [Add.1](#))

Conference room paper entitled “Replies from the Chair of the Space Law Committee of the International Law Association to the Committee on the Peaceful Uses of Outer Space on certain legal aspects of suborbital flights” ([A/AC.105/C.2/2016/CRP.10](#))

#### **Fifty-sixth session of the Legal Subcommittee (Vienna, 27 March–7 April 2017)**

Note by the Secretariat on national legislation and practice relating to the definition and delimitation of outer space ([A/AC.105/865/Add.18](#) and [19](#))

Note by the Secretariat on questions on suborbital flights for scientific missions and/or for human transportation ([A/AC.105/1039/Add.7-9](#))

Note by the Secretariat entitled “Definition and delimitation of outer space: views of States members and permanent observers of the Committee” ([A/AC.105/1112/Add.2](#) and [3](#))

Conference room paper entitled “Matters relating to the definition and delimitation of outer space: replies of Bolivia (Plurinational State of)” ([A/AC.105/C.2/2017/CRP.9](#))

Conference room paper entitled “Matters relating to the definition and delimitation of outer space: replies of Greece” ([A/AC.105/C.2/2017/CRP.16](#))

Conference room paper entitled “Matters relating to the definition and delimitation of outer space: replies of the Ibero-American Institute of Aeronautic and Space Law and Commercial Aviation” ([A/AC.105/C.2/2017/CRP.23](#))

Conference room paper entitled “Matters relating to the definition and delimitation of outer space: replies of Pakistan” ([A/AC.105/C.2/2017/CRP.24](#))

#### **Fifty-seventh session of the Legal Subcommittee (Vienna, 9–20 April 2018)**

Note by the Secretariat on national legislation and practice relating to the definition and delimitation of outer space ([A/AC.105/865/Add.20](#) and [21](#))

Note by the Secretariat on questions on suborbital flights for scientific missions and/or for human transportation ([A/AC.105/1039/Add.10](#) and [11](#))

Note by the Secretariat entitled “Definition and delimitation of outer space: views of States members and permanent observers of the Committee” ([A/AC.105/1112/Add.4](#) and [5](#))

Working paper prepared by the Chair of the Working Group on the Definition and Delimitation of Outer Space entitled “Promoting the discussion of the matters relating to the definition and delimitation of outer space with a view to elaborating a common position of States members of the Committee on the Peaceful Uses of Outer Space” ([A/AC.105/C.2/L.302](#))

Working paper submitted by the Russian Federation entitled “The challenging context of considering all aspects of the delimitation of airspace and outer space: arguments for adding dialectical elements to, and setting new analytical trends in, discussion of the issue” ([A/AC.105/C.2/L.306](#))

Conference room paper entitled “Suborbital flights and the delimitation of airspace vis-à-vis outer space: functionalism, spatialism and State sovereignty”, submitted by the Space Safety Law and Regulation Committee of the International Association for the Advancement of Space Safety (IAASS) ([A/AC.105/C.2/2018/CRP.9](#))

#### **Fifty-eighth session of the Legal Subcommittee (Vienna, 1–12 April 2019)**

Note by the Secretariat on national legislation and practice relating to the definition and delimitation of outer space ([A/AC.105/865/Add.22](#))

Note by the Secretariat on questions on suborbital flights for scientific missions and/or for human transportation ([A/AC.105/1039/Add.12](#))

Note by the Secretariat entitled “Definition and delimitation of outer space: views of States members and permanent observers of the Committee” ([A/AC.105/1112/Add.6](#))

Conference room paper entitled “Matters relating to the definition and delimitation of outer space: replies of the United Arab Emirates” ([A/AC.105/C.2/2019/CRP.5](#))

Conference room paper entitled “Matters relating to the definition and delimitation of outer space: replies of Greece” ([A/AC.105/C.2/2019/CRP.6](#))

Conference room paper entitled “Matters relating to the definition and delimitation of outer space: replies of Tunisia” ([A/AC.105/C.2/2019/CRP.7](#))

9. The above-referenced documents, as well as other historical documents of the Subcommittee and its Working Group under the item on matters relating to the definition and delimitation of outer space, are available at [www.unoosa.org/oosa/en/ourwork/copuos/lsc/ddos/index.html](http://www.unoosa.org/oosa/en/ourwork/copuos/lsc/ddos/index.html).

### **C. Statistics on replies received from States Members of the United Nations and permanent observers of the Committee during the period from 2002 to 2020**

10. The present section sets out the statistics on replies received, as at 31 January 2020, from the States Members of the United Nations and permanent observers of the Committee to the requests made by the Subcommittee and its Working Group and accommodated by the Secretariat in the documents prepared for the consideration of the Subcommittee and the Working Group. Replies received by the Secretariat after the established deadlines and thus published in conference room papers were not counted:

**“National legislation and practice relating to definition and delimitation of outer space”**

([A/AC.105/865](#) and Add.1–24)

From 2006 to the present

Replies received from 34 States

Albania (2020), Algeria (2012, 2013), Australia (2006, 2012, 2013), Austria (2017), Belarus (2009), Belgium (2013), Colombia (2013), Czechia (2007, 2008, 2009, 2010, 2018), Denmark (2011), France (2012), Germany (2006), Kazakhstan (2013), Jordan (2011, 2013), Mexico (2009, 2016, 2018), Mongolia (2009), Morocco (2006), Netherlands (2010), Norway (2010), Pakistan (2019), Peru (2020), Poland (2016), Republic of Korea (2007), Samoa (2013), Saudi Arabia (2019), Serbia (2010), Slovakia (2017), South Africa (2018), Thailand (2010, 2012), Tunisia (2010, 2020), Turkey (2013), Ukraine (2008), United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland (2010), Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of) (2007) and Viet Nam (2020)

**“Questions on suborbital flights for scientific missions and/or for human transportation”**

([A/AC.105/1039](#) and Add.1–14)

From 2013 to the present

Replies received from 26 States and 6 international organizations

Algeria (2013), Armenia (2013), Australia (2013), Austria (2017, 2019), Colombia (2013), Cyprus (2015), Czechia (2018), Finland (2013), Germany (2013), Guatemala (2013), Jordan (2013), Kazakhstan (2013), Kenya (2013), Mexico (2018), Mozambique (2015), Myanmar (2019), Norway (2015), Pakistan (2019), Peru (2020), Portugal (2013), Saudi Arabia (2019, 2020), South Africa (2018), Tunisia (2020), Qatar (2015), Ukraine (2015) and Viet Nam (2020)

International Association for the Advancement of Space Safety (IAASS) (2016, 2018), International Institute of Space Law (IISL) (2013), International Law Association (2013, 2017), Secure World Foundation (2019), Space Generation Advisory Council (SGAC) (2015) and World Health Organization (2017)

**“Definition and delimitation of outer space: views of States members and permanent observers of the Committee”**

([A/AC.105/1112](#) and Add.1–8)

From 2016 to the present

Replies received from 11 States and 4 international organizations

Algeria (2020), Austria (2017), Czechia (2018), Mexico (2016, 2018), Pakistan (2019), Peru (2020), Saudi Arabia (2019), South Africa (2018), Thailand (2016, 2017), Tunisia (2020) and Turkey (2017)

Secure World Foundation (2019), World Health Organization (2017), United Nations Industrial Development Organization (2020) and World Meteorological Organization (WMO) (2016)

**“Information relating to any practical case known that would warrant the definition and delimitation of outer space”**

([A/AC.105/1226](#))

From 2020

Replies received from 3 States

Peru (2020), Tunisia (2020) and Viet Nam (2020)

**“Questions on the definition and delimitation of outer space: replies from Member States”**

([A/AC.105/889](#) and Add.1–16)

From 2007 to 2015

Replies received from 40 States

Algeria (2011, 2012, 2013), Armenia (2013), Argentina (2013), Australia (2012, 2013), Azerbaijan (2009), Bangladesh (2010), Belarus (2008, 2009), Belgium (2013), Bolivia (Plurinational State of) (2013), Brazil (2009), Czech Republic (2007, 2008, 2010), Estonia (2010), Finland (2013), France (2012), Denmark (2008, 2011), Germany (2009, 2010), Guatemala (2013), Iceland (2007), Iraq (2010), Jordan (2008, 2013), Kazakhstan (2013), Kenya (2013), Mauritius (2010), Mexico (2009), Mozambique (2015), Netherlands (2010), Nicaragua (2008), Nigeria (2007), Norway (2010, 2012, 2015), Portugal (2013), Qatar (2009, 2015), Russian Federation (2012), Saudi Arabia (2009), Serbia (2010), Thailand (2010, 2012), Tunisia (2010), Turkey (2012, 2013), Ukraine (2008, 2015), United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland (2010) and Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of) (2007)

**“Questionnaire on possible legal issues with regard to aerospace objects: replies from Member States”**

([A/AC.105/635](#) and Add.1–17)

From 1996 to 2009

Replies received from 48 States

Algeria (2003), Argentina (1997, 1998), Azerbaijan (2009), Belarus (2008), Benin (2004), Brazil (2004), Chile (1996, 2004), Colombia (1998), Costa Rica (2003, 2004), Czech Republic (1996, 2003, 2008), Ecuador (2003), Egypt (2007), El Salvador (2003), Fiji (2004), Finland (2005), Germany (1996, 2002, 2006), Greece (1996), India (1997), Indonesia (1998), Iraq (1996), Italy (1996), Kazakhstan (1996), Kuwait (2007), Latvia (2006), Lebanon (1998, 2005), Libya (2005, 2007), Jordan (2008), Madagascar (2004), Mexico (1996, 2003), Morocco (2002, 2003, 2006, 2008), Netherlands (2003), Nigeria (2006), Pakistan (1996), Peru (2003), Philippines (1996), Portugal (2005), Republic of Korea (1996, 2007), Russian Federation (1996), Rwanda (2005), Slovakia (2003), South Africa (2003), Spain (2006), Syrian Arab Republic (1996, 2006), Turkey (1996, 2002, 2003, 2005, 2007), Ukraine (2005, 2008), United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland (1996, 1998), Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of) (2007) and Yemen (2004).