



INTERNATIONAL INSTITUTE FOR THE UNIFICATION OF PRIVATE LAW
INSTITUT INTERNATIONAL POUR L'UNIFICATION DU DROIT PRIVE

**PREPARATORY COMMISSION FOR THE ESTABLISHMENT
OF THE INTERNATIONAL REGISTRY FOR SPACE
ASSETS PURSUANT TO THE SPACE PROTOCOL**

First session
Rome, 6-7 May 2013

UNIDROIT 2013
Prep. Comm. Space/1/Doc. 6 rev.
Original: English
June 2013

**SUMMARY REPORT
OF THE FIRST SESSION
(Rome, 6-7 May 2013)**

1. The first session of the Preparatory Commission for the establishment of the International Registry for Space Assets pursuant to the Space Protocol took place at the headquarters of UNIDROIT in Rome on 6 and 7 May 2013 (for the List of Participants see Annex I to the present report).

Item No.1 on the draft agenda – Opening of the session and welcome by the UNIDROIT Secretary-General

2. Acting as provisional Chairman the *UNIDROIT Secretary-General* welcomed the delegations and the observers and thanked them for having positively responded to the invitation by UNIDROIT to participate in the work of the Space Preparatory Commission. He noted that Resolution No. 1 of the Final Act of the Diplomatic Conference in Berlin provided for the setting up of a Preparatory Commission to act with full authority as Provisional Supervisory Authority for the establishment of the International Registry for space assets, under the guidance of the General Assembly of UNIDROIT. Such Preparatory Commission would be composed of persons, having the necessary qualifications and experience, nominated by one-third of the negotiating States.

3. The *provisional Chairman* noted that the following States the following States agreed to serve as members of the Preparatory Commission: Brazil, People's Republic of China, Czech Republic, France, Germany, India, Italy, Russian Federation, Saudi Arabia, South Africa, United States of America. He finally pointed out that together with the International Telecommunication Union (ITU), the International Civil Aviation Organization (ICAO) and the Intergovernmental Organisation for Carriage by Rail (OTIF), a number of other participants and representatives of financial and commercial world were invited to attend the session as observers.

Item No. 2 on the draft agenda – Adoption of the agenda and organisation of the session

4. The draft agenda sent out with the invitation was adopted as drafted in its corrected version (see Annex II to the present report).

Item No. 3 on the agenda – Discussion and adoption of the Commission's Rules of Procedure

5. The *provisional Chairman* presented the draft Rules of Procedure for adoption by the Preparatory Commission (see Prep.Comm. Space/1/Doc. 2), which followed the latest version of the Rules of Procedure adopted by the Rail Preparatory Commission. Answering a comment regarding the proposed quorum for decisions of the Commission in Sec. 8, Rule 16 of the draft Commission's Rules of Procedure, the *provisional Chairman* clarified that the quorum of 7 States was chosen as representing slightly more than half of the total number of participating States which so far was 11; taking into account that according to Resolution No. 1 of the Final Act of the Berlin Diplomatic Conference the Preparatory Commission should be composed of 1/3 of the negotiating States, a number of participating States higher than 12 was not to be anticipated at the present stage. Following a further comment regarding the role of observers during the Commission's proceedings under Rule 15 of the draft Commission's Rules of Procedure, the *provisional Chairman* specified that according to the established practice in negotiations for Conventions or other instruments and in previous Preparatory Commissions, practitioners and industry representatives who did not already belong to a governmental delegation had the right to intervene and formulate proposals but not to vote or be counted when determining the existence of a consensus.

6. The Rules of Procedure were adopted by the Preparatory Commission without amendments.

Item No. 4 on the agenda – Election of the Chair and Vice-Chair of the Commission

7. According to its Rules of Procedure No. 2 and 3 the Preparatory Commission proceeded with the election of its Chair and Vice-Chair. Mr Sergio Marchisio (Italy), former Chairman of the Commission of the Whole during the Berlin Conference, was elected Chairman of the Commission. Mr Bernhard Schmidt-Tedd (Germany) was elected first Vice-Chair, the second Vice-Chairmanship being left to be filled at a future session.

Item No. 5 on the agenda – Consideration of matters relating to the appointment of a Supervisory Authority

8. *The Chairman* opened the discussion on Item No. 5 of the Agenda by recalling Art. 17 of the Cape Town Convention, concerning the functions of the Supervisory Authority and its relationship with the Registrar, and Art. XXVIII(1) of the Space Protocol, dealing with the procedure for the designation of the Supervisory Authority, its privileges and immunities as well as the setting up of a Commission of Experts with the task of assisting the Supervisory Authority in the discharge of its functions.

9. Before opening the floor to discussion on Item 5 of the agenda, *the Chairman* invited Mr Martin Stanford, former Deputy Secretary-General who attended the session of the Preparatory Commission as adviser to the UNIDROIT Secretariat, to provide the Preparatory Commission with an overview of the rules regarding the Supervisory Authority, its functions, privileges and immunities as well as its relationship with the Registrar under the Cape Town Convention (Arts 17 and 27) and in the Space Protocol (Art. XXVIII). In the course of his ample presentation *Mr Stanford* pointed out that although in the case of the Aircraft Protocol the International Civil Aviation Organisation (ICAO) was already designated in the Final Act as Supervisory Authority and it already possessed all requested characteristics for fulfilling such role, the practical operation of the Aircraft Registry since 2006 made it a useful example of the functioning and development over time of the relationship between the Supervisory Authority and the Registrar.

10. *The Chairman* proceeded to recall that Resolution No. 2 of the Final Act of the Berlin Conference, relating to the establishment of the Supervisory Authority of the International Registry for Space Assets, reported the interest expressed at the Conference by the observer representing the Secretary General of the International Telecommunication Union (ITU) for the ITU to consider becoming Supervisory Authority of the International Registry for Space Assets, subject to consideration of the matter by the governing bodies of the ITU and without prejudice to the decision to be taken by them in this regard, in the light of the outcome of the Conference, taking into account the financial, juridical and technical implications of such a decision. *The Chairman* drew further attention to the fact that pursuant to the same Resolution, the governing bodies of the ITU were invited to consider the matter of the ITU becoming Supervisory Authority upon or after the entry into force of the Protocol and take the necessary action, as appropriate, and to inform the Secretary-General of UNIDROIT accordingly.

11. The representatives of ITU reported that as a follow up to the Diplomatic Conference in Berlin, the ITU Secretary General continued to express interest in the possibility for ITU to accept the role of Supervisory Authority, subject to the conditions already contained in Resolution No. 2 of the Final Act, and authorised the participation of ITU representatives in the work of the Space Preparatory Commission. ITU drew the attention of the Commission to the importance of determining in advance a strict timeline for the action of the Commission, for the ITU Conference of the Plenipotentiaries, the organ determining ITU policies, to be able to take an informed decision on the issue in October 2014. It was underlined that a good progress of the work undertaken by the Preparatory Commission would be needed to allow ITU to come to a decision by 2014. The ITU Council Session in June 2013 and the next ITU Council Session in Spring 2014 were indicated as

intermediate steps in the decision making process. The ITU expressed satisfaction for the fact that the first meeting of the Preparatory Commission was held before the ITU Council Session of June 2013.

12. *The Chairman* agreed with ITU on the need to determine a timeline for the work of the Commission and specified that this could be done after discussing Items 6 and 7 in the Agenda. In the absence of further questions or requests for the floor, the discussion on Item 5 was concluded.

Item No. 6 – Establishment of a Working Group to develop draft regulations for the International Registry for space assets

13. *The Chairman* resumed the work of the Session by announcing that the Commission would discuss Item No. 6 on the Agenda relating to the establishment of a working group to develop draft regulations for the International Registry for space assets. Before opening the floor for discussion *the Chairman* asked Sir Roy Goode, in his role as adviser of the UNIDROIT Secretariat, to give a presentation to the Commission on the functioning of the International Registry and in particular on the registry regulations, drawing on the experience of the previous Aircraft and Rail Protocols.

14. *Sir Roy Goode* offered an ample overview of the functions of the International Registry under the Convention and the Protocols. He underlined that the registry fulfils two main functions: to give notice and preserve priority according to the first-to-file rule, which is one of the elements at the heart of the Cape Town Convention model; to allow searches by interested parties regarding the possible existence of an international interest on specific collateral. He recalled that the registration under Cape Town is asset-based, which requires the identifiability of the collateral. The latter issue was indicated as being particularly difficult for space assets and as representing one of the most important points upon which the Preparatory Commission and its Working Groups are called to decide. *Sir Roy Goode* also provided the Preparatory Commission with a list of registrable categories under the Cape Town Convention and its Protocols (see Annex III to the present Report).

15. Further issues covered by *Sir Roy Goode* in his overview concerned the accessibility of the registry for the purposes of inserting an entry and of conducting a search; the liability of the Registrar for errors and omissions; the insurance coverage, with particular regard to the positive experience under the Aircraft Protocol (where the scope of coverage was extended and premiums were lowered over time due to the increased confidence in the system); the fundamentally non-profit nature of the activity of the Registrar, with the possibility to envisage that ancillary services be offered by the Registrar; the different categories of certified users and the organisation of entry points; the importance of security and independent controls. The reliance of the functioning of the registry on technological feasibility was further underlined, as well as the need to adapt the regulations to changing circumstances. In that regard, *Sir Roy Goode* confirmed that while the current version of the regulations for the Aircraft Registry is the 4th edition, the 5th edition, already approved by ICAO, would be expected to enter into force in July 2013 and a 6th edition, expected to be formally approved in June 2013, would however enter into force only in 2014. The latter version contained several small improvements but also some major changes such as the possibility to register and search against multiple objects and to register the end result of a closing of complex interdependent contracts.

16. In response to a request for further clarifications regarding the availability to the Preparatory Commission of the 6th and latest edition of the Aircraft Registry Regulations, *Sir Roy Goode* specified that while the adoption of the 6th edition of the Aircraft Registry Regulations was expected in the next few weeks, the official publication would only appear by the end of the year and its entry into force would shift to the first part of 2014, mainly because of ICAO's procedure for translation in all six official languages. *Sir Roy Goode* expressed the hope to be able to obtain the 6th edition of the regulations immediately after their adoption for internal use by the Preparatory Commission only.

17. One delegation expressed satisfaction for the timely publication of the Official Commentary to the Space Protocol by Sir Roy Goode and stressed the fundamental role played by industry working groups (Aviation Working Group; Rail Working Group) for the implementation of both the Aircraft and the Rail Protocols, in particular regarding the drafting of the registry regulations. While regretting the absence, for the time being, of an analogous organised activity by the industry in the field of space assets, it was suggested that the coordination role in respect to future input by industry experts could be played by the UNIDROIT Secretariat and Sir Roy Goode. *Sir Roy Goode* acknowledged the importance of the input by industry specialists and provided the example of the current Registrar for the Aircraft Registry, which is regularly advised by a body of experts. On the same point, *the UNIDROIT Secretary-General* noted that the Working Group on regulations would not be prevented from seeking advice from industry and other experts both in the Preparatory Commission and outside.

18. *The Chairman* informed the Commission that the following countries had expressed an interest in participating in the Working Group on registry regulations: China (People's Republic of), France, Germany, Russian Federation, South Africa, United States of America, with ITU as observer.

19. Mr Igor Porokhin (Russian Federation) was appointed as Chairman of the Working Group on registry regulations. *The Chairman* of the Commission adjourned the session of the Preparatory Commission and invited the Chairman of Working Group on registry regulations to preside over the first meeting of that Working Group.

First meeting of the Working Group on registry regulations

20. *The Chairman* of the Working Group reminded the other members of the group that the difficult task of drafting regulations for a Space Registry would not be adequately fulfilled without the assistance and input of the relevant industry.

21. The representatives of Thales Alenia Space and SES declared their readiness to participate in the Working Group.

22. *The Chairman* of the Working Group noted that though the members of the group were not yet in a position to discuss any issue in detail at the present stage, it would be possible to start with the selection of the most appropriate model to be followed for the drafting of the regulations for the Space Registry, in particular taking into account the experience of the Aircraft Regulations. He further envisaged consultations with each member's respective countries and industry in order to gain as much practical input as possible from different players in different regions. He mentioned in particular the interest of Russian as well as Chinese manufacturers.

23. Being asked for advice by *the Chairman* of the Working Group on registry regulations, *the UNIDROIT Secretary-General* proposed that the Working Group could let the Secretariat know when they would like to receive a first draft of the regulations for comments. He further enquired as to the willingness of the Working Group on registry regulations to entrust Sir Roy Goode to produce such a first draft with proper advice. The Working Group expressed its consent. Sir Roy Goode accepted under the condition of receiving input from other members of the Preparatory Commission in order to be able to better identify such aspects of the existing regulations which have to be modified to be applied to space assets.

24. *The Chairman* of the Working Group asked whether the members of the Working Group were already in a position to indicate which parts of the existing regulations would need to be modified or adapted to the specific needs of the Space Protocol.

25. In the ensuing discussion two major areas of divergence were highlighted, i.e. the elaboration of appropriate criteria for the identification of the assets and the provision of rules on assignment and reassignment of the interest. Regarding the first area it was recalled that the Space Protocol did not provide for a definition of Space Assets for the purpose of identification and registrability and that such a task would be therefore wholly entrusted to the Preparatory Commission.

26. It was further suggested that the Working Group on registry regulations would benefit from the elaboration, on the part of Sir Roy Goode and with the support of the UNIDROIT Secretariat, of a synopsis of the existing Air and Rail regulations in order to distinguish those standard elements which would not have to be adapted from the open issues where the previous regulations would have to be modified.

27. After consultations *the UNIDROIT Secretary-General* observed that a first draft of the Registry Regulations could offer a comparative table of the regulations for the Aircraft and Rail Protocols with the view to identify those issues which would be specifically relevant for space assets as pointed out by the delegations in the previous discussion (among others, criteria for identifiability of the collateral; assignment and reassignment). He suggested that a first set of rules could be circulated before the fall in order to have a round of informal consultations on it prior to a formal meeting. The second revised draft version of the regulations, drafted with the benefit of such consultations, would then be submitted to the Working Group or perhaps the Commission as a whole for discussion. *The UNIDROIT Secretary-General* surmised that such a formal meeting could be held in early 2014, subject to the decision of the Working Group.

28. *Sir Roy Goode* intervened to point out that the regulations for the Space Registry could be drawn to a large extent from the current edition of the Aircraft Regulations. He asked however whether the members of the Working Group on registry regulations or other interested parties could provide information as to points of divergence even before the finalisation of the first draft of Space Registry Regulations, in order for the latter to benefit from the specialised know-how of the experts in the field.

29. In the ensuing discussion it was agreed that such a question could not be successfully solved without expert advice from the industry. Each delegation was urged to contact its own national industry to that effect. The question was posed as to whether it would be possible for all involved parties to find an opportunity to share their views on the issue in an organised way. *The Chairman* of the Working Group intervened to ask whether a questionnaire could be circulated in order to receive recommendations from industry as to what issues should be addressed. Some concern was expressed, however, that the sending of a questionnaire would produce non comparable data as opposed to the more tangible results of a guided discussion on specific points.

30. *The Chairman* of the Working Group on registry regulations, after ascertaining that no other questions or comments were coming from the audience, concluded the meeting of the Working Group.

Resumed Preparatory Commission's Session

31. *The Chairman* resumed the session of the Preparatory Commission announcing that Mr Rob Cowan, Managing Director of Aviareto, the Registrar of the Aircraft Registry, would present via internet the practical functioning of the Aircraft Registry, with a particular focus on the role of the Registrar.

32. *Mr Cowan* offered an ample overview of the functioning of the International Aircraft Registry. He sketched first of all the governance of the Aircraft Registry and its relationship with ICAO as Supervisory Authority, the ICAO Commission of Experts (CESAIR) and the Registry Advisory Board (IRAB). He then presented an overview of the functioning of the registry (types of

access; security features; types of search and role of the search certificate) as well as the functions of the Registrar (services provided and services not provided). He underlined in particular that the Registry had to ensure the integrity of the information inserted in the registry by providing for sufficient security and control, but did not fulfil the role of checking whether the information was correct or updated. Furthermore, he explained the process for introducing changes in the software and in the registry regulations. Other issues addressed in the presentation related to statistics (with particular regard to the increasing number of registered objects and of searches as well as to the geographical provenance of users) and dispute resolution.

33. In the course of the ensuing discussion the need to ensure the cooperation of the manufacturing industry to develop appropriate identification criteria for the Space Registry was underlined. Reference was made to the Aircraft Registry where a large number of manufacturer had signed a memorandum of understanding with the Registry and had provided detailed information as to serial numbers and names of aircraft collateral, while smaller companies had failed to do so. In the event of conflict as between two creditors the most accurate description of the collateral would prevail. It was suggested that the Space Preparatory Commission would provide guidelines for description of the equipment, with the cooperation of the industry, in order to minimise problems. To that effect, the opportunity to adopt the identification criteria already used by ITU as possible candidate for the role of Supervisory Authority was voiced.

34. *The UNIDROIT Deputy Secretary-General* asked whether Mr Cowan would be willing to share with the Preparatory Commission a brief summary which he had recently prepared of the issues to be considered in the establishment of a registry for Space Assets, based on the by now relevant experience of the operation of the Aircraft Registry. *Mr Cowan* agreed to send that informal document as soon as possible and expressed his availability for any further enquiry or request for information.

Item No. 7 on the agenda - Establishment of a Working Group to draft a request for proposals for the selection of a Registrar

35. *The Chairman* resumed the work introducing Item No. 7 on the agenda, on the establishment of a Working Group to draft a request for proposals for the selection of a Registrar for the Space Registry. He drew the attention of the delegates to Document No. 5 containing the text of the Request for Proposal (RFP) for the Luxembourg Protocol, which could be used as a model for a Request for Proposal for the Space Protocol (Prep. Comm. Space/1/Doc. 5).

36. As to the establishment of a Working Group for the drafting of a request for proposals for the selection of a Registrar ("Working Group on RFP"), the Chairman informed the Commission that the following members of the Commission had already expressed the wish to participate: People's Republic of China, Czech Republic, France, Germany, Italy, Russian Federation, United States of America, as well as ITU as observer.

37. *The Chairman*, in his capacity as delegate for Italy, proposed Mr Bernhard Schmidt-Tedd (Germany) as Chair of the Working Group on RFP. The proposal was unanimously accepted.

38. *The Chairman* adjourned the session of the Commission and called the Chairman of the Working Group on RFP to the podium in order to conduct the first meeting of that Working Group.

Working Group on RFP's first meeting

39. *The Chairman* of the Working Group on RFP opened the discussion by inviting those participants with previous experience in the selection procedures conducted under the Aircraft or the Rail Protocols to share their experience for the benefit of the Working Group.

40. In the ensuing discussion several points were raised. Most participants agreed that both the model request for proposals for the Aircraft Registry as well as the one used for the Rail Registry should be considered. The difference between the procedure followed in the case of the Aircraft Registry and the situation in the case of the Space Protocol was underlined by several participants. It was noted that a less cumbersome and less costly selection procedure could be more appropriate for the Space Registry, due to the fact that the number of alternative candidates was not expected to be high as opposed to the experience under the Aircraft Protocol. It was further noted that direct negotiations with the provider could prove to be more effective in the case of a single candidate. The possibility of making use of the contract already concluded with Aviareto was also envisaged. Moreover, it was suggested that the procurement process could be affected by the internal rules of the organization who would act as a Supervisory Authority, were such a Supervisory Authority appointed before completion of the process.

41. Finally, it was suggested that differently from the procedure followed in the Rail Protocol, a model contract for the Registrar should be annexed to the request for proposals, leaving open the option of acceptance by the provider of the contract as it was or of entering into negotiations with a selected provider.

42. *Mr Stanford* offered to contact ICAO to obtain permission to use the internal documentation concerning the request for proposals for the Aircraft Registry.

43. *The Chairman* recalled that a strict timeline for the work of the Working Group on RFP should be indicated, as it was done for the Working Group on registry regulations, taking into account the timeline indicated by the representatives of ITU for their internal decision making process. At the latest, the Working Group on RFP should present results before the ITU Council Meeting in Spring 2014. The ITU confirmed the importance of setting a precise schedule to obtain results and be able to report on a tangible progress of both Working Groups and the Preparatory Commission as a whole by the Council Meeting in April 2014.

44. After an extensive discussion it was agreed that the Working Group on RFP should wait for the development of the discussion within the Working Group on registry regulations before delivering a draft proposal, since the specifications needed to draft a request for proposals were strongly linked to the results of the consultations on specific aspects of the Space Registry, as well as to further external input regarding the procurement process. To that end, an early exchange of views involving industry representatives was deemed to be necessary.

45. *The UNIDROIT Deputy Secretary-General* suggested that the Working Group on RFP could consider whether to ask the members of the Preparatory Commission to forward comments regarding the kind of documents which would be more useful to the Working Group on RFP at the same time as the first round of comments on the registry regulations. It was so agreed.

46. The first session of the Working Group on RFP was concluded.

Resumed Preparatory Commission's Session

47. *The Chairman* of the Preparatory Commission resumed the session of the Commission by asking whether the members had further issues to consider.

48. In this regard it was inquired whether the UNIDROIT Secretariat could take into consideration the organisation of regional workshops in those countries where the industry appeared to be interested in the Protocol, in particular Eastern Asia and the Russian Federation, and to consider the possibility to make use of the expertise of Mr Stanford in the area. *The UNIDROIT Deputy Secretary-General* welcomed the suggestion to promote the Space Protocol through the organisation of workshops with the participation of the relevant industry in strategic regions of the world.

Item No. 8 on the agenda - Time-table and planning of further work

49. *The Chairman* summed up the time-table agreed to by the Preparatory Commission and its Working Groups as follows:

Working Group I /Registry Regulations

(participants: People's Republic of China, France, Germany, Russian Federation, South Africa, United States of America, as well as ITU, SES and Thales Alenia Space as observers):

- The Report of the present session of the Preparatory Commission will be sent possibly by the end of the week to all participants.
- Middle-End of June: deadline for comments concerning the open issues regarding the Registry Regulations should be sent to the UNIDROIT Secretariat.
- Middle-end of July: deadline for the circulation of a first draft of registry regulations prepared by Sir Roy Goode on the basis of the comments received and with the assistance of the UNIDROIT Secretariat.

The draft should clearly indicate which are the open points where input from industry and other experts would be most needed.

A teleconference involving all interested parties could be organised before or after completion of the first draft in order to assist in the identification of such points.

- Mid-September: deadline for comments on the first draft.
- End of the year: submission of a second revised draft by Sir Roy Goode.
- Beginning of 2014: meeting of the Working Group on registry regulations – depending on the inter-sessional work conducted, there could be a meeting of the Commission as a whole at the same time.

Working Group II / Request for Proposals

(participants: People's Republic of China, Czech Republic, France, Germany, Italy, Russian Federation, United States of America, as well as ITU as observer)

- Mid-End of June: expected deadline for comments concerning the selection of the most appropriate documents to be used as a model for the request for proposal.
- Before April 2014: first results of the discussion within the Working Group on RFP regarding the elements to be needed to draft a sound request for proposal, on the basis of the results reached by that time in the Working Group on registry regulations.

50. Following comments by the floor *the UNIDROIT Deputy Secretary-General* confirmed that all participants were kindly asked to consult internally with industry or other experts in order to be in a position to enhance the usefulness of their input on the technical issues involved in drafting both the registry regulations and the request for proposals.

51. In the absence of any other point to be addressed *the Chairman* closed the first session of the Space Preparatory Commission.

ANNEX I**LIST OF PARTICIPANTS****STATES**

BRAZIL	<p>Mr João Paulo TAVARES FERNANDEZ Second Secretary Embassy of Brazil in Italy <i>Rome</i></p> <p>Mr Wilson ALVARENGA DOS SANTOS Attaché Embassy of Brazil in Italy <i>Rome</i></p>
CHINA (PEOPLE'S REPUBLIC OF)	<p>Mr GAO Hua Official Ministry of Commerce 2, Dong Chang An <i>100731 Beijing</i> e-mail: gaohua_tf@mofcom.gov.cn</p> <p>Ms WANG Jilian General Manager Department of Legal Affairs China Great Wall Industry Corporation Building 1, A18 Xing Shi Kou Road Haidian District <i>100195 Beijing</i> e-mail: wangjl@cgwic.com</p>
CZECH REPUBLIC	<p>Mr Vladimír KOPAL Emeritus Professor of Law University of Pilsen Vidlicová 2200/9 <i>160 00 Prague 6 - Dejvice</i></p>
FRANCE	<p>Mr Julien MARIEZ Chef du Service juridique Entreprise du Centre national d'études spatiales <i>Paris</i> e-mail: julien.mariez@cnes.fr</p> <p>Mme Amélie DURANTON Magistrat de Liaison Ambassade de France en Italie <i>Rome</i> e-mail: amelie.duranton@giustizia.it</p>

GERMANY

Mr Hans-Georg BOLLWEG
Member of the UNIDROIT Governing Council
Head of Division
Federal Ministry of Justice
Mohrenstrasse 17
10117 Berlin
e-mail: bollweg-ha@bmj.bund.de

Mr Bernhard SCHMIDT-TEDD
(First Vice-Chair; Chair of Working Group on RFP)
Head of Legal Support
German Space Agency
Königswinterer Str. 522-524
Bonn
e-mail: bernhard.schmidt-tedd@dlr.de

ITALY

Mr Sergio MARCHISIO
(Chair)
Professor of Law;
University of Rome I
Institute of International Legal Studies
Rome
e-mail: sergio.marchisio@cnr.it

RUSSIAN FEDERATION

Ms Olga A. VOLIANSKYA
International Law Counsel
International Cooperation and Contractual
Department
Russian Space Agency (Roscosmos)
42 Schepkina st.
107496 Moscow
e-mail: o.a.volynskaya@roscosmos.org

Mr Y.V. ARTEMIEV
Legal firm ARTLEX
Moscow

Mr Igor N. POROKHIN
(Chair of Working Group on registry regulations)
Partner
Inspace Consulting (Russia) L.L.C.
42 Schepkina st.
107456 Moscow
e-mail: ibp@space.ru

SAUDI ARABIA

Mr Mohamed TARABZOUNI
Director
Space Research Institute
Office for Peaceful Uses of Outer Space
King Abdulaziz City for Science and Technology
P.O. Box 94690
Riyadh 11614
e-mail: mtrabzon@kacst.edu.sa
dr.tarabzouni@gmail.com

Mr Haitham AL TUWEJRI
King Abdulaziz City for Science and Technology
P.O. Box 94690
Riyadh 11614

SOUTH AFRICA

Mr Theunis KOTZE
State Law Adviser (IL)
Department of International Relations and Co-
operation
460 Soutpansberg Road
0084 Pretoria
e-mail: Kotzet@dirco.gov.za

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

Mr Tim SCHNABEL
Attorney-Adviser
Office of the Legal Adviser
U.S. Department of State
Washington, D.C.
e-mail: SchnabelTR@state.gov

Mr Louis E. EMERY
Senior Counsel
Office of the General Counsel
Import-Export Bank of the United States
of America
811 Vermont Avenue, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20571
e-mail: louis.emery@exim.gov

Mr Steven HARRIS
Professor of Law
Chicago-Kent College of Law
565 West Adams St.
Chicago, IL 60661
e-mail: sharris@kentlaw.edu

INTERNATIONAL ORGANISATIONS

INTERNATIONAL TELECOMMUNICATIONS
UNION (ITU)

Mr Yvon HENRI
Chief
Space Services Department
Place des Nations
CH-1211 Geneva 20
e-mail: yvon.henri@itu.int

Mr Arnaud GUILLOT
Conseiller juridique
Unité des affaires juridiques (JUR)
CH-1211 Geneva 20
e-mail: arnaud.guillot@itu.int

**REPRESENTATIVES OF THE RELEVANT INTERNATIONAL COMMERCIAL AND FINANCIAL
COMMUNITIES**

Mr Francesco AMICUCCI

Thales Alenia Space Italy
Rome
e-mail:
francesco.amicucci@thalesalieniaspace.com

Ms Nancy ESKENAZI

Vice President Legal Services
Global Regulatory
SES S.A.
6815 Betzdorf
e-mail: nancy.eskenazi@ses.com

Mr Oliver HEINRICH

Partner
BHO Legal
Hohenstaufenring 29-37
50674 Cologne
e-mail: Oliver.Heinrich@bho-legal.com

Mr Jeffrey WOOL

Secretary General
Aviation Working Group (AWG)
London

OTHER

Sir Roy GOODE

Emeritus Professor of Law
University of Oxford
Oxford
Adviser to the UNIDROIT Secretariat
e-mail: roy.goode@law.ox.ac.uk

Mr Souichirou KOZUKA

Researcher of the Institute of Space Law
Keio University
Mejiro 1-5-1, Toshima-ku
Tokyo 171-8588
e-mail: souichirou.kozuka@gakushuin.ac.jp

Mr Martin STANFORD

Immediate past Deputy Secretary-General of
UNIDROIT
Adviser to the UNIDROIT Secretariat

UNIDROIT

Mr José Angelo ESTRELLA FARIA

Secretary-General, UNIDROIT

Ms Anna VENEZIANO

Deputy Secretary-General, UNIDROIT

ANNEX II**AGENDA**

1. Opening of the session and welcome by the UNIDROIT Secretary-General
2. Adoption of the agenda and organisation of the business of the session
3. Adoption of the Commission's Rules of Procedure
4. Election of the Chair and Vice-Chairs of the Commission
5. Consideration of matters relating to the appointment of a Supervisory Authority
6. Establishment of a working group to develop draft regulations for the International Registry for space assets
7. Establishment of a working group to draft a request for proposals for the selection of a Registrar
8. Time-table and planning of further work
9. Any other business
10. Closing of the session.

ANNEX III**List of registrable categories under the Cape Town Convention and its Protocols
(Roy Goode)****Note:**

1. Sales of railway rolling stock are not registrable. Notices of sales are registrable but have no Convention effects.
2. Items (o) to (r) are registrable only as regards space assets.
3. The following list breaks down some of the categories lumped together in the Convention.

Registrable categories

The following are the registration categories

- (a) international interests;
- (b) prospective international interests;
- (c) registrable non-consensual rights and interests;
- (d) assignments of international interests;
- (e) assignments of prospective international interests;
- (f) assignments of registrable non-consensual rights or interests;
- (g) prospective assignments of international interests;
- (h) acquisitions of international interests by legal or contractual subrogation under the applicable law;
- (i) notices of national interests;
- (j) subordinations of interests referred to in any of the preceding sub-paragraphs;
- (k) subordinations of non-registrable interests of an outright buyer, a conditional buyer or a lessee that would otherwise have priority under Article 29;
- (l) pre-existing rights or interests registered pursuant to a declaration under Article 60(3);
- (m) sales;
- (n) prospective sales;
- (o) the recording of rights assignments and rights reassignments;
- (p) the recording of acquisitions of debtor's rights by subrogation;

- (q) the registration of public service notices under Article XXVII(1) of the Protocol to the Convention on International Interests in Mobile Equipment on Matters specific to Space Assets;
- (r) the registration of creditors' notices under Article XXVII(4) of the Protocol to the Convention on International Interests in Mobile Equipment on Matters specific to Space Assets;
- (s) the amendment of a registration;
- (t) the discharge of a registration;
- (u) the discharge of an amendment of a registration;
- (v) declarations under various provisions of the Convention;
- (w) amendments and withdrawals of such declarations;
- (x) designations of entry points; and
- (y) details of ratifications by Contracting States.

The Aircraft Registry also maintains details of identification criteria for aircraft objects which are available for search, but the facility is outside the Convention and does not generate a search certificate.