



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**

***Second session***  
**Rome, 27-28 January 2014**

UNIDROIT 2014  
Prep. Comm. Space/2/Doc. 6  
Original: English  
February 2014

**SUMMARY REPORT**  
**OF THE SECOND SESSION**  
**(Rome, 27-28 January 2014)**

1. The second 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 27 and 28 January 2014 (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***

2. Participants met at the headquarters of UNIDROIT for the opening of the session by *the UNIDROIT Deputy Secretary-General* on behalf of the UNIDROIT Secretary-General.

***Item No 2 on the draft agenda – Visit of Thales Alenia Space premises, in particular with a view of obtaining information on the practical implications of the draft Space Regulations***

3. During the morning session the members of the Preparatory Commission were kindly invited by Thales Alenia Space Italia for a visit to their premises in Rome and the “clean room” where satellites and other space assets were assembled (see Annex III to the present report). The visit allowed the members of the Commission to ask several questions to expert engineers, in particular as to the separate identifiability of space assets, including payloads, both in a pre- and in a post-launch situation. It was agreed that additional information and – if needed – requests for clarification on the part of the experts as to the questions asked by the Preparatory Commission would be forthcoming. *Sir Roy Goode* and *the Deputy Secretary-General* expressed their gratitude to Thales Alenia Space Italia for the hospitality and for the opportunity to gather important information of a technical nature that would be useful for the subsequent discussions of the Commission.

***Item No 3 on the draft agenda – Adoption of the agenda and organisation of the business of the session (Prep.Comm.Space/2/Doc.1)***

4. Acting as provisional Chairman *the Secretary-General* welcomed the delegations and the observers and thanked them for having positively responded to the invitation to participate in the work of the second session of the Preparatory Commission. He further expressed his gratitude to Thales Alenia Space Italia for the field visit that was offered during the morning session of the meeting and that would undoubtedly benefit the discussion on the open issues of the draft Space Regulations.

5. The agenda sent out with the invitation was adopted (see Annex II to the present report).

6. Prof Sergio Marchisio (Italy) was reappointed Chairman of the session. It was agreed that no meetings of the Working Groups would be needed during the session.

***Item No. 4 on the agenda – Consideration of the Explanatory Note to the revised draft Space Regulations prepared by Prof Roy Goode (Prep.Comm.Space/2/Doc.2)***

***Item No. 5 on the agenda – Consideration of other points concerning the revised text of the draft Space Regulations prepared by Prof Roy Goode (Prep.Comm.Space/2/Doc.3)***

7. *The Chairman* opened the discussion on Items No 4 and No 5 of the agenda, drawing the delegates’ attention to three documents: Document No 3 containing the revised text of the Space Regulations prepared by Sir Roy Goode; Document No 2 containing the revised Explanatory Note to the draft Space Regulations prepared by Sir Roy Goode; Document No 4 containing a summary of the comments received on the first version of the draft Space Regulations prepared by UNIDROIT. He

noted that the first draft of the Space Regulations prepared by Sir Roy Goode had been circulated in July 2013 for consultations among the members of the Commission. Those consultations were very fruitful and resulted in the revised Explanatory Note and revised text of the draft Regulations to be discussed at the present session. *The Chairman* invited Sir Roy Goode to introduce the above-mentioned documents and the Deputy Secretary-General to add other information if necessary.

8. *Sir Roy Goode* first expressed his thanks to those members of the Preparatory Commission who responded to the consultation paper and to the Deputy Secretary-General for coordinating the responses. He noted that the draft Regulations were based on the 6<sup>th</sup> Edition of the Regulations for the Aircraft Registry and that an Appendix dealing with the closing room facility would be added as a further attachment to the document, and he proceeded to give a brief overview of the items highlighted in his Explanatory Report.

9. The first item to be discussed was the issue of the identification criteria for registration of space assets, in particular satellites. *Sir Roy Goode* reported that there seemed to be a general agreement among the consultees that in the case of pre-launch financing, the elements to be indicated would be the serial number of the space asset, its generic model and the manufacturer's name; further to this, one delegation suggested to add another unique identifier such as the contract number. On the other hand, identifiers for post-launch financing were considered to be more problematic, also because the serial number would not be necessarily visible when the space object was already in outer space. Consultees mentioned the manufacturer's name, the launch date, the UTC (Coordinated Universal Time) and the COSPAR unique international identifier (the designation system for satellites developed by the Committee on Space Research). One consultee suggested the use of the designations maintained in the UN Convention on Registration of Objects Launched into Outer Space (1974 Registration Convention). In comments sent for the present session of the Preparatory Commission (Prep.Com.Space/2/Doc.5), one observer had suggested that there should be no distinction between pre- and post-launch identification criteria and that supplementary information could be requested in order to solve the problem of ascertaining the serial number from Earth, with no effect, however, on searches and priorities. In *Sir Roy Goode's* opinion, if the additional information were non-mandatory it would be difficult to use it for identification purposes; further clarifications were felt to be needed on this point. As to the classification of satellites by function, *Sir Roy Goode* reported that most consultees did not recommend it since it could lead to confusion.

10. *Sir Roy Goode* further invited the Preparatory Commission to comment on whether the same identifiers suggested for satellites could be considered applicable also to other spacecrafts.

11. With regard to the international Registry's facilities, *Sir Roy Goode* observed that specific regulations on controlled entities, block assignments and closing room were suggested as possible additions to the draft Regulations. While block assignments were not yet feasible from a technical point of view, the closing room facility was operational for the Aircraft Registry and was considered to be practically useful when multiple connected transactions occurring at different times were involved. It consisted in the possibility to coordinate a number of different registrations and to agree in advance on their order of priority and on a closing date, following which an entry in the Registry would ensue.

12. On the issue of international interests on a payload or a part of a payload or spacecraft, *Sir Roy Goode* reported that there was a consensus among the consultees that their separate registrability would depend on their "bankability", i.e. their economic significance for the purpose of separate financing. He invited the Preparatory Commission to consider, in line with a suggestion

made by the former Deputy-Secretary General Mr Martin Stanford, the setting up of a Sub-Committee of the Preparatory Commission to look into this issue in close cooperation with the International Communication Union (ITU) and Mr Rob Cowan of Aviareto.

13. Concerning the question of physically linked assets, *Sir Roy Goode* pointed out that according to Art. XVII(3) of the Space Protocol a creditor may not enforce an international interest in a space asset that is physically linked with another space asset so as to impair or interfere with the operation of the other space asset if an international interest or sale has been registered with respect to the other space asset prior to the registration of the international interest being enforced. In his view, this question should not be addressed by the Registry regulations but was a matter to be decided at the time of enforcement.

14. With reference to the question as to whether the definition of satellite should be modified, *Sir Roy Goode* clarified that such definition was contained in the Space Protocol and could not be changed in the Regulations.

15. Finally, the important question of the determination of the fees for use of the Registry facilities was raised but it was suggested that it could be left for a later stage of the discussions, possibly through inclusion in the Procedural Rules following the Regulations.

16. *The Deputy Secretary-General* suggested that the issue of the identification criteria for payloads and parts of payloads and spacecrafts could be addressed by the Working Group I on Regulations instead of creating an *ad hoc* Sub-Committee.

17. *The Chairman* thanked both Sir Roy Goode and the Deputy Secretary-General for their inputs and opened the floor for discussion.

18. Several participants expressed their thanks to Sir Roy Goode and the Secretariat for the inter-sessional work done and commented on the usefulness of the morning visit to the premises of Thales Alenia Space Italia. One delegation pointed out that manufacturers appeared to be in possession of ample electronic documentation that would allow identification of the asset even after launch; others underlined that, in practice, it was difficult to envisage a situation where serial numbers and information concerning the manufacturer would not be sufficient to identify the space asset both pre-launch and in a post-launch setting. One observer did note, however, that according to their practical experience not all manufactures provided serial numbers and that therefore ensuring the cooperation of manufacturers would be extremely important. Other delegations supported the specific post-launch criteria indicated in the Explanatory Report such as launch date and place and UTC number on the one hand, or the COSPAR identifier number or the UN register number on the other hand; the usefulness of the COSPAR identifier was however questioned by one delegation, since it was a voluntary system with no international legal underpinning.

19. *Sir Roy Goode* acknowledged that some manufacturers may not provide serial numbers and that, therefore, additional criteria might be needed; he recognised the criticism to the proposed use of the current COSPAR numbering as an entirely voluntary operation, which made it difficult to use for registration purposes.

20. In response to a question by *the Chairman* on whether the Preparatory Commission felt the need to distinguish between identification criteria for pre-launch and those for post-launch, *Mr Cowan* referred to the experience of Aviareto in operating the Aircraft Registry, pointing out that a number of additional criteria initially provided in the Registry Regulations (such as for example the tail number for aircrafts) had been later considered to be a source of confusion and had been accordingly dropped from the revised version of the Aircraft Regulations. Not only would such additional information be more easily subject to changes, but there would be further issues

concerning the responsibility to enter new data after launch or the liability in case of errors or different interpretations as to the relevant data. In the interest of efficiency, identification criteria should be kept to a minimum: manufacturer's name, model and serial number. Were the latter not available for all space assets, the Registrar could be asked to issue an *ad hoc* number, following the example of the Rail Protocol.

21. In the ensuing general discussion, while there was agreement on the fact that the identification criteria should be kept to a minimum to avoid confusion and errors, but opinions were divided as to the need to provide additional criteria to indicate that the space asset had already been launched. One delegation was reluctant to abandon such distinction since reference to launch date and/or the COSPAR number could be relevant to better identify the space object, while the UN Register data was important in determining jurisdiction in sovereign free areas or for liability purposes. Others considered that launch date and time, as well as launch provider, could represent useful additional elements to conduct a search in the registry. In response, other participants stressed that the purpose of the Protocol was to facilitate financing and not to solve general questions of jurisdiction or liability; it was further observed that multiple search criteria might defeat the purpose of the registry which was to provide certainty; in addition, if a pre-launch registration already existed it would be difficult to determine who would be entitled or responsible for filing the additional information after the collateral had been launched (secured creditor, other creditors, Registrar).

22. *The Secretary-General*, referring to consultations with *Sir Roy Goode*, pointed out that the additional criteria for post-launch provided in Section 5.3 of the draft Regulations would have to be understood as supplementary criteria for the case where there was no serial number, and not as cumulative criteria.

23. *The Chairman* summed up the discussion by stating that participants agreed that registration criteria should be kept to a minimum and that there was consensus on the required elements for pre-launch registration of an international interest on space assets, namely manufacturer's name, serial number and model. No agreement, on the other hand, existed on the need to include additional criteria for post-launch registration.

24. *Sir Roy Goode* observed that the only difficult situation would arise where no manufacturer serial number existed for the collateral. For those situations it could be envisaged that the Register issued a serial number for registration upon receiving additional information from the interested party. He suggested, however, that further thought should be given to that issue and that it might be useful to revert to that point the following day, in the light of the responses to the written questions submitted to the representatives of Thales Alenia Space Italia.

25. *The Chairman* agreed and opened the floor to discuss the remaining points in the Explanatory Report.

26. Concerning the opportunity to provide a regulation on controlled entities, *Mr Cowan* observed that while the experience of the Aircraft Registry in this area was positive because of the high number of involved entities, the space industry appeared to be characterised by a markedly lower number of operating companies. Thus, the advantages of allowing special rules for controlled entities would be significantly reduced. A number of delegates joined him in considering that there would be no compelling reason to cover controlled entities in the draft Regulations at this stage.

27. The issue of physically linked assets was addressed next. In particular, the Commission considered the question of the discoverability by a creditor registering against the whole spacecraft of a previously registered interest in a part of that spacecraft (i.e. a payload). As a possible

solution to this problem, it was suggested that registration of an interest in a payload should identify also (in advance) the spacecraft to which it would be affixed. On the other hand, it should be taken into account that payloads might be moved from one spacecraft to another, and that the precise destination of a payload might not be known at the time of financing. The solution to only allow registrations against payloads that were not capable of detachment and reattachment was considered to be inadequate, such payloads being of less value than the detachable ones. Thus, two diverging opinions on how to solve the issue were presented. According to one delegation, the burden of indicating to which spacecraft the collateral attached would be better put on the holder of an interest in that collateral, since the financier against the whole spacecraft could not be expected to conduct a search on all parts of that spacecraft. One observer, on the other hand, would rather put the onus on the searching creditor since such a creditor would reasonably conduct a thorough research of all objects which might be linked to the prospective collateral.

28. After observing that the latter issue would have to be further discussed, *the Chairman* adjourned the session of the Commission to the following day.

29. In resuming the session, *the Chairman* announced that a useful list of answers and further questions had been sent to the Preparatory Commission by the representatives of Thales Alenia Space Italia and asked Sir Roy Goode's opinion on the possibility to reach a consensus on the identification criteria for pre- and post-launch for satellites.

30. *Sir Roy Goode*, referring to consultations with Mr Cowan, noted that consensus had been reached for both pre- and post-launch registration on the need to provide the name of the manufacturer and the model of the collateral, plus the serial number if existing. Should such number not be available, two possibilities were envisaged: either to ask the manufacturer to provide a serial number (failing compliance, registration of the interest on the collateral would not be feasible), or to make use of the classification number of the UN Registration Convention as an alternative identifier for post-launch registration. Either of the two solutions would present some practical problems. He felt that more input would be needed from industry to understand how much finance was provided when the space asset had already been launched and whether it would be commercially unreasonable to exclude from registration all assets that did not have a serial number. For this reason, he suggested that a revised version of Section 5.3 would be circulated to Preparatory Commission's members in good time to allow its consideration at the 3<sup>rd</sup> Session of the Preparatory Commission.

31. In the discussion following Sir Roy Goode's statement, the proposal to make use of the UN Registration Convention classification as an alternative to the serial number was not favoured. Moreover, a number of delegations expressed the view that agreement on at least a part of Section 5.3 could already be reached before the end of the session, leaving aside only the question of the additional criteria (which could be further considered during the inter-sessional period before the next session of the Commission).

32. On the issue of the expected timeframe of activity of the Preparatory Commission, *The Secretary-General* observed that a 3<sup>rd</sup> meeting of the Commission would be in any case needed in 2014 in order to discuss the draft Request for Proposals. He suggested that the Preparatory Commission could meet at the headquarters of UNIDROIT on 11-12 September 2014. That should provide enough time for the preparation of a draft of the Regulations that the Commission could approve at that meeting and for including the text in the ITU's documentation for the Assembly of the Plenipotentiaries (to be held during the last two weeks of October 2014). He further suggested that following Sir Roy Goode's indication of those parts of the current draft of the Regulation which would need to be revised, all the remaining provisions could be considered as having been

approved in principle by the Preparatory Commission at the current session, unless comments were raised on them. This would ensure that the Preparatory Commission would receive a completed revised draft well in advance of the September session.

33. *The Chairman* endorsed that suggestion and asked Sir Roy Goode to point out which provisions of the draft Regulations would need revision.

34. *Sir Roy Goode* first referred to the provisions on controlled entities, recalling that the Preparatory Commission, following Mr Cowan's advice, was willing to delete them. In practice, this would mean deletion of Section 2.1.7 (definition of a controlled entity) and Section 4.3 (substantive regulation of controlled entities). He then addressed Section 5.3, observing that while there was no disagreement on the indicated pre-launch identification criteria, further thought should be given to the drafting of the whole Section 5.3 for reasons of consistency. Moreover he mentioned that the issue of physically linked assets had not been settled; in his opinion, no provision on this issue should be contained in the draft Regulations because it would seem to be a matter concerning the enforcement of a creditor's rights.

35. *The Chairman* opened the discussion on Sir Roy Goode's statement. One observer having informed the Commission that in practice, at least one financing company known to them separately financed parts of spacecrafts, the issue of how to deal with registration of interests on parts of a spacecraft was more generally debated. *Sir Roy Goode* stressed that clarification would be needed as to which parts of a spacecraft were to be considered "bankable" i.e. capable, in practice, of being separately financed. The key issue would thus be how to avoid the inclusion of parts with no independent economic significance. As an example, he mentioned antennae as parts of transponders. One delegation was of the opinion that although financing of parts of spacecrafts and in particular transponders was a reality in the market, such financing was not structured as asset-based financing but as corporate or project financing, thereby sidestepping the issue of the precise identification of the collateral and all its parts. According to them, this issue was not ripe for discussion and should be postponed for the time being. As a consequence, also the question of physically linked assets could be postponed, since the potential problems relating to physically linked assets would arise almost exclusively when collateral other than a spacecraft was involved. Several other delegations, however, strongly felt that regulations for the registration of international interests on such collateral were essential to reach the purposes of the Protocol. This was considered particularly true for transponders that could be easily identified by two criteria, namely the serial number and the frequency band, as demonstrated also by the information given during the morning visit. On the other hand, identification criteria for payloads would be less evident and should be further discussed. One observer, however, pointed out that the identification of transponders may also be problematic especially taking into account the interconnection of virtual components of transponders. The possibility to consult with manufacturers to understand how they concretely identify their products was suggested. There was also a suggestion to refer to the definition of an asset according to accounting practice that took into account the capability of the asset to produce a cash-flow and not the tangible or intangible nature of its components.

36. As a possible roadmap for further discussion *the Secretary-General* noted that Art. I (k) of the Space Protocol contemplated three (non-exclusive) categories of space assets: (i) a spacecraft; (ii) a payload, in respect of which a separate registration may be effected in accordance with the regulations; (iii) a part of a spacecraft or payload such as a transponder, in respect of which a separate registration may be effected in accordance with the regulations. He suggested that regarding Art. I (k) (i) of the Protocol, Section 5.3 (c) (i)-(iii) of the draft Regulations already contained some identification criteria tentatively agreed upon by the Commission. Thus, Professor Goode and the Preparatory Commission would have to consider the registration criteria for the

other two types of space assets mentioned in the Protocol, bearing in mind that transponders may represent the most relevant of them. Current financing practice, though not necessarily asset-based, may nevertheless offer some guidance if space assets were found to be identified for other purposes. Nothing prevented the Regulations to be amended at a later stage in order to take future developments into account.

37. *The Chairman* proceeded to sum up the results of the deliberations of the Preparatory Commission in order to ascertain whether consensus had been reached on some elements of Section 5.3 of the draft Regulations. As far as satellites and other spacecrafts were concerned, there was agreement on requiring the indication of the manufacturer's name and the collateral's serial number. After some discussion, the relevance of the "marketing" name of the satellite was denied, while there was no clear consensus on whether the indication of the generic model designation of the satellite was superfluous as an additional identification criterion. Thus, it was proposed, for the time being, to keep the reference to the generic model and to delete the words "contract number or other unique identifier" (currently in square brackets in the draft Regulations).

38. In relation to post-launch registration in the absence of a serial number, the general feeling of the Commission went in the direction of obtaining such a number, either from the manufacturer or, failing this, from the registrar. On the other hand, the need to resort to further additional criteria, such as the UN Register number or the COSPAR was questioned.

39. As to information on launch (name of launch provider, date and UTC) two delegations were of the opinion that such data should be additionally required in a post-launch situation. Other participants, however, considered that such information (and possibly even additional information, if felt necessary after further reflections on the issue) would be relevant for the sole purpose of allowing the registrar to issue a serial number in the absence of such a number provided by the manufacturer.

40. Upon a request of clarification by one delegation, *Sir Roy Goode* confirmed that the identification criteria for satellites would be applicable to all spacecrafts.

41. Upon another query by the *Deputy Secretary-General* and after a general discussion it was clarified that a search on the registry by an interested party in the absence of a manufacturer serial number could be conducted by typing in the launch data in order to verify whether a serial number had been issued by the Registrar.

42. *The Chairman* noted that the identification criteria for transponders were still open and invited the Commission to continue its discussion through electronic means in order to enable the drafting of a revised version of the Regulations by *Sir Roy Goode*.

***Item No. 6 on the agenda – Consideration of matters relating to the appointment of a Supervisory Authority***

43. *The Chairman* opened the discussion on Item No. 6 of the Agenda by inviting the representatives of ITU to take the floor.

44. *The representative of ITU* reaffirmed the interest of his organisation for accepting the role of Supervisory Authority for the future Registry for space assets. He informed the Preparatory Commission on the forthcoming ITU meetings during which the question would be discussed. While a final decision would be taken by the Conference of Plenipotentiaries at the end of October, the matter would be first considered in the ITU Council Session in May. He announced that a list of practical questions concerning the precise role of the Supervisory Authority and its liabilities would be sent to the UNIDROIT Secretariat shortly. In particular, reference to the experience of ICAO as



Supervisory Authority for the Aircraft Registry would be most useful. He asked whether a response could be received by mid-February in order to consider it in the preparation of the report for the Council, that would have to be sent by the end of February.

45. *The Chairman*, after consultations with UNIDROIT Secretariat, confirmed that a memorandum clarifying the precise role of the Supervisory Authority as well as liability issues in response to the questions posed by the representative of ITU would be prepared by the Secretariat within the requested deadline.

46. In response to a question by one delegation as to whether alternative candidates for the role of Supervisory Authority should be considered, *the Secretary-General* referred to Resolution No 2 of the Final Act of the Berlin Diplomatic Conference that, taking into account the expression of interest by the representative of the ITU during the diplomatic Conference, invited the governing bodies of ITU 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. Since the Preparatory Commission was working on the assumption that there would be no problems with such a designation it would be premature to speculate on possible alternatives.

47. One delegation underlined the importance for members of the Preparatory Commission to enter in contact with the delegates of their own States at ITU in order to give clarifications if needed on the issue to be decided by ITU; they furthermore informed the Commission that before the ITU Council session a meeting of European delegations would take place in March.

48. In the absence of further questions or requests for the floor, the discussion on Item 6 was concluded.

***Item No. 7 on the agenda – Consideration of the issue of the drafting of a request for proposals for the selection of a Registrar***

49. *The Chairman* opened the discussion on Item No. 7 on the agenda by inviting Mr Bernhard Schmidt-Tedd, the Chairman of Working Group II on the drafting of a Request for Proposals for the selection of a Registrar, to take the floor.

50. *The Chairman of Working Group II (RFP)* reported that for the time being, informal discussions had been commenced on how to proceed with the Request for Proposals but that the relevant paperwork could be prepared for the 3<sup>rd</sup> session of the Preparatory Commission in September. It would be useful, however, to obtain the opinion of the Commission on whether direct negotiations with potential candidates would be a better option than organising a formal bidding procedure, taking into account that responses to the Request for Proposals were expected to be very limited in number. He suggested that the Commission could already decide on a deadline for presentation of expressions of interests on the part of potential candidates.

51. *The Secretary-General* warned against setting an excessively short deadline for expressions of interest on the part of potential candidates, since an assessment of the business case for the Space Registry before soliciting expressions of interest would be necessary. The possibility that a particular State were interested in the operation of the Registry or in setting up a joint-venture with private companies could not be excluded from the outset. *The Chairman of the Commission* suggested that discussions on these points continued through electronic communications among the members of Working Group II in order for a broader consensus to be reached. It was so agreed.

52. *The Secretary-General* further informed the Commission that Sir Roy Goode would be able to circulate a revised draft of the Regulations in consultation with the members of Working Group I

and benefiting from the practical advice of lenders, manufactures and operators by May 2014. He observed that it was understood that the redraft would be limited to those points that were identified as still under discussion while the remaining sections of the Regulations were considered to have been approved in principle by the Commission. Thus, even if the revised draft would not be definitively approved before the ITU Council session in May, it could be noted that by that time 90% of the Regulations would have been approved in principle, that the Commission was given a deadline for comments and that the entire Regulations would be presented for final approval at the September session of the Commission. At the same session a clearer picture of the proceedings for a Request for Proposals would also be available.

**Item No 8 on the agenda – Timetable and planning of future work**

53. *The Chairman* summed up the timeline for the future work of the Commission as follows:
- Mid-February 2014: deadline for the UNIDROIT Secretariat's response to the list of questions posed by the ITU on the role of the Supervisory Authority;
  - Mid-February 2014: deadline for the Report on the second session of the Preparatory Commission;
  - May 2014: circulation of the revised draft of the Regulations prepared by Sir Roy Goode after consultations with delegates and industry experts;
  - Inter-sessional period: discussion of how to proceed with the Request for Proposals and preparation of a draft Request for Proposals;
  - September 11-12, 2014: Third session of the Preparatory Commission (with the aim of approving the completed Regulations).

**Item No 9 on the agenda – Any other business**

54. In the absence of any other point to be addressed *The Chairman* closed the second session of the Space Preparatory Commission.

-----

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

CHINA (PEOPLE'S REPUBLIC OF)

Mr WANG Jianbo  
Deputy Director  
Department of Treaty and Law  
Ministry of Commerce  
*Beijing*  
e-mail: [wangjianbo@mofcom.gov.cn](mailto:wangjianbo@mofcom.gov.cn)

Mr WANG Cheng  
Department of System Engineering  
China National Space Administration  
*Beijing*

Ms WANG Jilian  
General Manager  
Department of Legal Affairs  
China Great Wall Industry Corporation  
*Beijing*  
e-mail: [wangjl@cqwic.com](mailto:wangjl@cqwic.com)

Ms ZHANG Zhiping  
Managing Partner  
Filong Law Firm  
*Beijing*  
e-mail: [zhiping999@hotmail.com](mailto:zhiping999@hotmail.com)

FRANCE

M. Jean-Baptiste BOUSQUET  
Centre National d'Etudes Spatiales  
*Paris*  
e-mail: [jean-baptiste.bousquet@cnes.fr](mailto:jean-baptiste.bousquet@cnes.fr)

GERMANY

Ms Vera WEISSFLOG  
Legal Adviser  
Federal Ministry of Justice and Consumer  
Protection  
*Berlin*  
e-mail: [weissflog-ve@bmj.bund.de](mailto:weissflog-ve@bmj.bund.de)

Mr Bernhard SCHMIDT-TEDD  
**(First Vice-Chair; Chair of Working  
Group on RFP)**

Head of Legal Support  
German Space Agency  
*Bonn*  
e-mail: [bernhard.schmidt-tedd@dlr.de](mailto:bernhard.schmidt-tedd@dlr.de)

Mr Georg HAMPE  
Legal Director  
EADS Astrium  
*München*  
e-mail: [georg.hampe@astrium.eads.net](mailto:georg.hampe@astrium.eads.net)

ITALY

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

RUSSIAN FEDERATION

Ms Olga A. VOLYNSKAYA  
International Law Counsel  
International Cooperation and Contractual  
Department  
Russian Space Agency (Roscosmos)  
*Moscow*  
e-mail: [aoerjia88@mail.ru](mailto:aoerjia88@mail.ru)

Mr Igor N. POROKHIN  
**(Chair of Working Group on registry regulations)**  
Partner  
Inspace Consulting (Russia) L.L.C.  
*Moscow*  
e-mail: [igor.porokhin@magnussonlaw.com](mailto:igor.porokhin@magnussonlaw.com)

SAUDI ARABIA

Mr Mohamed TARABZOUNI  
Director  
Space Research Institute  
Office for Peaceful Uses of Outer Space  
King Abdulaziz City for Science and  
Technology  
*Riyadh*

Mr Jilowey N. ALQAHTANI  
Permanent Mission of Saudi Arabia to the  
IAEA - Saudi Arabia Embassy in Austria  
*Vienna*

## SOUTH AFRICA

Mr Theunis KOTZE  
State Law Adviser (IL)  
Department of International Relations and  
Co-operation  
*Pretoria*  
e-mail: [Kotzet@dirco.gov.za](mailto: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](mailto:SchnabelTR@state.gov)

Mr Luis EMERY  
Assistant General Counsel for  
Transportation  
Import-Export Bank of the United States  
of America  
*Washington, D.C. 20571*  
e-mail: [louis.emery@exim.gov](mailto:louis.emery@exim.gov)

Mr Steven HARRIS  
Professor of Law  
Chicago-Kent College of Law  
*Chicago, IL*  
e-mail: [sharris@kentlaw.edu](mailto:sharris@kentlaw.edu)

**INTERNATIONAL ORGANISATIONS**INTERNATIONAL TELECOMMUNICATIONS  
UNION (ITU)

Mr Yvon HENRI  
Chief  
Space Services Department  
Place des Nations  
*Geneva*  
e-mail: [yvon.henri@itu.int](mailto:yvon.henri@itu.int)

Mr Arnaud GUILLOT  
Conseiller juridique  
Unité des affaires juridiques (JUR)  
*Geneva*  
e-mail: [arnaud.guillot@itu.int](mailto: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@thalesaleniaspace.com](mailto:francesco.amicucci@thalesaleniaspace.com)

Ms Nancy ESKENAZI  
Vice President Legal Services  
Global Regulatory  
SES S.A.  
*Betzdorf*  
e-mail: [nancy.eskenazi@ses.com](mailto:nancy.eskenazi@ses.com)

Mr Oliver HEINRICH  
Partner  
BHO Legal  
*Cologne*  
e-mail: [Oliver.Heinrich@bho-legal.com](mailto:Oliver.Heinrich@bho-legal.com)

**OTHER**

Mr Rob COWAN  
Managing Director  
Aviareto Limited  
*Dublin*  
e-mail: [rob.cowan@aviareto.aero](mailto:rob.cowan@aviareto.aero)

Sir Roy GOODE  
Emeritus Professor of Law  
University of Oxford  
*Oxford*  
*Adviser to the UNIDROIT Secretariat*  
e-mail: [roy.goode@law.ox.ac.uk](mailto:roy.goode@law.ox.ac.uk)

**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 Secretary-General
2. Visit of Thales Alenia Space premises in Rome, in particular with a view of obtaining information on the practical implications of the draft Space Regulations
3. Adoption of the agenda and organisation of the business of the session
4. Consideration of the Explanatory Note to the revised draft Space Regulations prepared by Prof. Sir Roy Goode
5. Consideration of other points concerning the revised text of the draft Space Regulations
6. Consideration of matters relating to the appointment of a Supervisory Authority
7. Consideration of the issue of the drafting of 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**

**VISIT of UNIDROIT**  
International Institute for the Unification of Private Law  
**TO**  
**THALES ALENIA SPACE ITALIA**  
**Rome, January 27th 2014**

*AGENDA*

- 09:00      *Transfer Via Panisperna, 28- Thales Alenia Space*
- 10:15      *Welcome and Introduction*  
*F.Amicucci, General Counsel Thales Alenia Space Italia*
- 10:20-  
11:20      *Presentation: Thales Alenia Space Italia*  
*R.Somma, Senior Advisor Thales Alenia Space Italia*
- 11:30-  
13:30      *Transfer to Via Tiburtina Plant and Visit at the Satellite Integration Center*  
*E. Baruffi, Deputy and Director Industrial Coordination, facilities, logistics & Technical Procurement*  
  
*G.Di Sanza, Competence Center Platform & Integration Italia, AIT Center Rome Responsible*
- 13.30-14.30      *Buffet Lunch*
- 14:30      *End of the visit*  
*Transfer Thales Alenia Space- Via Panisperna, 28*