

Third United Nations Conference on the Law of the Sea

1973-1982

Concluded at Montego Bay, Jamaica on 10 December 1982

Document:-

A/CONF.62/C.3/SR.24

24th meeting of the Third Committee

Extract from the *Official Records of the Third United Nations Conference on the Law of the Sea, Volume IV (Summary Records, Plenary, General Committee, First, Second and Third Committees, as well as Documents of the Conference, Third Session)*

41. For many, the denial of freedom of fundamental scientific research within the economic zone implicit in the proposal submitted on behalf of the Group of 77 was wholly unacceptable, because they believed it essential for that freedom to be given legal recognition in the convention, inasmuch as its exercise was to the advantage not only of the developed countries, but of all mankind. It would be dangerous and unrealistic to confer upon an international authority the right to regulate scientific research, as it would not have the financial resources, equipment or staff, and States would be unwilling to allow any interference with the activities of their scientific institutions. However, an international authority could certainly promote co-operation in scientific research related to the international sea-bed area and its resources.

42. Miss AGUTA (Nigeria) supported the proposal submitted on behalf of the Group of 77, which, together with the socialist countries' proposal, provided the elements of a compromise for the Committee to work on at the following session. She reserved the right to comment on the Netherlands proposal (A/CONF.62/C.3/L.28) at a later stage because of the implications it had for land-locked and geographically disadvantaged States, of which there were a number in the African continent.

43. Mr. AL ASFOOR (Oman) said that it was most important to protect the legitimate rights of coastal States and developing countries with regard to scientific research. He supported the proposal submitted on behalf of the Group of 77 in the belief that the consent of the coastal State should be obtained before any research was under-

taken either by a State or by an international organization, and that the coastal State had the right to stop or cancel any scientific research project which failed to comply with the conditions agreed upon.

44. The International Sea-Bed Authority should be responsible for the conduct of scientific research in the international area.

45. Mr. WALKATE (Netherlands) said that the proposal submitted by his delegation on behalf of the group of land-locked and other geographically disadvantaged States in document A/CONF.62/C.3/L.28 complemented that submitted by 17 delegations concerning a notification system, in document A/CONF.62/C.3/L.19. The notification system in that text had not been fully understood; it provided for the right by the coastal State to participate in research within its economic zone through qualified experts. The coastal State would decide who the experts would be and, if it had none, might ask for the assistance of an international organization. The aim of the proposal was to allay the justified concern of coastal States about the proposed system and to enable them to object, when appropriate, to the way in which the agreed conditions for carrying out the research were being fulfilled and to suspend preparations for the research project, if necessary.

46. In view of the late hour, he would postpone the rest of his comments until the following meeting.

The meeting rose at 1.20 p.m.

24th meeting

Wednesday, 7 May 1975, at 3.40 p.m.

Chairman: Mr. A. YANKOV (Bulgaria).

Development and transfer of technology (*continued*)* [Agenda item 14]

Scientific research (*concluded*) [Agenda item 13]

1. Mr. WALKATE (Netherlands), continuing his statement begun at the previous meeting concerning the comments made on his delegation's proposals (A/CONF.62/C.3/L.28), said that the document proposed a two-phase settlement of disputes procedure. During the first phase, discussions would take place between the research and the coastal State with a view to solving any difficulties that might have arisen. If they did not yield results, impartial experts would be called in, and if neither of the parties was convinced by the experts' advice the general procedures for the settlement of disputes would be followed: that would constitute the second phase. The concision of the draft articles might have made the procedure appear more complicated than it really was.

2. The second and final phase had to be a settlement by a third party, but as third-party settlements at the State level were usually very protracted and costly, his delegation

favoured a procedure in which experts might be called in, as that would be expeditious and therefore in the interests of all the parties concerned.

3. A convention without a satisfactory third-party settlement procedure would be unacceptable.

4. Mr. VARGAS (Mexico), introducing draft articles on marine scientific research (A/CONF.62/C.3/L.29), said that they were the culmination of a process which had begun after the second session. They incorporated ideas advanced by a great many delegations and had been prepared in consultation with them. The proposals were inspired by the conviction that in future marine scientific research would be extremely important for the developing countries.

5. One of the best ways of promoting scientific progress was the free flow of ideas, and that was the reason for the provisions in draft article 7 concerning bilateral, regional and multilateral agreements. Most participants in the Conference, including his own delegation, favoured a legal régime requiring the coastal State's consent to research. Others preferred a system requiring notification to the coastal State and participation by it. The new draft articles sought to reconcile the two schools of thought and to protect the interests of both coastal and research States.

* Resumed from the 22nd meeting.

6. The sponsors were aware of the great difficulty of distinguishing between fundamental and applied research, but experience showed that scientists acting in good faith could differentiate between activities which were traditionally described as fundamental research and research directed to the discovery and utilization of marine resources, both renewable and non-renewable. Such distinctions might be artificial, but with the development of science and technology all countries would wish to intensify the latter type of research so as to strengthen their economies, while at the same time preserving the marine environment for the benefit of future generations.

7. Miss AGUTA (Nigeria) said that her delegation had joined in sponsoring the proposal in order to facilitate further negotiations: it did not represent her delegation's final position. The sponsors, in trying to achieve a compromise, had borrowed ideas from documents A/CONF.62/C.3/L.13/Rev.2, L.17, 26 and 28.

8. Mr. OSPINA HERNANDEZ (Colombia) said that his delegation had sponsored the new draft articles in the belief that scientific research was essential and that such a proposal would advance the negotiations. There were two schools of thought about research, that of some developed countries and that of the developing countries. The latter were trying to expand their scientific capability and technology so as to narrow the gap between themselves and the developed countries, whereas developed countries feared that the measures advocated by the developing countries would hamper or discourage research. The problem lay in the lack of trust between the two groups, and it was his hope that the proposal would help to overcome that.

9. The sponsors were proposing that the research State should decide whether a given project was pure or applied marine research. If its decision was accepted by the coastal State, implementation of the project could go ahead. If the coastal State objected, and the issue could not be settled by direct talks, the parties could have recourse to independent experts. Such arrangements would obviate arbitrary action by either State.

10. Mr. TREVES (Italy) said that no substantial measure of agreement on marine scientific research had been achieved at the current session. However, the four-Power draft articles (A/CONF.62/C.3/L.29), together with the proposals in documents A/CONF.62/C.3/L.19 and 28, provided a range of compromises for the Committee to work on. In addition, the socialist countries in their draft articles (A/CONF.62/C.3/L.26) had sought to find a balance between the interests of coastal and research States.

11. He welcomed the fact that article 7, paragraph 5, of the four-Power draft articles incorporated the essence of an idea put forward by his delegation in the Committee on the Peaceful Uses of the Sea-Bed and the Ocean Floor beyond the Limits of National Jurisdiction, to wit, that the research State could proceed with a fundamental research project if within 120 days it received no acknowledgement of receipt of its communication to the coastal State. He also welcomed the inclusion of provisions, however inadequate, on the settlement of disputes.

12. However, the four-Power proposal as a whole was not acceptable. It failed to mention research in the territorial sea. Moreover, it conferred upon the coastal State, as did the socialist countries' proposal, the residual power to decide whether research in the economic zone was or was not related to resources; that provision was unacceptable to

his delegation. Some of the provisions of draft article 8 were not entirely satisfactory because they might extend the competence of the coastal State beyond the economic zone.

13. Mr. HERNANDEZ DE ARMAS (Cuba) said that Cuba, a geographically disadvantaged country, had made large investments in its fishing and merchant fleets and in hydrographic research as part of its efforts to satisfy the growing needs of its people—needs which could not be confined within a line drawn 40 or 50 miles from its coasts. It had made appreciable progress in developing its research capability and in training of technical staff, aided by international co-operation—largely with FAO—and assistance under bilateral agreements with the Soviet Union and other socialist countries.

14. He welcomed the four-Power proposal, which should assist the Committee to produce a single text on the subject. It rightly included a provision requiring the coastal State's consent to and its participation in research in the economic zone, and on the continental shelf, thus safeguarding that State's sovereignty over living and non-living resources: such a requirement was indispensable for developing countries. In his delegation's view, however, the proposal erred in giving the coastal State the right to veto research projects not related to the resources of the economic zone. The interests of the coastal State would surely be adequately safeguarded by a requirement that it be notified of the purposes of the project and by its right to participate in the research. Moreover, the uncertainty so created would discourage research and harm the interests of the developing coastal States concerned.

15. Mr. TAYLOR (United Kingdom) commended the positive movement reflected in the four-Power draft articles. Some of the sponsoring delegations had stated at Caracas that it was artificial to differentiate between fundamental and applied research because both were stages of the same process, but they had come to recognize that the distinction could be made and were prepared to apply a more liberal régime to fundamental research—a change of attitude that would be welcomed by scientists. The difficulties of differentiating between the two were not confined to marine scientific research: indeed, any attempt to divide a body of knowledge into separate compartments could not escape imprecision and overlapping, and that was why a single régime had been suggested for marine scientific research. At the same time, that approach had serious drawbacks. It assumed a degree of homogeneity which existed only at the university level and would mean one régime for two dissimilar types of activity—pure and applied research.

16. He was pleased to note that in contrast to the proposal in document A/CONF.62/C.3/L.13/Rev.2, according to which marine scientific research in the international sea-bed area would be conducted through the International Sea-Bed Authority itself, thus giving the Authority direct and effective control at all times over the research, a more liberal attitude was advocated in the four-Power draft articles.

17. In spite of the fact that the document showed a pronounced bias in favour of the coastal State, some change of attitude in that regard had taken place, though not enough. The period of 120 days for the reply by the coastal State was far too long and should be substantially reduced, perhaps by half. He assumed that the third party referred to in article 7, paragraph 9 was the arbiter.

18. He was concerned about the implications of the requirement for the coastal State's consent to resource research programmes to be co-ordinated, and occasionally carried out, by recognized international organizations such as the International Council for the Exploration of the Sea (ICES). An ICES programme concerning fish-stock breeding might involve the economic zone of several States which might not necessarily all be members of the organization, and the programme could consequently be blocked. His delegation also deplored the proposed constraints on publication and the undertaking to supply raw data, both of which would be anathema to scientists.

19. Mr. MBOTE (Kenya) welcomed document A/CONF.62/C.3/L.29. He considered, however, that the draft articles were based on two false assumptions. First, the document implied that only States and international organizations conducted marine research, whereas, in the experience of his country, individuals also engaged in such activities. Secondly, it was surprising that the sponsors included delegations which had been associated with the preparation of document A/CONF.62/C.3/L.13/Rev.2, which did not distinguish between fundamental and resource-oriented research, unlike the new document. Despite statements to the contrary in the Committee, scientists acknowledged that it was impossible to distinguish between pure and applied research until the results were evaluated.

20. His delegation rejected the provisions of article 7, paragraph 5 (b). States should not be subjected to such requirements, and the failure of a coastal State to reply to a request to conduct scientific research in its economic zone should be regarded as a refusal to permit the activities.

21. His delegation considered that article 7, paragraph 9, was out of place since no "appropriate United Nations body" existed. Paragraph 10 of that article was also unacceptable since it prevented the coastal State from taking immediate action in the event of non-compliance with the conditions governing the conduct of a research project; the proposed arrangements were, in any event, unworkable. Article 9 was superfluous, since there was no reason to differentiate between marine research vessels and other vessels.

22. He welcomed the fact that the sponsors had remained faithful to the concept of residual rights for coastal States. In that connexion, his delegation regarded the provisions of the third paragraph of article 7, paragraph 9 as equivalent to the concept of coastal State consent and held that the coastal State might make use of those provisions to block scientific research projects.

23. Miss MARIANI (France) commended the sponsors of document A/CONF.62/C.3/L.29 on their effort to achieve a compromise. She welcomed the reference to the "rights of neighbouring developing land-locked States and other geographically disadvantaged States" in article 4. Other valuable features were the distinction drawn between fundamental and resource-oriented research, and the provision for recourse to experts in the settlement of disputes.

24. With regard to the provisions of article 7, paragraph 5 (b), her delegation preferred the more positive approach used in document A/CONF.62/C.3/L.26. Moreover, it contended that the procedure for the settlement of disputes should not leave the final decision to the coastal State alone, as contemplated in article 7, paragraph 9. Similarly, research projects should be suspended or terminated only in exceptional circumstances; the absence of safeguards in that respect would hinder scientific progress.

25. It was to be hoped that the sponsors would find it possible to clarify the distinction between fundamental and resource-oriented research. Her delegation would also welcome the inclusion of provisions to ensure that the coastal State could not prevent the conduct of a fundamental research project unless a group of experts advised against it.

26. It believed that scientific research in the international area should be unrestricted and should not be subject to the consent of either a coastal State or the proposed International Authority.

27. Mr. JAIN (India) said he regretted that the sponsors had not given notice of their intention to other members of the Group of 77. Though well-intentioned, their attempt to achieve a compromise was premature.

28. The document contained separate provisions for fundamental and resource-oriented research. Some of the sponsors, however, had earlier maintained that it was impossible to distinguish between the two forms of research.

29. Although it understood their purpose, his delegation could not support the provisions of draft article 7, paragraph 5 (b). Furthermore, the sponsors would have included specific objective criteria among the provisions on the settlement of disputes.

30. Mr. TIKHONOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) said that the attempt by the sponsors to differentiate between fundamental and applied research and to establish separate conditions for them was a welcome move towards compromise. Unfortunately, however, the provisions of draft article 7, paragraphs 8 and 9, showed that the sponsors had not abandoned their original position in the case of non-resource-oriented research. Their approach was not acceptable to his delegation. Furthermore, his delegation rejected the requirement that research States should comply with the provisions of those paragraphs prior to initiating a research project. The financing and organization of a research project had to be completed well in advance of implementation and could not go ahead if there was a risk of permission being refused or of having scientists and expensive equipment kept idle pending a decision by the coastal State.

31. He failed to see how conciliation machinery could be used until a research project was under way. When it was in progress, however, the coastal State's scientists on board the research vessels could establish whether the research was fundamental or resource-oriented. Moreover, he considered that the complicated procedure envisaged in the case of research in the international sea-bed area could be avoided and the problem resolved by the publication of the appropriate scientific data in the scientific bulletins of such organizations as the Intergovernmental Oceanographic Commission.

32. Mr. YUSUF (Somalia) said that his delegation could not support document A/CONF.62/C.3/L.29, which contained the same untenable artificial distinction between pure and applied scientific research as document A/CONF.62/C.3/L.26. It rejected the arbitration procedure outlined in the new draft articles, since it was based on the assumption that such a distinction was possible.

33. With regard to draft article 7, paragraph 5 (b), his delegation, unlike the sponsors, considered that the lack of a reply from a coastal State should be regarded as rejection of an application to conduct scientific research. Many

developing countries might not be in a position to assess within the short period proposed the information submitted to them. His delegation strongly objected to the provisions of paragraph 10 of draft article 7 and had serious reservations concerning draft article 8.

34. Mr. FINUCANE (Ireland) commended the sponsors on their comprehensive and flexible approach. They had managed to incorporate in their proposal a large number of the elements of documents A/CONF.62/C.3/L.13, 19, 26 and 28.

35. One of the main problems arising in connexion with marine scientific research was the lack of dialogue between researching and coastal States, which could lead to mutual suspicion and to arbitrary refusals and delays in the granting of consent to the conduct of such activities. The sponsors had attempted to establish international guidelines which would be entrenched in a convention and which would make arbitrary refusal more difficult. At the same time, the rights of the coastal State would be protected, since it would participate in the process from the beginning.

36. His delegation attached the utmost importance to the provisions outlining a ladder approach to arbitration. With regard to the remark by the representative of Kenya concerning the third paragraph of article 7, paragraph 9, it was the understanding of his delegation that the sponsors intended that paragraph to be considered in the context of the draft article as a whole and not in isolation, as the representative of Kenya had seemed to imply.

37. Mr. FIGUEIREDO BUSTANI (Brazil) said he found it surprising that the developing countries which were sponsors of the document should have introduced in article 7 provisions which were, in practice, equivalent to a notification régime.

38. His delegation maintained that it was not possible to distinguish between pure and applied research. Consequently, it was not convinced that draft article 7, paragraph 3, was sufficient to ensure that the researching State would inform the coastal State of the exact nature of each research project. Similarly, if a consent régime was effective, the proposed procedure for the settlement of disputes would be superfluous. Furthermore, the six-month time-limit envisaged in article 7, paragraph 10, was unacceptable to his delegation.

39. The provisions relating to the conduct of scientific research in the international area were tantamount to absolute freedom of research, a concept which his delegation had consistently rejected.

40. It was regrettable that every attempt to achieve compromise on the problems relating to scientific research should result in diminishing the rights of the coastal State and produce no concessions by researching States.

41. Mr. HUSSAIN (Pakistan) said that he regarded the decision to submit the four-Power draft articles in document A/CONF.62/C.3/L.29 as untimely, since they differed substantially from the proposal submitted on behalf of the Group of 77 in document A/CONF.62/C.3/L.13/Rev.2.

42. His delegation was one of those which considered that it was not possible to distinguish between fundamental and resource-oriented scientific research, and it was opposed to the provisions of articles 2 and 7 of the four-Power draft articles which implied that researching States had the right to engage in fundamental scientific research in the eco-

omic zones of other States. Those provisions were contrary to the concept of coastal States' residual powers in their economic zones.

43. It was the view of his delegation that the coastal State should have the exclusive right to regulate all research activities in its economic zone. Consequently, it could not accept the provisions of articles 5 and 7. Furthermore, it considered that disputes between the coastal State and the researching State should be settled by bilateral negotiations without the intervention of any third party.

44. With regard to article 8, his delegation considered that the International Authority should have over-all control of research activities in the international area, including the water column.

45. Mr. PONS (El Salvador) said that the sponsors of document A/CONF.62/C.3/L.29 had endeavoured to offer a constructive solution to the problems which had arisen with regard to marine scientific research by including in their draft articles any points on which consensus had been reached at either the previous or the current session and reconciling interests on which there had been semi-consensus, bearing in mind the need to encourage marine scientific research in the interests of the survival of humanity. They hoped that the document could serve as a basis for future discussions and appealed to all delegations to study it carefully with that end in view.

46. It was because no law could be valid without a competent institution to administer it that reference had been made in article 7 to an "appropriate United Nations body".

47. Mr. RAMADAN (Egypt) said that the document under discussion differed from other documents on the subject in that it distinguished between pure and resource-oriented scientific research. It was difficult to decide what pure research actually covered. The document was not clear with regard to the participation of coastal States in research carried out in the waters within their jurisdiction, and the actual role of the scientist of the coastal State within the team of experts working on the research vessel was not specified. Moreover, some provisions in the document could be said to depend on distinguishing between raw results of research and processed data.

48. The document was, however, a step towards compromise and should be studied with an open mind, since everything could be perfected through discussion. He would state his final position on the subject at the following session.

49. Mr. JARAMILLO DEL CASTILLO (Ecuador) said it was regrettable that the views expressed in document A/CONF.62/C.3/L.29 had not been brought to the notice of the Group of 77 when it was studying the proposals for draft articles which had subsequently been issued as document A/CONF.62/C.3/L.13/Rev.2. The proposals in the document under discussion required careful study, and he would comment on only two points. The first was that, whereas the proposals required the distinction between pure and resource-oriented research to be made only at the time when the research State was submitting its proposals, the nature of the research could really be known only after it had been carried out and the results analysed. The second was the proposal in article 7, paragraph 10, that the coastal State should passively contemplate the harm that research was doing to its marine environment for six months before requesting an opinion from the appropriate United Nations

body. In his delegation's view, scientific research in the zone under the jurisdiction of the coastal State should be carried out only with that State's consent, and no arbitration was acceptable from any other party.

50. Mr. KOLCHAKOV (Bulgaria) said that his delegation had had little time to study document A/CONF.62/C.3/L.29. Nevertheless, the new draft articles were clearly an improvement on document A/CONF.62/C.3/L.13/Rev.2, and he hoped that they might enable a compromise to be reached at the following session. He had many reservations about the document, but he realized that it was only through compromise that a convention would be produced. The drafting of final articles on the subject of marine scientific research would call for a thorough study of documents A/CONF.62/C.3/L.26, 28 and 29, and of all other documents quoted in them. Document A/CONF.62/C.3/L.29 represented a sincere effort at compromise and, with goodwill on the part of all participants, might soon result in the drafting of a consolidated text.

51. Mr. CACERES ENRIQUEZ (Peru) said that the participants' awareness of the need to produce generally acceptable texts had been apparent at all the meetings of informal groups at the current session. Although the sponsors of document A/CONF.62/C.3/L.29 had been active in the discussions which had culminated in the consensus of the Group of 77 on document A/CONF.62/C.3/L.13/Rev.2, the document they had just submitted showed a completely different approach to the problems. It was a combination of two concepts, the consent régime and the notification régime. Many speakers had referred to the constructive contribution made by the sponsors of document A/CONF.62/C.3/L.29, but their membership of the Group of 77 was another factor to be borne in mind. He hoped that in the preparation of the consolidated text it would be remembered that the majority opinion of the Group of 77 was expressed in document A/CONF.62/C.3/L.13/Rev.2.

52. Mr. BRANKOVIĆ (Yugoslavia) said that his delegation had had little time to study document A/CONF.62/C.3/L.29 in detail but had difficulty in accepting its general philosophy, since it was contrary to that of document A/CONF.62/C.3/L.13/Rev.2, which was supported by his delegation as a member of the Group of 77.

53. The CHAIRMAN introduced document A/CONF.62/C.3/L.31 on behalf of the Chairman of the informal meetings on items 13 and 14, who was unfortunately unable to be present. The document consisted of two parts, part I, containing proposals received by the Chair as possible consolidated texts, and part II, containing texts submitted as conference room papers for the informal meetings which had not been considered at those meetings owing to lack of time.

54. Mr. BRANKOVIĆ (Yugoslavia) suggested that, in order to avoid confusion between texts having different status, part II should be deleted and issued either as a conference room paper or as an annex to document A/CONF.62/C.3/L.31.

55. Mr. WALKATE (Netherlands) opposed that proposal because it would deviate from the practice established by the Committee at the second session.

56. After a brief discussion in which Mr. TIKHONOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics), Mr. BRANKOVIĆ

(Yugoslavia), Miss MARIANI (France) and Mr. WALKATE (Netherlands) took part, Mr. TRESSELT (Norway), supported by Mr. DAHMOUCHE (Algeria), proposed that the decision should be left to the Chairman.

57. The CHAIRMAN proposed that part II should be issued as an annex to document A/CONF.62/C.3/L.31.

It was so decided.

58. Mr. FIGUEIREDO BUSTANI (Brazil) expressed surprise at seeing reproduced within the "possible consolidated texts" some paragraphs which had not been adopted by the relevant small working group. His delegation had suggested alternative texts, which it would submit to the secretariat with a view to their inclusion in the annex as a conference room paper.

59. Mr. JAIN (India) said that, as paragraph 5 of part I, section B of the document had been inserted at the request of his delegation, it might be preferable to replace that paragraph by the Indian proposal in part II, section C, which could then be deleted.

60. The CHAIRMAN appealed to the Indian representative not to reopen the discussion at so late a stage, and to agree to leave the wording of the document as it stood.

61. Mr. JARAMILLO DEL CASTILLO (Ecuador) reminded the Committee that the Chairman of the informal meetings had suggested that part I, section B of the document should be left pending, and had pointed out that, in the absence of consensus on the subject, that section could not be considered as a possible consolidated text. It was still under discussion and would continue to be discussed at the following session.

62. The CHAIRMAN drew attention to the existence of an alternative to section B, namely, to delete the paragraph. The texts would be subject to further negotiations and should therefore be maintained on that understanding.

Preservation of the marine environment (concluded)*
[Agenda item 12]

63. Mr. VALLARTA (Mexico), Chairman of the informal meetings on item 12, introduced documents A/CONF.62/C.3/L.15/Add.1 and A/CONF.62/C.3/L.30.

64. Mr. FIGUEIREDO BUSTANI (Brazil) said that the alternative submitted by his delegation to one of the paragraphs had not been included in document A/CONF.62/C.3/L.30. He assumed that the reason for the omission was that the alternative had not been introduced as a conference room paper. However, his delegation would like it to be included in the document.

65. The CHAIRMAN undertook to see that the alternative was included.

66. Mr. SIMMS (United Kingdom) said that at an earlier meeting the Committee had invited the United Kingdom, as depositary of the 1972 London Convention on the Prevention of Marine Pollution by Dumping of Wastes and Other Matter to give an up-to-date report on the status of the Convention. He could inform the Committee that 13 States

* Resumed from the 21st meeting.

had ratified or acceded to the Convention. Since 15 ratifications or accessions were required before the Convention could be brought into force, he urged delegations whose Governments were or would shortly be in a position to ratify it to inform his delegation as soon as possible, so

that his Government might make arrangements for the meeting of the contracting parties which had to be held within three months of the Convention's entry into force.

The meeting rose at 6.20 p.m.

25th meeting

Thursday, 8 May 1975, at 12.30 p.m.

Chairman: Mr. A. YANKOV (Bulgaria).

Development and transfer of technology (*concluded*) [Agenda item 14]

1. Mr. WALKATE (Netherlands) said that the transfer of marine technology was a subject that was under active and continued consideration in the Netherlands. His Government realized that the effective transfer of the appropriate marine technology would greatly reduce the gap between developed and developing countries in marine scientific research and the exploration and exploitation of the sea and its living and non-living resources.

2. With that in mind, his Government had accepted an invitation from the Secretary-General of the United Nations to be host to a United Nations seminar on the transfer of appropriate marine technology to developing countries, which was to be held towards the end of 1976. The seminar was expected to deal, among other things, with theoretical aspects of marine technology transfer, specific marine technology projects, environmental aspects of sea-bed exploitation and future activities relating to the transfer of marine technology. His Government would be making a very substantial contribution to the costs of the seminar, which would probably last seven to ten days.

3. His delegation believed that a seminar of that kind, during which participants could be informed about new techniques and the technology best suited to their needs, would contribute to a better understanding of, and co-operation in, the transfer of marine technology.

Statement on the work of the Committee

4. The CHAIRMAN drew attention to the statement on the work of the Third Committee contained in document A/CONF.62/C.3/L.32.

5. Mr. MANYANG D'AWOL (Sudan), Rapporteur, said that the statement had been prepared on the same lines as a similar one on the work of the second session. It was a factual description of the activities of the Committee and the work it had accomplished during the present session. The statement was divided into six parts: part I stated when the Committee had been set up and listed its officers during the present session; part II set out the mandate of the Committee; part III described the organization of the Committee's work in both formal and informal meetings; part IV described the work of the informal meetings; part V dealt with the documents before the Committee; and part VI was a request by the Committee for an opportunity to complete its work at a future session. A list of the documents submitted to the Committee was annexed.

6. The CHAIRMAN said that the statement was not subject to formal approval by the Committee, but was open to comment.

The Committee took note of the statement on the work of the Third Committee.

Concluding statement by the Chairman

7. The CHAIRMAN thanked the representatives of the International Hydrographic Bureau and the Intergovernmental Oceanographic Commission for the valuable information and advice they had provided during the current session.

8. Summing up the work of the session, he said that the Committee had made a significant advance in the negotiating and drafting process. He was satisfied that it had produced positive results which would have an important bearing on the future work of the Conference. The procedural pattern adopted had proved satisfactory and had greatly enhanced the Committee's work: about eight formal meetings had been held—roughly one a week—the rest being informal meetings within the framework of the Committee as a whole. Long procedural discussions had thus been avoided, there had been no mysterious unofficial groups, and the proceedings had all been open. The informal negotiating groups had made a valuable contribution.

9. The main features of the session had been: the formal proposals received covering the three items on the Committee's agenda, some of them filling important gaps, as reflected in documents A/CONF.62/C.3/L.15/Add.1, 30, 31 and 32; the spirit of co-operation and understanding that had prevailed throughout, despite conflicting views; and the constructive negotiations that had led to informally agreed texts which provided a good basis for the different parts of the future convention. A turning-point had been reached in the negotiating process, with the emergence of the will to negotiate.

10. In accordance with the decision taken at the 55th plenary meeting, he had transmitted to the President of the Conference a single negotiating text on the three items assigned to the Third Committee. In the accompanying letter he had explained the difficulty of preparing the text, in view of the differing and sometimes conflicting views in the Committee, and his endeavour to reflect as far as possible the views expressed by delegations and to take full account of all the formal and informal proposals presented to the Committee. In cases where he had been compelled to make a choice between differing views, he had done so on