

**THE GRAND BARGAIN:
PRIVATE PROPERTY RIGHTS FOR PUBLIC POLICY OBLIGATIONS**

**SYMPOSIUM ON INTERNATIONAL GOVERNANCE
OF EMERGING SPACE ISSUES UNDER THE RULE OF LAW
April 24-25, 2019 Changsha, China**

**O'BRIEN Dennis
The Space Treaty Project, 1201 Parducci Rd., Ukiah, CA 95482 USA
dennisobrien@spacetreaty.org**

1. Introduction

The United Nations' consensus process, through its Committee on the Peaceful Uses of Outer Space (COPUOS), has accomplished much over the decades, most notably helping to produce the five space treaties and related guiding principles. But it has failed to produce an international framework of laws to facilitate humanity's departure from our home planet. The Moon Treaty, with the proper Implementation Agreement (IA), now offers the best hope for doing so. Such an agreement would need to address many issues, most involving private enterprise and settlements. Although critics of the Moon Treaty have argued that it would hinder commercial/private space activities, with the proper IA it would in fact enable them.

The Space Treaty Project has proposed a ten-paragraph Implementation Agreement that is based on a Grand Bargain: the States Parties to the Moon Treaty grant private property rights to non-governmental entities (NGE's) in return for the NGE's acceptance of public policy obligations. We will start with the proposed IA itself. The rest of the paper will focus on how the proposal builds upon current consensus and existing organizations/processes, addressing unresolved concerns to establish the needed international framework of laws.

2. Proposed Implementation Agreement for Article 11 of the Moon Treaty

The provisions of this Agreement and the Treaty shall be interpreted and applied together as a single instrument. In the event of any inconsistency between this Agreement and the Treaty, the provisions of this Agreement shall prevail. After the adoption of this Agreement, any instrument of ratification or formal confirmation of or accession to the Treaty shall also represent consent to be bound by this Agreement. No State or entity may establish its consent to be bound by this Agreement unless it has previously established or establishes at the same time its consent to be bound by the Treaty.

2.1. Creation of Agency

The States Parties shall create as soon as is practicable an agency ("Agency") to administer the provisions of the Agreement Governing The Activities Of States On The Moon And Other Celestial Bodies ("Treaty") and this Implementation Agreement ("Agreement").

2.2 Licensing of Priority Rights

The Agency shall be authorized to issue licenses to non-governmental entities ("NGE") for the priority exploitation of resources. Exploitation of resources shall include but is not limited to a) the extraction of materials, b) the use of a location for any other commercial activity, and c) the use of a location for a settlement. Use by governments is authorized under Articles 8 and 9 of the Treaty. Use for scientific activity shall be classified as government, commerce, or settlement depending on the sponsor of the activity.

2.3. Licensing Requirements

The Agency shall issue a license upon the proper application by an NGE, provided that the applicant (a) is approved and supervised by a national government, (b) agrees to accept the public policy obligations of the Treaty as described in Paragraph 4, and (c) agrees to share technology as described in Paragraph 8. The license shall describe the extent, duration, and nature of the activity. The license shall be revoked if, at any time, a licensee fails to comply with this Agreement.

2.4. Public Policy Obligations

The public policy obligations of the Treaty that are applicable to NGE's are as follows (detailed in the cited Treaty articles):

1. Using outer space exclusively for peaceful purposes (3.1);
2. Providing co-operation and mutual assistance (4.2);
3. Informing the public of activities (including compliance with the Registration Treaty) and any scientific discoveries (5.1);

4. Informing the public of any phenomena which could endanger human life or health, as well as of any indication of organic life (5.3);
5. Protecting the environment (7.1);
6. Preserving areas of “special scientific interest” such as historic landing sites (7.3);
7. Allowing free access to all areas by other parties (9.2);
8. Honoring the Rescue Treaty (10.1)
9. Informing the public of the discovery of resources (11.6).

2.5. Dispute Resolution

Any dispute over the use/development of a specific area/resource shall first be addressed using the consultation process detailed in Article 15 of the Treaty. If that process fails, the dispute shall be resolved by binding arbitration in accordance with the *2011 Permanent Court of Arbitration Optional Rules for Arbitration of Disputes Relating to Outer Space Activities*. The Agency shall be a member of the Arbitration Panel.

2.6. Collection and Use of Fees

The Agency is authorized to collect a fee for the issuance of a license. By adoption of this agreement, the States Parties authorize the use of such fees for the administrative costs of the Agency. The collection and use of fees for any other purpose must be authorized by the States Parties. The States Parties shall create a process of governance for making such decisions as authorized under Article 18 of the Treaty. The States Parties are ultimately responsible for the cost of administration. The Agency shall be operated in a cost-effective manner.

2.7. Standards and Practices

The States Parties, in consultation with private enterprise and international organizations, shall develop technology standards and recommended practices for the safe use and development of space resources. Any dispute over the development and/or the application of such standards shall be resolved in accordance with Paragraph 5.

2.8. Technology

In accordance with Treaty Article 4, the States Parties shall develop a process for sharing technology on a mutually acceptable basis. Until or in the absence of such a process, NGE’s shall license technology at no more than market rates. Technology that is subject to export controls shall be excluded from these requirements to the extent necessary to comply with

said controls. Any dispute over the sharing of technology shall be resolved in accordance with Paragraph 5.

2.9. Cultural/Historical Sites

The use or disturbance of any location on the Moon or other celestial body that is the site of a historical mission that occurred prior to the year 2000 is prohibited pending a final determination of the site's status as a Cultural Heritage Site. This prohibition applies to the location of any equipment and any evidence of presence (e.g., footprints, tracks). The States Parties shall develop standards and recommended practices for making such determinations or shall designate another entity/process for making such determinations that will be binding on the States Parties.

2.10. Controlling Law; Rights of Individuals and Settlements

In accordance with Treaty Article 12, the controlling law at any location shall be the law of the country that authorized/supervises the licensee using that location, subject to this Agreement and Treaty. However, nothing in this Agreement or in the Treaty shall be interpreted as denying or limiting the rights guaranteed to individuals by the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, or the right of settlements to seek autonomy and/or recognition as sovereign nations.

3. The Need for an International Framework of Laws to Create Property Rights

Why is this proposal necessary? As of April 2019, there is no internationally recognized mechanism for granting property rights to anyone for any location or natural object in outer space. The Outer Space Treaty prohibits any one country from establishing sovereignty anywhere in space:

Outer space, including the moon and other celestial bodies, is not subject to national appropriation by claim of sovereignty, by means of use or occupation, or by any other means. [1]

Most countries agree that this prohibition prevents any country from granting property rights on its own authority. A small minority disagree, large enough so that the potential for conflict has grown. Since one of the goals of law to avoid such conflicts, it is imperative to create the international framework now.

The Moon Treaty provides the international authority to grant such rights. Article 11 doesn’t prohibit ownership; it just prohibits any one country from granting it:

11.3. Neither the surface nor the subsurface of the moon, nor any part thereof or natural resources in place, shall become property of any State, international intergovernmental or non-governmental organization, national organization or non-governmental entity or of any natural person. The placement of personnel, space vehicles, equipment, facilities, stations and installations on or below the surface of the moon, including structures connected with its surface or subsurface, shall not create a right of ownership over the surface or the subsurface of the moon or any areas thereof. *The foregoing provisions are without prejudice to the international regime referred to in paragraph 5 of this article.* (emphasis added) [2]

Paragraph 5 specifically states that “States Parties to this Agreement hereby undertake to establish an international regime, including appropriate procedures, to govern the exploitation of the natural resources of the moon as such exploitation is about to become feasible.” [2] The States Parties are thus authorized to create an international framework of laws that grants property rights, so long as they do it together.

The Hague Space Resources Governance Working Group (“Hague Group”), a consortium of NGE’s, supports the creation of an international framework for space resource activity in its proposed Building Blocks:

5. International responsibility for space resource activities and jurisdiction over space products

5.1 The international framework should provide that States and intergovernmental organizations shall be responsible for space resource activities authorized by them in accordance with their international obligations.

5.2 The international framework should provide that space resource activities require prior authorization and continuing supervision by the appropriate State or intergovernmental organization.

5.3 The international framework should provide that States and intergovernmental organizations shall exercise jurisdiction and control over space products used in space resource activities authorized by them. [3]

It is the international framework of laws that will create private property rights. Without it, private entities will have difficulty moving forward. The uncertainty over the legitimacy of their “ownership” and ability to engage in commerce would make long-range financial planning, including attracting investors, almost impossible.

4. The Use of Priority Rights

The Hague Group has also proposed the use of “Priority Rights” to establish personal property rights:

6. Access to space resources

6.1 The international framework should enable the unrestricted search for space resources.

6.2 The international framework should enable the attribution of priority rights to an operator to search and/or recover space resources *in situ* for a maximum period of time and a maximum area upon registration in an international registry, and provide for the international recognition of such priority rights. The attribution, duration and the area of the priority right should be determined on the basis of the specific circumstances of a proposed space resource activity. [3]

The current prohibition on the ownership of materials applies only to materials “in place”, sometimes called *in situ*. [4] The license issued by the Agency would allow a licensee to remove materials from in place. At that point the materials would become the personal property of the licensee and marketable in accordance with any other applicable laws.

What about commerce that is not engaged in mining, such as space tourism? If an NGE wanted to establish a facility and/or engage in activities on the Moon, it would apply for a license for priority use of a location for that purpose. In this example, the licensee would need to honor the prohibition against disturbing cultural/historical sites as a condition for its license; the penalty for not doing so would be revocation of the license.

The use of a location on the Moon for a settlement is also defined in the Implementation Agreement as an exploitation of resources. Settlers would likewise obtain a license for priority use of their chosen location that would provide the same or similar property rights that home owners have on Earth. As with commercial activities, their license would be revoked if they did not comply with the Treaty’s public policy obligations.

Expanding the definition of “exploitation of space resources” to include the use of any location for any commerce or private settlements allows the creation of a comprehensive framework of laws that supports all private activity on the Moon and beyond. It is the only way to fulfill the mission of the Moon Treaty - to facilitate humanity’s departure from our home planet.

5. The Creation of an Agency

Once the States Parties, through the Implementation Agreement, establish the requirements for a license, they will need to create an agency to administer the process. The Agency in the proposed IA

will be ministerial, not discretionary. It will not pass judgement on the merits of any use, nor try to impose some universal “common law”. “The Agency shall issue a license upon the proper application by an NGE.” (IA paragraph 3) The Agency will thus function like a Department of Motor Vehicles, focusing on licensing and registration, revoking a license if a licensee fails to follow the “rules of the road”, but not making substantive decisions.

The Hague Group has called for “The designation or establishment of an international body or bodies” responsible for the identification of best practices, governance of an international registry, and other functions:

17. Institutional arrangements

The international framework should provide for:

- a) The establishment and maintenance of a publicly available international registry for registering priority rights of an operator to search and recover space resources *in situ*;
- b) The establishment and maintenance of an international repository, in addition to the international registry, for making publicly available:
 - i. Information and best practices;
 - ii. The list of designated and internationally endorsed outer space natural and cultural heritage sites; and
 - iii. The list of designated and internationally endorsed sites of scientific interest;
- c) *The designation or establishment of an international body or bodies* responsible for:
 - i. The identification of best practices;
 - ii. The listing of designated and internationally endorsed outer space natural and cultural heritage sites, and sites of scientific interest;
 - iii. The monitoring and review of the implementation of the international framework as well as its modification or amendment; and
 - iv. The governance of the international registry, the international repository and any other mechanism that may be established for the implementation of the international framework. (emphasis added) [3]

The proposed Agency would be such a body, with the licensing of NGE’s added to the above portfolio. It is the granting and/or revocation of such licenses that allows the enforcement of all other provisions of any international framework of laws for private activity in outer space.

6. Assessing a Fee

Perhaps the most contentious issue in space law is the proposal to use the profits of space commerce for

income distribution to non-spacefaring countries. Article 11 of the Moon Treaty requires some sort of sharing of the benefits of resource development:

11.7. The main purposes of the international regime to be established shall include:

- (a) The orderly and safe development of the natural resources of the moon;
- (b) The rational management of those resources;
- (c) The expansion of opportunities in the use of those resources;
- (d) An equitable sharing by all States Parties in the benefits derived from those resources, whereby the interests and needs of the developing countries, as well as the efforts of those countries which have contributed either directly or indirectly to the exploration of the moon, shall be given special consideration. [2]

The Hague Group Building Blocks state that “The international framework should not require compulsory monetary benefit-sharing” (12.2), though it also proposes that “Operators should be encouraged to provide for benefit-sharing.” (12.3) [3] The same section lists other ways in which the benefits of space exploration and development can be shared:

12. Sharing of benefits arising out of the utilization of space resources

12.1 Bearing in mind that the exploration and use of outer space shall be carried out for the benefit and in the interests of all countries and humankind, the international framework should provide that States and intergovernmental organizations authorizing space resource activities shall provide for benefit-sharing through the promotion of the participation in space resource activities by all countries, in particular developing countries. Benefits may include, but not be limited to enabling, facilitating, promoting and fostering:

- a) Development of space science and technology and of its applications;
- b) Development of relevant and appropriate capabilities in interested States;
- c) Cooperation and contribution in education and training;
- d) Access to and exchange of information;
- e) Incentivization of joint ventures;
- f) Exchange of expertise and technology among States on a mutually acceptable basis;
- g) Establishment of an international fund. [3]

Some fear that the statement “The moon and its natural resources are the common heritage of mankind” in the Moon Treaty (Art. 11.2) [2] requires the literal sharing of all mined materials or the proceeds of their sale. It does not. The very same sentence in the Treaty

continues “which finds its expression in the provisions of this Agreement, in particular in paragraph 5 of this article.” Paragraph 5 then explicitly empowers the development of resources:

States Parties to this Agreement hereby undertake to establish an international regime, including appropriate procedures, to govern the exploitation of the natural resources of the moon as such exploitation is about to become feasible. (Art. 11.5) [2]

Article 11.7, as quoted above, defines the “equitable sharing” of benefits. Compulsory monetary sharing is not explicitly required, nor is it prohibited. It is an option to be considered by the States Parties.

The proposed Implementation Agreement defers a decision on this most controversial issue. Instead it instructs the States Parties to create a governance process that can make such a decision in the future, along with any other substantive decision. The Agency’s authority will be limited to ministerial actions. By the terms of the IA, which the States Parties will adopt, the Agency will only have the authority to collect fees to cover its own administrative costs. That provision is consistent with the Hague Group’s recommendation, as the fees will be used only for administration, not benefit-sharing.

How would such fees would be structured? The implementation agreement for the Convention for the Law of the Seas (CLOS) allows NGE’s to pay the fee either as a standard amount up front or as a percentage of profit at a later date. [5] The fee for a settlement, if any, would likely be less than for an income-producing use. The Agency should allow the greatest flexibility for payment of fees in the name of encouraging activity, not restricting it. The Agency would follow any directive concerning fees given to it by the Sates Parties through their ongoing governance process (see below).

Ultimately, the States Parties are responsible for the cost of administration. If a State Party does not want it’s NGE’s to pay the fee and instead wants its national government to bear the cost of administration, it can grant a tax credit for the amount of the fee to any NGE required to pay it. This would guarantee funding for administration while giving individual State Parties control over who pays it.

In short, it is not necessary to resolve the issue of monetary benefit sharing at this time in order to empower space commerce and settlements. Other types of benefit sharing will be implemented while a framework for collecting fees is established. Doing so will help build confidence in all interested parties for substantive decisions that must be made later.

7. Governance for Substantive Decisions

If the Agency is ministerial, how will substantive decisions be made? Since the Moon Treaty and its Implementation Agreement are functions of international law, the States Parties can, by consensus (unanimous consent) make any such decision; they are the ultimate legislature. But obtaining the consensus of all parties to a treaty can be cumbersome, so international organizations such as the United Nations and the European Union have created structures of ongoing governance for making such decisions. The Moon Treaty itself envisions such ongoing governance, even requiring a review of any implementation agreement every 10 years (Article 18). [2]

The governance structure most relevant to space law is the one created by the Convention on the Law of the Seas (“CLOS”). The CLOS established a governing entity separate from the United Nations, composed of an Assembly made up of all Member States and an executive Council made up of 36 states who are chosen by the Assembly. Membership on the Council consists of five sub-groups to assure that all interests and interested parties are served. For example, four members are from countries who each consume more than 2% of the world’s consumables of potentially developable sea resources; 18 members are chosen to assure geographic diversity. (Agreement on Part XI, Annex 3) [5]

Since the Moon Treaty (Art.4) and even the Outer Space Treaty (Art. 1) require that “the exploration and use of outer space shall be carried out for the benefit and in the interests of all countries, irrespective of their degree of economic or scientific development” [2][1], the sub-groups for governance will help insure that the “interests of all countries” are represented.

Although consensus is preferred, it is possible under the CLOS to make decisions in both the Assembly and the Council by a simple majority for procedural matters and by two-thirds majority for substantive matters. All decisions on financial matters, including the charging of any fees, the administrative budget, and the use of any income “shall be based on the recommendations of the Finance Committee” that is chosen by the Executive Council. Decisions of the Finance Committee on substantive matters must be by consensus. (Agreement on Part XI, Annexes 3, 9) [5] This is still a high bar, but not as difficult as consensus by all States Parties.

The proposed Implementation Agreement requires the States Parties to create a form of governance to make such substantive decisions. By deferring the decision on direct monetary transfers till then, the proposed IA is able to focus on the other ways by which the benefits of space exploration and development can be shared with all of humanity.

8. Sharing Information

One of the ways of sharing the benefits is to share information. The proposed Implementation Agreement confirms that NGE's will have the same obligations as the States Parties concerning the sharing of information. This begins with their obligations under the Registration Treaty:

Article IV

1. Each State of registry shall furnish to the Secretary-General of the United Nations, as soon as practicable, the following information concerning each space object carried on its registry:

- (a) name of launching State or States;
- (b) an appropriate designator of the space object or its registration number;
- (c) date and territory or location of launch;
- (d) basic orbital parameters, including:
 - (i) nodal period;
 - (ii) inclination;
 - (iii) apogee;
 - (iv) perigee;
- (e) general function of the space object. [6]

Article 5.1 of the Moon Treaty requires more detailed information:

States Parties shall inform the Secretary-General of the United Nations as well as the public and the international scientific community, to the greatest extent feasible and practicable, of their activities concerned with the exploration and use of the moon. Information on the time, purposes, locations, orbital parameters and duration shall be given in respect of each mission to the moon as soon as possible after launching, while information on the results of each mission, including scientific results, shall be furnished upon completion of the mission. In the case of a mission lasting more than sixty days, information on conduct of the mission, including any scientific results, shall be given periodically, at thirty-day intervals. For missions lasting more than six months, only significant additions to such information need be reported thereafter. [2]

Article 5.3 of the Moon Treaty would also require NGE's to promptly report "any phenomena they discover in outer space, including the moon, which could endanger human life or health, as well as of any indication of organic life."

Finally, Article 11.6 of the Treaty would require NGE's to disclose the discovery of any natural resources. Such discoveries would *not* be considered proprietary information.

This interpretation is consistent with the Building

Blocks of the Hague Resources Working Group, comprised of interested NGE's. Section 13(e) of the Building Blocks lists the type of information that should be shared:

13. Registration and sharing of information

- (e) Provide . . . information and best practices on . . . space resource activities . . . including:
- i. The purposes, locations, orbital parameters and duration of space resource activities;
 - ii. The nature, conduct, and locations of space resource activities and associated logistic activities, for example deployment of stations, installations, equipment and vehicles;
 - iii. The results of space resource activities;
 - iv. Any phenomena discovered in outer space which could endanger human life or health, as well as of any indication of life;
 - v. Any harmful impacts resulting from space resource activities authorized by them and the measures planned or implemented to redress such impacts. [3]

The COPUOS Legal Sub-Committee has recently released a draft guidance document that summarizes the intent of the five space treaties, indicating a similar scope of what information should be shared:

48. The registration regime contained in the outer space treaties aims at the exchange of information on the nature, conduct, locations and results of space activities, in particular by submitting registration data to the Secretary-General of the United Nations and establishing national registries. States shall set up a national registry and additionally submit information to the United Nations Register maintained by the Office for Outer Space Affairs. [7]

Although the Moon Treaty itself describes the above as obligations of the States Parties, the Implementation Agreement would clarify that all such obligations also apply to NGE's (see 2.4 above). If the procedures detailed in the Registration Treaty are used, the NGE's would report to a national registry maintained by a State Party, then the State Party would report to an international registry maintained by the United Nations. This would expand the information contained in the current international registry but would still be easily manageable.

9. Sharing Technology

Although the proposed Implementation Agreement defers the issue of direct monetary transfers, it does specifically address the issue of sharing technology.

The Moon Treaty's reference to the Common

Heritage of Mankind (“CHM”) has raised concerns about the status of intellectual property rights. One commentator has suggested that:

“They [developed countries] would also be required to surrender technology developed by private industries under their jurisdiction for extracting extraterrestrial resources so that developing nations could participate in the activity of acquiring those resources as well.” [8]

The conflict over the meaning of the CHM is central to the debate over Moon Treaty. More than anything else, it is keeping Treaty from being adopted, as some claim that the concept grants sweeping powers to international organizations while others fear precisely that.

The middle way is to define what the CHM means for particular circumstances. The Moon Treaty itself tells us that the CHM is what we choose to make it:

Article 11

1. The moon and its natural resources are the common heritage of mankind, which finds its expression in the provisions of this Agreement, in particular in paragraph 5 of this article. . . .

5. States Parties to this Agreement hereby undertake to establish an international regime, including appropriate procedures, to govern the exploitation of the natural resources of the moon as such exploitation is about to become feasible. [2]

Consider how the IA for the Convention for the Law of the Seas, which also uses the CHM concept, describes the sharing of technology:

Section 5: Transfer of Technology

(a) The Enterprise, and developing States wishing to obtain deep seabed mining technology, shall seek to obtain such technology on fair and reasonable commercial terms and conditions on the open market, or through joint-venture arrangements;

(b) . . . States Parties undertake to cooperate fully and effectively with the Authority for this purpose and to ensure that contractors sponsored by them also cooperate fully with the Authority;

(c) As a general rule, States Parties shall promote international technical and scientific cooperation with regard to activities in the Area either between the parties concerned or by developing training, technical assistance and scientific cooperation programmes . . . [5]

Article 12 of the Hague Group’s Building Blocks also calls for an “exchange of expertise and technology among States on a mutually acceptable basis” as part of sharing the benefits of space development with all countries (see Assessing a Fee, above.) [3]

The proposed Implementation Agreement for the Moon Treaty calls upon the States Parties to engage in such a cooperative process. As a backup, it requires the licensing of technology for fair market value, as in the CLOS. Although such a provision would require private companies to share technology, it would also mandate that they are paid a fair and reasonable amount for its use (note also the Hague Group’s suggestion of an “international fund” to help developing countries pay for needed technology). An exception is made for technologies that have been barred from export for national security reasons. The proposed IA would thus protect private economic interests and national security interests while ensuring that less-developed nations have the technical capacity to share in the development of space resources.

10. Developing Standards and Practices

The Implementation Agreement requires the States Parties to develop standards and recommended practices (SARP’s) for the development of outer space resources. This does not diminish the efforts of private enterprise and international organizations who are already doing so. It is not meant to create a super-agency that will override efforts that have been developing organically. Rather, it requires the States Parties work with NGE’s, providing them a seat at the table and a legal foundation for their work. The International Organization for Standards (ISO) [9], the Hague Resources Group [3], the Moon Village Association [10], and For All Moonkind [11] are examples of such organizations.

These organizations use extensive outreach and inclusive working groups to harness the knowledge and expertise of interested parties, particularly commerce, academia, and civil society. The Moon Village Association, for example, has workgroups for Architectural Concepts & Issues; Moon Village Standards; Human Factors; Moon Markets, Missions & Economics; Mission & Markets Requirements Data; Coordination & Cooperation; Moon Village & Exploration Analogues; Cultural Considerations; and Outreach/Education. [10]

Article 11.5 of the Moon Treaty instructs us to establish the international framework of laws concerning the exploitation of resources “as such exploitation is about to become feasible.” Article 18 establishes a process for ongoing review. [2] The Treaty thus anticipates that there will be ongoing advances in technology that will require a constant updating of the best standards and practices. It is essential for the States Parties to integrate the work of the NGE’s. Otherwise a vast pool of talent and innumerable hours of work will be wasted. The Treaty and Implementation Agreement will lack organizational support, and may well fail.

11. Protecting Historical/Scientific Sites

Article 7.3 of the Moon Treaty authorizes the preservation of sites of scientific interest:

States Parties shall report to other States Parties and to the Secretary-General concerning areas of the moon having special scientific interest in order that, without prejudice to the rights of other States Parties, consideration may be given to the designation of such areas as international scientific preserves for which special protective arrangements are to be agreed upon in consultation with the competent bodies of the United Nations.

The organization For All Moonkind has declared as its primary mission the preservation of all historic landing sites on the Moon, including the boot prints and tracks left by explorers and rovers, not just as cultural/historical sites but also for scientific research, e.g., to study the effects of solar radiation and micrometeor strikes on surfaces newly exposed by such activity:

Declaration of Objectives and Agreements Regarding Cultural Heritage in Outer Space

This Declaration has as its primary objective the collaboration and participation of all Parties to ensure that Cultural Heritage Sites in Space are recognized for their outstanding value to humanity and consequently preserved and protected for posterity as part of our common human heritage. . .

The Parties do hereby agree to:

1. Work together and with For All Moonkind to address the uncertainties with respect to current space law in relation to human heritage in space by developing, adopting and amending from time to time as may be necessary, progressive standards and recommended practices and procedures (“SARPs”) dealing with the protection and preservation of Cultural Heritage Sites in Space on a general and a site-by-site basis, as the case may be. SARPs are intended to promote and facilitate the exploration and use of space, while balancing development and preservation. SARPs may take into consideration any national recommendations and guidelines implemented by national governments in respect of their own space objects.
2. Work with For All Moonkind to assure that each of their space activities, including any activities implemented before the development of relevant SARPs, whether on the Moon or elsewhere, will avoid disturbance and damage to any protected Cultural Heritage Sites in Space.
3. Work together and with For All Moonkind to assure that any entity seeking access to space

through or with their services also agrees to assure that each of their space activities, whether on the Moon or elsewhere, will observe the SARPs, and in any event, avoid disturbance or damage to any protected Cultural Heritage Sites in Space.

4. Comply with any SARPs promulgated and agreed pursuant to Section 2(1) above. [11]

It is unclear whether a new organization will be established to meet these goals or if the task will be given to an existing organization. [12] Until such decisions are made and procedures in place, the proposed Implementation Agreement prohibits “the use or disturbance of any location on the Moon or other celestial body that is the site of a historical mission that occurred prior to the year 2000.”

12. Cooperation, Assistance, and Rescue

Article 4 of the Moon Treaty requires cooperation among all States Parties:

4.2 States Parties shall be guided by the principle of co-operation and mutual assistance in all their activities concerning the exploration and use of the moon. International co-operation in pursuance of this Agreement should be as wide as possible and may take place on a multilateral basis, on a bilateral basis or through international intergovernmental organizations.

Article 10 requires assistance and rescue for humans on the Moon:

1. States Parties shall adopt all practicable measures to safeguard the life and health of persons on the moon. For this purpose they shall regard any person on the moon as an astronaut within the meaning of Article V of the Treaty on Principles Governing the Activities of States in the Exploration and Use of Outer Space, including the Moon and Other Celestial Bodies [Outer Space Treaty] and as part of the personnel of a spacecraft within the meaning of the Agreement on the Rescue of Astronauts, the Return of Astronauts and the Return of Objects Launched into Outer Space [Rescue Treaty].
2. States Parties shall offer shelter in their stations, installations, vehicles and other facilities to persons in distress on the moon. [2]

The proposed Implementation Agreement would confirm that NGE’s also have the same obligations. It integrates the Rescue Treaty [13] into the international framework of laws concerning private activity in space, just as it integrates the Registration Treaty into the sharing of information.

What about sharing essential but scarce resources,

such as water? Article 4.2 of the Moon Treaty includes a mandate to cooperate:

States Parties shall be guided by the principle of co-operation and mutual assistance in all their activities concerning the exploration and use of the moon. International co-operation in pursuance of this Agreement should be as wide as possible and may take place on a multilateral basis, on a bilateral basis or through international intergovernmental organizations. [2]

The proposed Implementation Agreement confirms that NGE's also have that obligation. As with other activities, if there is no mutual agreement on the sharing of resources, then the dispute resolution process described in Article 5 of the agreement (consultation, arbitration) will be used. As with technology, if a resource is developed by a licensed NGE, the default process requires resources to be shared through the marketplace at a price that assures a return of investment but is not monopolistic.

Currently private organizations such as the Hague Group, the Moon Village Association, and For All Moonkind are supplementing the work of COPUOS and national governments in sorting out what it means to cooperate and assist. The Moon Treaty and the proposed IA call for incorporating the work of such organizations in developing the international framework of governance.

13. Controlling Law

The Outer Space Treaty requires all space activities to be approved and supervised by a national government.

States Parties to the Treaty shall bear international responsibility for national activities in outer space, including the moon and other celestial bodies, whether such activities are carried on by governmental agencies or by non-governmental entities, and for assuring that national activities are carried out in conformity with the provisions set forth in the present Treaty. The activities of non-governmental entities in outer space, including the moon and other celestial bodies, shall require authorization and continuing supervision by the appropriate State Party to the Treaty.

- Outer Space Treaty, Article VI [1]

Both the Outer Space Treaty and the Moon Treaty extend a country's laws to cover their nationals and objects.

A State Party to the Treaty on whose registry an object launched into outer space is carried shall

retain jurisdiction and control over such object, and over any personnel thereof, while in outer space or on a celestial body.

- Outer Space Treaty, Article VIII [1]

1. States Parties shall retain jurisdiction and control over their personnel, vehicles, equipment, facilities, stations and installations on the moon. The ownership of space vehicles, equipment, facilities, stations and installations shall not be affected by their presence on the moon.

- Moon Treaty, Article 12 [2]

Thus, the controlling law for any location will be the law of the country that authorized and supervises activity at that location. There will also be extra-territoriality, i.e., a country's laws will apply to its nationals if nationals travel beyond the geographic limits of the registered area of activity, even if they enter the area of activity of another country.

Since all countries are bound by the treaties they have adopted, their national laws would be subject to the five space treaties, including the Moon Treaty and its Implementation Agreement.

14. Resolution of Disputes

Article 15 of the Moon Treaty details a process for resolving disputes. It begins with a process for avoiding them:

Each State Party may assure itself that the activities of other States Parties in the exploration and use of the moon are compatible with the provisions of this Agreement. To this end, all space vehicles, equipment, facilities, stations and installations on the moon shall be open to other States Parties.

- Moon Treaty, Art. 15.1 [2]

The proposed Implementation Agreement confirms that this obligation also applies to NGE's, part of their public policy obligation to share information as a way of sharing the benefits of space exploration and development with all of humanity.

Article 15 goes on to describe levels of dispute resolution, beginning with consultations between the States Parties. Any other State Party can join in the consultations, and any State Party can request the assistance of the Secretary-General of the United Nations. If consultations fail to resolve the dispute, the States Parties are instructed to "take all measures to settle the dispute by other peaceful means of their choice appropriate to the circumstances and the nature of the dispute." (Art. 15.3)

The Hague Space Resources Governance Working Group has recommended the use of arbitration as a "peaceful means" for resolving disputes, especially

between NGE's:

18. Settlement of disputes

The international framework should encourage recourse by States, intergovernmental organizations and operators to the amicable resolution of disputes, for example by developing procedures for consultation or promoting the use of the 2011 Permanent Court of Arbitration Optional Rules for Arbitration of Disputes Relating to Outer Space Activities. [3]

The proposed Implementation Agreement commits all parties to binding arbitration if they are not able to resolve their disputes through consultation. The Rules referenced above allow the parties to choose the arbitrators. The proposed IA requires that the Agency itself shall be part of the arbitration panel. This would be an expansion of the role of the Agency beyond its ministerial function of issuing licenses for priority rights. Yet it may be the one body that can provide institutional continuity and consistency of decisions. Establishing the protocols for dispute resolution may be the most difficult task in creating the Implementation Agreement.

15. Settlements

Including settlements (along with non-extracting commercial activities) in the definition of "exploitation of resources" is essential for creating an international framework of laws that is sufficiently comprehensive to include all private and public activity. This is done by interpreting "the exploitation of the natural resources of the moon" in Article 11.5 to include the use of any location on the Moon for any purpose.

This interpretation is consistent with other provisions Article 11, such as 11.4, which asserts a universal "right to exploration and use of the moon" and 11.7, which states that "the main purposes of the international regime to be established shall include: (a) The orderly and safe development of the natural resources of the moon." "Use" and "development" are terms common to the management of real estate, which is consistent with the call for "The rational management of those resources" in 11.7(b). [2] Including all private activity within the scope of the Moon Treaty provides the authority, support, and protection that those activities require.

When the Moon Treaty was first proposed, some individuals and NGE's, led by the L5 Society (now merged with the National Space Society), opposed it because there were no provisions for establishing private settlements with their own governance. [13] They point again to Article 11.2, which states that "the moon is not subject to national appropriation by any claim of sovereignty, by means of use or occupation,

or by any other means." [2] As explained above, the international framework of laws authorized by Article 11.5 overrides those prohibitions, and the proposed Implementation Agreement specifically authorizes the establishment of private settlements.

For those who wish to establish independent nations on the Moon or elsewhere in space, the Treaty's prohibitions are actually helpful. First, the ban on sovereignty stops the States Parties from establishing colonies. Second, the proposed Implementation Agreement will provide settlements the protection of legal recognition and support. Third, the Implementation Agreement confirms that a settlement can seek autonomy and/or independence through established international protocols. [14]

16. Individual Rights

Applying international law to settlements can be challenging. What if an inhabitant of a settlement sought asylum in another country's facility? The Moon Treaty and the Outer Space Treaty contain certain provisions that seem to say that their country of origin retains jurisdiction, and can have them returned (see Controlling Law, above).

Do the treaties require the person to be returned? This would conflict with the Universal Declaration of Human Rights ("UDHR"), which states in Article 14.1 that "Everyone has the right to seek and enjoy in other countries asylum from persecution." [15]

The proposed Implementation Agreement incorporates the protections of the UDHR. As explained above, this would override national law and allow an individual to remove themselves from the legal authority of one country and enter the authority of another.

The hopes and dreams of individuals and groups to create new societies in outer space are just as important as the entrepreneurship of those seeking to engage in space commerce. Both must be recognized, honored, and nurtured if humanity is to leave our home planet in a sustainable manner. The proposed Implementation Agreement states that "nothing in this Agreement or in the Treaty shall be interpreted as denying or limiting the rights guaranteed to individuals by the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, or the right of settlements to seek autonomy and/or recognition as sovereign nations." (Art. 10) Any international framework of laws must acknowledge and incorporate these protections, or it will fail. Indeed, it will never be adopted.

17. The Benefits for Humanity

The above discussion has revealed several benefits that the Moon Treaty and its Implementation Agreement would provide to humanity, even if there

was no direct transfer of wealth from successful enterprises to less developed nations. These benefits include the free access to outer space by any nation, organization, or individual; the peaceful use of outer space by all; the creativity, talent, and resources of free enterprise; the sharing of information; access to technology; mutual assistance at times of need; the protection of the celestial environment (including historical/cultural legacy sites); the protection of individual rights; and a decision-making process that addresses public policy interests while providing a predictable and sustainable legal framework for space commerce.

But there is another, more generalized benefit to humanity that springs from an international framework of laws for the exploration and use of outer space: the bringing together of the nations and the people of the Earth. This goal is alluded to in the preamble of the Outer Space Treaty:

Inspired by the great prospects opening up before mankind as a result of man's entry into outer space,
Recognizing the common interest of all mankind in the progress of the exploration and use of outer space for peaceful purposes,

Believing that the exploration and use of outer space should be carried on for the benefit of all peoples irrespective of the degree of their economic or scientific development,

Desiring to contribute to broad international co-operation in the scientific as well as the legal aspects of the exploration and use of outer space for peaceful purposes,

Believing that such co-operation will contribute to the development of mutual understanding and to the strengthening of friendly relations between States and peoples . . .”

- *Preamble*, Outer Space Treaty, 1967 [1]

These principles were adopted at the beginning of the space age and have guided us ever since. Every subsequent treaty and declaration of principles by the United Nations are based on them, and they are even more relevant today. For, indeed, the prospects have never been greater, and recognizing the common interests of all humanity has never been more important. We have reached the moment of decision when we must dedicate the exploration and use of outer space to the benefit of all of humanity, and it can only be done through international cooperation that will develop understanding and strengthen relations.

The benefits of such cooperation are also the focus of the Preamble to the Moon Treaty:

Determined to promote on the basis of equality the further development of co-operation among States in the exploration and use of the moon and other

celestial bodies,

Desiring to prevent the moon from becoming an area of international conflict,

Bearing in mind the benefits which may be derived from the exploitation of the natural resources of the moon and other celestial bodies, . . .

Taking into account the need to define and develop the provisions of these international instruments in relation to the moon and other celestial bodies, having regard to further progress in the exploration and use of outer space . . .

- *Preamble*, Moon Treaty, 1984 [2]

The benefits of international cooperation were first realized in the Apollo-Soyuz mission of 1975 and continued through the multi-national use of the International Space Station. More recently, the United Nations and China have announced initiatives to increase access to outer space by all countries and all people. The more nations work together, the more likely that space exploration and development will be peaceful and benefit all.

18. The Challenge of Nationalism

But such international efforts are now being threatened. The United States has already passed a law that would unilaterally grant property rights to a space resource to any U.S. entity that gets to it first. [16] The Trump administration intends to use the U.S. military to protect such economic interests. Last August, Vice-President Pence announced a new Space Policy Directive, calling for the creation of a "Space Force". Space is a "warfighting domain", said Pence, quoting President Trump. The nation must "prepare for the next battlefield", to "defeat a new generation of threats".

"It is not enough to merely have an American presence in space," said the Vice-President, again quoting Trump. "We must have American dominance in space." He went on to claim that our "adversaries" are "seeking to disrupt" and "challenge American supremacy" and asserted that, in space, "peace only comes through strength." [17]

Such militant nationalism has been common throughout history. But as humanity prepares to leave its home planet, it raises new concerns. As one commentator stated:

The fear is that rhetoric like that coming from those raising the inevitability of space war will fuel a race to the bottom, as all major (space) powers dedicate even more energy towards an arms race in space.

This also gives rise to the creeping colonization of space around claims regarding resource exploitation and possible attempts by countries to establish systems to protect themselves against their vulnerabilities by denying access to space for

others. [18]

This concern was also raised at last April's UNCOPUOS conference:

29. The view was expressed that space resources were accessible to only a very limited number of States and to a handful of enterprises within those States. In that connection, the delegation expressing that view was also of the view that it would be important to assess the impact of a "first-come, first-served" doctrine on the global economy, which could create a de facto monopoly in complete contradiction to the letter and the spirit of the United Nations treaties and resolutions. [19]

These are the two futures facing humanity, a choice between international cooperation and nationalistic competition. In order to make that choice, every policy-maker and interested party must now pause and ask themselves, on the deepest level, "What is our mission?"

19. The Overview Through Time

The early 21st century is an extraordinary time. Humanity has been presented with an historic opportunity as it prepares to leave its home planet. Like those who went forward during the Age of Exploration some 500 years ago, the decisions made today will affect humanity for centuries, perhaps millennia. If ever there has been a time to determine how to implement humanity's collective vision for the future, it is now.

This paper has so far been written in legal and economic terms. It has tried to demonstrate that a comprehensive international framework of laws for the development of resources will actually help private enterprise flourish, and that the certainty and support of the rule of law will allow countries, businesses, non-profits and even individuals to dare to make their dreams come true. It is now time to speak of those dreams.

When Galileo looked at Jupiter the first night he used a telescope, he was pleased but not too surprised. It was the second night, when he looked again and saw that the four stars near Jupiter had all moved, that they were actually moons circling another celestial body, that he realized the universe was far different, far more fascinating and glorious, than he had ever imagined. More recently, just six decades ago, people all over the world stood outside their homes as the sun set, looking to the sky as a blinking light passed overhead, the tumbling upper stage booster of the world's first satellite, Sputnik. Because of the Cold War there was some fear, but for most the overwhelming emotions were awe and excitement. Despite all its imperfections,

all its follies, and all its deadly conflicts, humanity had managed to throw off the shackles of gravity and reach the stars. All the stuff of science fiction suddenly seemed possible. And not just the stuff about technological advances; the writers, the poets, those who dared to dream of a better future saw a day when humanity could resolve its differences by peaceful means and move forward together.

This dream was enhanced in December 1968, when our view of the world literally changed. As Apollo 8 rounded the Moon, the astronauts on board were suddenly overwhelmed as humans saw the Earth rising above the lunar horizon for the first time. The picture taken at that moment showed our home planet, beautiful and fragile, hanging in the vastness of space. Humanity as a species began to realize that we are all one, living together on a fragile planet hurtling through the cosmos.



But even though no borders were visible, war and suffering continued to wrack the home world. In the half-century since, people have begun to lose faith in their governments, their private institutions, even in humanity itself. Every day people wake up to the news of yet another mass killing, more terrorist attacks, the disastrous effects of climate change, and an increased threat of nuclear war. To that has now been added the threat of war in outer space. Our governments seem to care more for corporations than for people, and the corporations seem to put their bottom line above everything else. The people of Earth are beginning to despair, wondering if there is anything they can really believe in. They are losing hope, and the resulting cynicism is poisoning our politics, our relationships, even our thinking.

The mission of space law must be nothing less than to restore that hope, to give the people of our planet a future they can believe in. To counter the despair of war and violence and neglect. This moment in time presents a unique opportunity to set an example and create a new future for humanity, to build that shining

city on a hill that will light the way for all.

Imagine looking up at the Moon in the future, knowing that humans are there, living and working under a common framework of international law. Every person on Earth will have that same experience. Just imagine the inspiration and hope that looking at the Moon will give to a whole new generation of humanity, one that is not bound by the mistakes of the past.

20. Conclusion: The Time to Act

It is the duty of everyone involved with outer space to make that hope and inspiration a reality. It is time to voice support for adopting the Moon Treaty with an Implementation Agreement and to make every effort to persuade national governments to do so. The current State Parties must immediately begin the process of creating an Implementation Agreement that will address outstanding concerns and allow other nations to join, thus creating the international framework of laws the Treaty requires.

It has been 500 years since the world has had such an opportunity to start anew. At that time, European countries used their advanced technology to perpetuate military conquest and economic exploitation, causing widespread misery and countless wars. And when the Industrial Revolution came along, governments placed profits ahead of people, resulting in economic and environmental catastrophe. Much of humanity stopped believing in its ability to control its own destiny.

It is fitting that we are meeting in China, for China suffered during the past 500 years as foreign powers controlled much of its land and commerce, even occupying its capital. It is also fitting that we are meeting in Changsha, where Mao Zedong began his political career. When he finally stood on the podium in Beijing and declared “China has risen!” it marked the end of an era when other countries had used their advanced technology to dominate it.

We can make sure that such domination does not extend into outer space. But doing so requires immediate action. There will be only one time when humanity leaves our home world, only one chance to create a new pattern that will lead each person, and all people, to their best destiny. That time is now. Please join in this effort to restore hope and create a better world – a better universe – for everyone. If we do, then one day someone, perhaps someone in this very room, will be able to stand on the Moon and say, “Humanity has risen!”

(Dennis O’Brien is an attorney and former member of the NASA-Hastings Research Project. He is currently Director of The Space Treaty Project. The Project is an organizational member of the Moon Village Association; Mr. O’Brien is a member of their

Coordination & Cooperation Workgroup. For more information, including a petition in support of the Moon Treaty, please go to www.spacetreaty.org.)

References

[1] Treaty on Principles Governing the Activities of States in the Exploration and Use of Outer Space, Including the Moon and Other Celestial Bodies (also known as the Outer Space Treaty), <http://www.unoosa.org/oosa/en/ourwork/spacelaw/treaties.html> 108 countries are parties to the treaty, while another 23 have signed the Treaty but have not completed ratification.

[2] Agreement Governing The Activities Of States On The Moon And Other Celestial Bodies (also known as the Moon Treaty), <http://www.unoosa.org/oosa/en/ourwork/spacelaw/treaties.html> 18 countries are parties to the Treaty; another 4 have signed the Treaty but have not completed ratification.

[3] The Hague Space Resources Governance Working Group, Draft Building Blocks for the Development of an International Framework on Space Resource Activities, <https://www.universiteitleiden.nl/binaries/content/assets/rechtsgeleerdheid/instituut-voor-publiekrecht/lucht-en-ruimterecht/space-resources/draft-building-blocks.pdf>

For more information on the composition and processes of the Hague Group, see <https://www.universiteitleiden.nl/en/law/institute-of-public-law/institute-for-air-space-law/the-hague-space-resources-governance-working-group>.

[4] Force, Melissa K., Moon Agreement and Property Rights, <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=dgQQkjTikUw> (video), and its referenced PowerPoint presentation, Space Law Principles That Encourage Extraterrestrial Resource Extraction and Investment, <http://images.spaceref.com/docs/2013/CSCA2013/Melissa-K-Force-presentation.pdf>, Nov. 5, 2013. Ms. Force is currently general counsel for the New Mexico Spaceport Authority.

[5] Agreement Relating to the Implementation of Part XI of the Convention of the Law of the Sea, http://www.un.org/depts/los/convention_agreements/texts/unclos/closindxAgree.htm. 167 countries are parties to the Convention.

[6] Convention on Registration of Objects Launched into Outer Space,

<http://www.unoosa.org/oosa/en/ourwork/spacelaw/treaties/introregistration-convention.html>. 69 countries are parties to the Convention. The actual registrations of space objects, by year or by country, are also available there.

[7] Draft guidance document under UNISPACE+50 thematic priority 2. “Legal regime of outer space and global governance: current and future perspectives”, Working paper submitted by the Chair of the Working Group on the Status and Application of the Five United Nations Treaties on Outer Space, A/AC.105/C.2/L.310, http://www.unoosa.org/oosa/oodoc/data/documents/2019/aac.105c.2/aac.105c.2l.310_0_0.html (April 2019)

[8] Listner, Michael, The Moon Treaty: Failed International Law or Waiting in the Shadows?, <http://www.thespacereview.com/article/1954/1>, The Space Review, Oct. 24, 2011.

[9] International Organization for Standards (ISO). <https://www.iso.org/home.html> (search “space” for specifics).

[10] Moon Village Association Working Groups <https://moonvillageassociation.org/about/working-groups/>.

[11] For All Moonkind, Declaration of Objectives and Agreements Regarding Cultural Heritage in Outer Space, <https://www.forallmoonkind.org/about/the-declaration/>. For All Moonkind is an official non-voting Observer of UN-COPUOS <http://www.unoosa.org/oosa/en/ourwork/copuos/members/copuos-observers.html>.

[12] The Times Editorial Board, A World Heritage site on the moon? That’s not as spacey as it sounds, <https://www.latimes.com/opinion/editorials/la-ed-moon-nasa-russia-united-nations-world-heritage-20190222-story.html>, Los Angeles Times, February 22, 2019. See also Hanlon, Michelle D., The Case for Protecting the Apollo Landing Areas as Heritage Sites, <http://blogs.discovermagazine.com/crux/2019/02/19/protecting-human-heritage-on-the-moon-dont-let-one-small-step-become-one-giant-mistake/#.XJQEOXLsY8E>. Discover, February 19, 2019. Ms. Hanlon is co-founder and current vice-president of For All Moonkind.

[13] Henson, H. Keith and Lucas, Arel, Star Laws, <https://groups.google.com/forum/#!msg/sci.space.policy/u8i2OEytsmA/8PTk7o3QVDYJ>, *Reason* Magazine, Aug. 1982. Mr. Henson was a founder and the first president of the L-5 Society; Ms. Lucas was the editor of L-5 News. The L-5 Society has since

merged with the National Space Society. See also Michael A. G. Michaud, Reaching for the High Frontier: Chapter 5, <http://space.nss.org/reaching-for-the-high-frontier-chapter-5/>, National Space Society (1986)

[14] Centre for a Spacefaring Civilization, Space Settlement Governance: An Overview of Legal and Policy Issues (2019), <https://www.spacefaringcivilization.space/>

[15] Universal Declaration of Human Rights. <http://www.un.org/en/universal-declaration-human-rights/index.html>

[16] United States Commercial Space Launch Competitiveness Act, Section 51313 (2015), <https://www.gpo.gov/fdsys/pkg/PLAW-114publ90/html/PLAW-114publ90.htm>

[17] Washington Post, Mike Pence on Space Force: “We must have American dominance in space” (video), <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=9xEkyT7XrxQ>, , August 9, 2018.

[18] Freeland, Steven, The US Plan for a Space Force Risks Escalating a “Space Arms Race”, <https://theconversation.com/the-us-plan-for-a-space-force-risks-escalating-a-space-arms-race-101368>, The Conversation, Aug. 10, 2018.

[19] UNCOPUOS Legal Subcommittee, Information on the Activities of International Intergovernmental and Non-Governmental Organizations Relating to Space Law, 57th Session, Draft Report, Section III, April 9-20 2018, http://www.unoosa.org/res/oodoc/data/documents/2018/aac_105c_2/aac_105c_2l_304add_3_0_html/AC105_C2_L304Add03E.pdf

Reference List (alphabetically, by title or source):

Agreement Governing The Activities Of States On The Moon And Other Celestial Bodies (also known as the Moon Treaty)

Agreement Relating to the Implementation of Part XI of the Convention of the Law of the Sea

Centre for a Spacefaring Civilization, Space Settlement Governance: An Overview of Legal and Policy Issues

Convention on Registration of Objects Launched into Outer Space

Draft guidance document under UNISPACE+50

thematic priority 2

For All Moonkind, Declaration of Objectives and Agreements Regarding Cultural Heritage in Outer Space

Force, Melissa K., Moon Agreement and Property Rights

Freeland, Steven, The US Plan for a Space Force Risks Escalating a “Space Arms Race”

Hanlon, Michelle D., The Case for Protecting the Apollo Landing Areas as Heritage Sites

Henson, H. Keith, and Lucas, Arel, Star Laws

International Organization for Standards (ISO)

Listner, Michael, The Moon Treaty: Failed International Law or Waiting in the Shadows?

Moon Village Association Working Groups

The Hague Space Resources Governance Working Group, Draft Building Blocks for the Development of an International Framework on Space Resource Activities

The Times Editorial Board, A World Heritage site on the moon? That’s not as spacey as it sounds

Treaty on Principles Governing the Activities of States in the Exploration and Use of Outer Space, Including the Moon and Other Celestial Bodies (also known as the Outer Space Treaty)

UNCOPUOS Legal Subcommittee, Information on the Activities of International Intergovernmental and Non-Governmental Organizations Relating to Space Law, 57th Session, Draft Report

United States Commercial Space Launch Competitiveness Act

Universal Declaration of Human Rights

Washington Post, Mike Pence on Space Force: “We must have American dominance in space” (video)

Keywords: space, treaty, moon, commerce, settlements, implementation