Corrigendum

In a press release (SB/15/7) dated 29 May 2009, with the headline: “SEABED COUNCIL GETS REPORTS FROM LEGAL AND TECHNICAL COMMISSION AND FINANCE COMMITTEE; BEGINS REVIEW OF OUTSTANDING ISSUES IN DRAFT REGULATIONS”, it was incorrectly stated that New Zealand and Canada endorsed a position offered by Japan.

Paragraph 2 on page 8 of the press release should therefore read as follows:

Arguing for a fixed fee approach, Argentina, Germany, Nigeria, the United Kingdom, and the United States observer agreed that fees based on the amount of work involved in dealing with each application would present many variables. China and New Zealand said a progressive fee system would encourage relinquishment of blocks not used by contractors. Japan’s alternative approach seeking to determine the actual cost of processing application was endorsed by India. **New Zealand and Canada agreed that the current language as contained in regulation 21 was adequate, but that they needed more time to consider the implication of the proposal before the Council.** Germany wondered whether a refund clause, similar to that in Article 13, paragraph 2 of Annex 3 of the convention, could be included in the regulations.

In the same press release, page 3, paragraph 4, “Environmental recommendations”, the first line should begin as: “The Commission decided to revise and update recommendations…” instead of “The Commission called for a revision…” Insert the following in the same paragraph, “The Commission agreed to work on the matter intersessionally for review at the next session...”

* *** *