

Summary and aid to discussion for FoP DR 92 (India) Seabed Mining Register

FoP DR 92 (India) SMR thankfully acknowledges the support of all the delegations contributing to this outstanding issue on Seabed Mining Register since it was taken as FoP's work by India during July 2025. The intersessional work carried out during October -November, 2025 mainly through seeking comments by email and compilation of the revised version for discussion during 31st session, which significantly improved this DR through the contribution and cooperation of the delegations and FoP DR 92 is grateful for that.

This topic was discussed in the informal setting in the first part of the 31st session of the Council during March 2026. Overall, the delegations expressed that the presented version has been improved through FoP's work. The comments on the floor were mainly for editorial like capitalization of defined terms, cross referencing of the paras of this DR with the relevant Draft regulations, following uniform style for singular or plural and avoiding repetition. Following that, one delegation suggested for thorough refining of the textual part of the sub para 1 bis and some comments were also received by email.

During the intersessional work after the first part of the 31st session, FoP addressed all the comments and incorporated the proposed refining of text for achieving a revised version. The revised version was circulated by email seeking further comments and suggestions. FoP thankfully acknowledges the second round of comments received and based on that the revised version was submitted by the FoP for inclusion in the FRCT June 2026 version for discussion in the second part of the council.

The present version of the DR has some bracketed text as alternative options, which needs attention of the Council towards finalisation of this DR in a consensual way. In addition, there are some thematic issues which are listed out para wise below as aid for discussion FoP's work during the second part of the 31st session of the Council

1. Para 1 is straight forward and it highlights for a standard and guidelines to be followed by the SG in establishing, maintaining and publishing a Seabed Mining Register, whether delegations may have any further view on this para.
2. Para 1 bis states redacting the confidential information in accordance with 89(4) and 90(1); there was a proposal of DR 92 should accommodate two separate

register formats for each contract like one for general information related and another for core contractual & application documents related. Whether delegations have any views in this format of record keeping in the SMR and inclusion of any textual modifications to the para.

3. Para 1 bis (a) to (q) is mainly for the information to be listed in the SMR and are presented under sub paras following their anticipated chronological sequences under an exploitation contract. In all sub paras there are bracketed texts which are mainly the alternative versions to the one of original version over the proposed refined version. The bracketed text in the beginning part of the sub para is original text and the bracketed text in the end part of each sub para is the proposed refined text. Council is requested to give their view on the preferred version for finalisation of these sub paras. In addition, there are some bracketed words in some of the sub paras which needs council attention for their inclusion and deletions. The text of para(1bis)(j)Alt. is the result of work provided by the FoP on Modification of a Plan of Work and the same has been included.

4. Para 2 mainly needs consideration of two terms proposed ('available' and 'accessible') whether either of them or both of them to be included and inclusion of the term 'online'.

5. Para 3 is a clean para, noting the standards and guidelines are applicable as mentioned in the para 1 which may cover this, is this para required?

6. There are some overarching issues like whether exploration phase documents will be part of the SMR of the exploitation regulation and SMR should not be limited to simple repository of information also should work as a legal tool for the Authority. Delegations may provide their view in this regard.

7. FoP is mindful about the UCH working group work for inclusion of UCH related matters in the Seabed Mining Register and appropriate language provided by the facilitator of the WG to be included in the list of sub para of 1 bis.

Finally, there was a general consensus for cross referencing across the exploitation regulations referring the matter to be included in the SMR and mentioning the same as a para of the respective DRs. The cross referencing in DR 92 has been uniformly done. In line with that further discussion may be required whether such work should be under the scope of present FoP's work.