Council of the European Union
General Secretariat

PUBLIC

Interinstitutional files:
2025/0555 (COD)

Brussels, 19 November 2025

WK 15802/2025 INIT

LIMITE

COMPET	**ENV**	**JAI**
IND	**CLIMA**	**DIGIT**
MI	**AGRI**	**DATAPROTECT**
CADREFIN	**TRANS**	**FREMP**
FIN	**SAN**	**RELEX**
RECH	**PHARM**	**COPS**
ESPACE	**BIOTECH**	**UD**
CONSOM	**POLMIL**	**AUDIO**
DUAL USE	**POLGEN**	**PROCIV**
EDUC	**ECOFIN**	**IPCR**
TELECOM	**COH**	**MAP**
ENER	**INDEF**	**FISC**
	CULT	**CSC**
	CYBER	**CODEC**

This is a paper intended for a specific community of recipients. Handling and further distribution are under the sole responsibility of community members.

WORKING DOCUMENT

From:	General Secretariat of the Council
To:	Ad Hoc Working Party on the Multiannual Financial Framework (AHWP MFF) - European Competitiveness Fund
Subject:	Member States comments on the Proposal for a Regulation on establishing the European Competitiveness Fund (ECF), including the specific programme for defence research and innovation activities, repealing Regulations (EU) 2021/522, (EU) 2021/694, (EU) 2021/697, (EU) 2021/783, and amending Regulations (EU) 2021/696, (EU) 2023/588, (EU) [EDIP] (doc. 11770/1/25 REV 1, Chapter VII, section 3) - comments from AT, BE, CZ, EL, ES, FI, FR, IE, LT, LU, NL, PT, RO, SE, SI, DE, EE, IT, MT, PL

Proposal for a Regulation establishing the European Competitiveness Fund (doc. 11770/1/25 REV 1)-SPACE PART **Deadline 23/10/2025 cob**
From: AT, BE, CZ, EL, ES, FI, FR, IE, LT, LU, NL, PT, RO, SE, SI, DE, EE, IT, MT, PL **Updated: 27/10/2025 12:26**

Guidelines to be followed

Please kindly provide your contributions in the table below.

Drafting suggestions: you may use '**track changes**'* or formatting (for example **bold-underline** for additions and ~~strike-through~~ for deletions, **where necessary, in a different colour**). *Track changes can only be connected once the cursor is placed in editable areas (Drafting or Comments columns).

To make it feasible to consolidate all contributions, the structure of the table must not be changed, so **no rows can be added or deleted.**

New provisions may only be added in any of the **'existing cells'.**

Name of document: please add the **two initials** of your delegation's country followed by a space (to the MS Word document name), followed by any optional text, for example, for Austria: **AT comments on … .docx**

Thank you for your cooperation!

Commission proposal	Drafting Suggestions and Comments
General Comments	EL (Comments): The ECF proposal rightly seeks to enhance flexibility for programme implementation, but this flexibility is not extended to space activities. The current draft over-specifies technical details while lacking the legal clarity and predictability needed for major space programmes. A lighter ECF space framework and a separate, dedicated legal binding document are therefore essential to ensure coherence, legal certainty, and operational efficiency. ES (Comments): Include provisions that facilitate the participation of SMEs, mid-cap companies, non-Large System Integrators, and new entrants, while fully maintaining applicable security requirements.

Commission proposal	Drafting Suggestions and Comments
	Reaffirm the Copernicus free, full and open data principle; keep any security exceptions limited to existing delegated/implementing acts. Specify governance (Commission/EUSPA/ESA) and continuity of partnerships (SST Partnership) to avoid overlaps. (AEE) LT (Comments): We are still scrutinizing the proposal and will come back with more specific comments at a later stage. LU (Comments): General comments with reference to the European Commission's Technical Note on the Budgetary Technique for the ECF InvestEU Instrument (WK 12725/2025 INIT, 30 September 2025): • On the Access for Early-Stage Deep-Tech SMEs and Start-ups: How will early-stage SMEs and start-ups in the deep-tech domain, particularly those in emerging sectors like space, benefit from these planned financial products? Are the ECF's InvestEU-backed instruments designed primarily for established firms with proven track records, or will dedicated mechanisms (e.g. equity windows, higher-risk guarantee compartments, or blending operations with grants) ensure access for innovative, early-stage ventures and foster private co-investment? General comments with reference to the European Commission's Technical Note on Industrial Policy Tools (WK 12726/2025 INIT, 30 September 2025): • The document notes that *"project preparation as well as crowding in of additional public and private capital may be supported"* - Could the

Commission proposal	Drafting Suggestions and Comments
	Commission clarify whether financial operations under the ECF will be channelled through existing structures and partners such as EIB/EIF, or national promotional institutions, or whether a dedicated ECF financial platform is envisaged? • Page 3 "*EU Tech Frontrunners*": the initiative aims *"to identify and support leading tech companies in the EU, leveraging their roles as innovation and export drivers"* - Could the Commission confirm whether national agencies/Institutions (e.g. innovation or space agencies) may participate in the nomination, or coordination of frontrunner candidates? This would ensure better alignment of EU-level actions with national strategies and increase visibility for high-potential SMEs and mid-caps. • Pages 5 to 6 "*Accelerated and Targeted Actions for Competitiveness*": the note highlights the example of *"funding the latest AI models"* through accelerated intervention procedures - Could the Commission indicate whether this fast-track approach could also apply to hardware-based deep-tech fields, and not only digital technologies? • Page 6 "Two-Stage Intervention Mechanism": an open "*call for expressions of interest without specifying the type of activities or budgetary instruments to be used*" is proposed - Could the Commission clarify whether this two-stage intervention model will include structured engagement with national entities to ensure alignment with national strategic priorities, facilitate project identification, and prevent duplication with ongoing initiatives? PT (Comments): The comments provided are still preliminary and aim at contributing to the initial discussion process, without pre-empting or compromising Portugal's position during upcoming negotiations and more substantial comments to be provided in future iterations.

Commission proposal	Drafting Suggestions and Comments
	SE (Comments): SE would like to have a clarification stemming from the Explanatory Memorandum, Context of the Proposal under 'Consistency with existing policy provisions in the policy area' where it's written on page 5 that "*The Commission should propose by the end of 2025 the legislative framework for the EU Space Systems and their Governance building on the EU acquis of the Space and IRIS² regulations*". How will that framework be designed, and how will it relate to the space programs here in the ECF, to the ECF itself as well as to the EU Space Act? DE (Comments): General scrutiny reservation: We are still in the process of examining the very extensive draft regulation in detail. The following comments are therefore preliminary and we reserve the right to make further comments. Comments made here on the Space Part are without prejudice to our further comments on the MFF and parts thereof, which we have submitted or will submit elsewhere. Please revert to us on our requests for the provision of information, sometimes entailed in this column. Please do so in writing even if this is not explicitly requested in the comments. Please also note, for the sake of completeness, that at the very end of this table, there is a comment and request for COM to draft mid-term evaluation provisions regarding the space policy window, similar to Art 102 of the current space regulation but with inclusion of the COM's regulatory scrutiny board (RSB).

Commission proposal	Drafting Suggestions and Comments
	PL (Comments): Poland maintains its general scrutiny reserve on the text proposal (Space part). The comments provided at this stage of the analysis are without prejudice to any further or additional observations that Poland may submit at a later stage of the examination. Both in the context of the ECF as a whole and, in particular, in Section 3 on Space systems and space policy implementation, we wish to emphasize the importance of ensuring clear and effective access for companies – especially SMEs from all EU Member States – to participation in major EU programmes, notably the EU Space Programme
2025/0555 (COD)	
Proposal for a	
REGULATION OF THE EUROPEAN PARLIAMENT AND OF THE COUNCIL	SE (Comments): SE has a general comment/question on the legal basis of the space programme and the exclusion of harmonisation of laws and regulations of the Member States in TFEU: How has this new space programme in the ECF considered the harmonisation prohibition in article 189.2?

PUBLIC

Commission proposal	Drafting Suggestions and Comments
on establishing the European Competitiveness Fund ('ECF'), including the specific programme for defence research and innovation activities, repealing Regulations (EU) 2021/522, (EU) 2021/694, (EU) 2021/697, (EU) 2021/783, and amending Regulations (EU) 2021/696, (EU) 2023/588, (EU) [EDIP]	SE (Comments): SE is still scrutinising this proposal. As shown in the more specific comments below, SE questions whether the level of detail regarding the space sector in the ECF is sufficient.
(Text with EEA relevance)	
Article 3	
Objectives	
	DE (Comments): Regarding the Space Section, the further development of ongoing activities as well as any new programmes have to be designed and implemented according to Member States' and user needs and requirements. Running as well as potential new programmes must be built incrementally. When defining potential new activities, existing components ~~have to~~ should be considered while fully respecting the available means. Moreover, all activities must be established with a flexible architecture with maximum integration of commercial solutions.
2. Under the general objectives set out in paragraph 1, the ECF shall in particular pursue the following specific objectives:	IE (Comments):

Commission proposal	Drafting Suggestions and Comments
	IE - Should note that space assets and industries can contribute to all of these activities
(d) For support to 'Resilience and Security, Defence Industry and Space' policy, respectively the specific objectives of:	IE (Comments): IE would appreciate more detail on what is intended under this paragraph – exploration/ extraction etc across EU, Europe, Global, Moon and beyond.
(3) For the implementation of EU space systems and space policy, the specific objectives of developing, maintaining and operating space systems, providing cutting-edge space-based information, data and services supporting Union policies, notably in the area of security, defence, sustainable growth, environment protection and climate resilience, global engagement and strategic independence; Maximising the socio-economic benefits of space-based activities, in particular by fostering the development of an innovative and competitive Union space economy and supporting the development of a genuine Single Market for space activities, including collaborative research and innovation for space products and technologies and support to SMEs; Enhancing the safety, security and sustainability of all outer space activities; Promoting the role of the Union as a global actor in the space sector.	AT (Drafting Suggestions): (3) For the implementation of EU space systems and space policy, the specific objectives of developing, maintaining**,** and operating **and improving** space systems, providing cutting-edge space-based information, data and services supporting Union policies, notably **inter alia** in the area of security, defence, sustainable growth, environment protection and climate resilience, **telecommunication, transport, agriculture, disaster management,** global engagement and strategic independence; Maximising the socio-economic benefits of space-based activities, in particular by fostering the development of an innovative and competitive Union space economy and supporting the development of a genuine Single Market for space activities, including collaborative research and innovation for space products and technologies and support to SMEs; Enhancing the safety, security and sustainability of all outer space activities; Promoting the role of the Union as a global actor in the space sector. AT (Comments): The evolution/improvement of the various space components is very important.

Commission proposal	Drafting Suggestions and Comments
	Civil policy areas where space technologies are highly relevant should be taken into account. Please explain the division between Horizon Europe, EU-Space-Programme and ESA. CZ (Drafting Suggestions): (3) For the implementation of EU space systems and space policy, the specific objectives of developing, maintaining and operating space systems, providing cutting-edge space-based information, data and services supporting Union policies, notably in the area of security, defence, sustainable growth, **natural resources, transport and infrastructure**, environment protection and climate resilience, global engagement and strategic independence; Maximising the socio-economic benefits of space-based activities, in particular by fostering the development of an innovative and competitive Union space economy and supporting the development of a genuine Single Market for space activities, including collaborative research and innovation for space products and technologies and support to SMEs; Enhancing the safety, security and sustainability of all outer space activities; Promoting the role of the Union as a global actor in the space sector. CZ (Comments): We can agree with the wording of the Article. We propose to complement the text by inserting *"natural resources, transport and infrastructure"* into the passage "…supporting Union policies, notably in the area of security, defence, sustainable growth, natural resources, transport and infrastructure, environmental protection and climate resilience, global engagement and strategic independence…". In these areas, data and services of space systems play a significant role.

Commission proposal	Drafting Suggestions and Comments
	With regard to natural resources, this includes agriculture, the management of drinking water resources, and other relevant domains. Concerning transport and infrastructure, this relates to aviation, land and maritime transport, energy networks, and further sectors. FR (Drafting Suggestions): (3) For the implementation of EU space systems and space policy, the specific objectives of **ensuring EU strategic autonomy through and in space, by** developing, maintaining and operating space systems, **ensuring their full operationalization and compliance with the adequate security and defence requirements as well as interoperability and coherence with NATO initiatives where applicable**, providing cutting-edge space-based information, data and services supporting Union policies, notably in the area of security, defence, sustainable growth, environment protection, **climate change and** climate resilience, **marine and maritime, transport**, global engagement and strategic independenc, **with attention to user needs and in due respect to the dual nature of the EU Space Program and thus providing for adequate governance schemes**; Maximising the socio-economic benefits of space-based activities, in particular by fostering the development of an innovative**,** **user-centric** and competitive Union space economy and supporting the development of a genuine Single Market for space activities **(righteously excluding activities conducted for the benefit of defence users),** including collaborative research and innovation for space products and technologies and support to SMEs; Enhancing the safety, security and sustainability of all outer space activities; Promoting the role of the Union as a global actor in the space sector. FR (Comments):

Commission proposal	Drafting Suggestions and Comments
	This article does not contain all the policies to which space policy also contributes, in particular the observation of climate change (Copernicus) or air navigation and martime in the transport sector. Proposal to ensure that the first objective of the Space Programme is to allow for European strategic autonomy through and in space; Proposal to ensure that the duality of the EU Space Programme be taken into account, including with an adapted governance scheme; Proposal to ensure that interoperability with NATO be taken into account at times where both organizations will considerably step up on space capabilities used (also) for security and defence needs; Rationale of addition of user-centric : develop space systems, based on user needs, that integrate end-to-end solutions, including user terminals, service level agreements (SLAs), data access, value-added services, and hybridization with terrestrial solutions, as needed. LU (Drafting Suggestions): (3) For the implementation of EU space systems and space policy, the specific objectives of developing, maintaining and operating space systems, providing cutting-edge space-based information, data and services supporting Union policies, notably in the area of security, defence, sustainable growth, environment protection and climate resilience, global engagement and strategic independence; Maximising the socio-economic benefits of space-based activities, in particular by fostering the development of an innovative and competitive Union space economy and supporting the development of a genuine Single Market for space activities, including collaborative research and innovation for space products and technologies and support to **start-ups, scale-ups, and** SMEs; Enhancing the safety, security and sustainability of all

Commission proposal	Drafting Suggestions and Comments
	outer space activities; Promoting the role of the Union as a global actor in the space sector. LU (Comments): To maximise the socio-economic benefits and support the development of a competitive Union space economy, the specific objective must explicitly encompass the entire growth continuum of innovative companies, including start-ups and scale-ups, which are crucial engines for growth, disruptive innovation, and market deployment in the space sector. This broadening ensures that the Fund supports the full innovative industrial base. NL (Drafting Suggestions): For the implementation of EU space systems and space policy, the specific objectives of developing, maintaining and operating space systems, providing cutting-edge space-based information, data and services supporting Union policies, notably in the area of security, defence, **preparedness and resilience**, sustainable growth, environment protection and climate resilience, global engagement and strategic independence; Maximising the socio-economic benefits of space-based activities, in particular by fostering the development of an innovative and competitive Union space economy and supporting the development of a genuine Single Market for space activities, including collaborative research and innovation for space products and technologies and support to SMEs; Enhancing the safety, security and sustainability of all outer space activities; Promoting the role of the Union as a global actor in the space sector **and safeguarding the public interests served by the Union Space Programme, such as safety, security, sustainability and the provision of essential public services; ensuring the continuation of the objectives of the Union Space Programme to support the societal and public value of space activities; Promoting user uptake of space-based data and services.**

Commission proposal	Drafting Suggestions and Comments
	NL (Comments): • We welcome the emphasis in Article 3(2)(d)(3) on economic growth, competitiveness, industrial capacity and technological sovereignty in space. This rightly reflects the importance of strengthening the European space ecosystem and reducing strategic dependencies. In the current Union Space Programme, user uptake is a core objective. How will the ECF ensure sufficient attention to downstream applications and market uptake? We would therefore welcome an explicit reference to user uptake in Article 3(2)(d)(3). • Also, the public interests traditionally served by the Union Space Programme, such as safety, security, sustainability and the provision of essential public services should be emphasized within the Space section. We therefore suggest inserting an explicit reference to the societal and public value of space activities. • How does the proposed ECF Regulation relate to the proposal for an EU Space Act and the forthcoming proposal for EUSPA? How will the respective scopes be delineated to avoid overlaps, in particular with regard to governance, security responsibilities and programme implementation? • Finally, we would like to refer to 'preparedness and resilience' in the text as well (see drafting suggestion). PT (Drafting Suggestions):

Commission proposal	Drafting Suggestions and Comments
	(3) For the implementation of EU space systems and space policy, the specific objectives of developing, maintaining and operating space systems, providing cutting-edge space-based information, data and services supporting Union policies, notably in the area of security, defence, sustainable growth, environment protection and climate resilience, global engagement and strategic independence; Maximising the socio-economic benefits of space-based activities, in particular by fostering the development of an innovative and competitive Union space economy **[**and supporting the development of a genuine Single Market for space activities**] ,** including collaborative research and innovation for space products and technologies and support to SMEs; Enhancing the safety, security and sustainability of all outer space activities; Promoting the role of the Union as a global actor in the space sector. PT (Comments): As the discussions on the existance of a Single Market in the area of space are still undergoing, the reference to it shoul be in [ ] DE (Drafting Suggestions): (3) For the implementation of EU space systems and space policy, the specific objectives of developing, maintaining and operating space systems, providing **high quality and up-to-date** ~~cutting-edge~~ space-based **/ -related data**, information~~, data~~ and services **able to** support~~ing~~ Union policies, notably in the area of ~~security, defence,~~ sustainable growth, environment protection and climate resilience, **transport,** global engagement and strategic independence, **and, to the extent requested by the Member States and without prejudice to national prerogatives, security and defence**; Maximising the socio-economic benefits of space-based **/ -related** activities, in particular by fostering the development of an innovative and competitive Union space economy ~~and supporting the development of a genuine Single Market for space activities~~, including **innovative and competitive**

Commission proposal	Drafting Suggestions and Comments
	European upstream and downstream sectors, collaborative research and innovation for space products and technologies and support to SMEs **while promoting the widest possible uptake and use of the data, information and services provided by the (sub-)components**; Enhancing the safety, security and sustainability of all outer space activities; Promoting the role of the Union as a global actor in the space sector **inter alia to avoid undue dependencies on third countries and actors for space services and space access**. DE (Comments): 1. The EU space programme components are foremost civilian programmes under civilian control. Mentioning security and defence first suggests otherwise. As outer space is a dual use domain, the components may also contribute to security and defence, but only to the extent requested by the Member States. 2. In view of the EU treaties currently in force (and the uncertainty regarding the EUSA proposal), it is not possible for DE to speak of "supporting the development of a genuine internal market for space activities", so this part of the sentence must be deleted IT (Drafting Suggestions): (3) For the implementation of EU space systems and space policy, the specific objectives of developing, maintaining and operating space systems, providing cutting-edge space-based information, data and services supporting Union policies, notably in the area of security, defence, sustainable growth, environment protection and climate resilience, global engagement and strategic **autonomy** ~~independence~~;

Commission proposal	Drafting Suggestions and Comments
	[…]; Maximising the socio-economic benefits of space-based activities, in particular by fostering the development of an innovative and competitive Union space economy**, maximising market uptake and downstream use of Union space data and services** and supporting the development of a genuine Single Market for space activities, including collaborative research and innovation for space products and technologies and support to SMEs; […] […] Promoting the role of the Union as a **leading** global actor in the space sector. IT (Comments): Alignment with established EU terminology (“strategic autonomy”) Reinforces references to market uptake and to the downstream support, alling the ECF at the reccomendations of several Council Conclusions.. Reinforces the political ambition regarding the Union’s global impact
	EL (Drafting Suggestions): The space pillar of the European Competitiveness Fund shall be implemented through a dedicated Union act (‘Space Programme Framework Regulation’) providing the necessary legal, institutional and financial detail to ensure predictability and clarity for all actors, including the Commission, EUSPA, ESA and Member States EL (Comments): Clarifies that the ECF should contain only high-level strategic objectives for space, while implementation details should be set out in a separate legal act to preserve flexibility and avoid duplication.

Commission proposal	Drafting Suggestions and Comments
SECTION 3	EL (Comments): The structure of Section 3 is overly detailed for a regulation intended to provide flexibility. At the same time, it omits critical implementing provisions on governance, budget predictability and institutional roles. The absence of a dedicated legal base creates legal uncertainty for ongoing and future space programmes (eg. Galileo, Copernicus, IRIS², SST, GOVSATCOM)
SPACE SYSTEMS AND SPACE POLICY IMPLEMENTATION	ES (Drafting Suggestions): ~~SPACE SYSTEMS AND~~ SPACE POLICY IMPLEMENTATION ES (Comments): The Space Policy implementation should include space systems. IT (Comments): Italy welcomes the structured approach, but would recommend a clearer programmatic framing (objectives, timelines, indicative budgeting logic) and a consolidated list of implementing/delegated acts per component to ensure predictability and oversight.
Article 57	

PUBLIC

Commission proposal	Drafting Suggestions and Comments
Specific provisions	ES (Comments): Since space is a domain with clear dual-use implications, the absence of any definition or explicit reference to the concept of "dual use"—both in this section and throughout the regulation—creates legal uncertainty. It is recommended to include a clear definition or, at minimum, a reference to an official EU definition, as is done in other cases (e.g. the legal definition of MidCaps). This point is particularly relevant in relation to dual-use technologies mentioned in later articles (such as Article 67)
	RO (Comments): General comment: Balanced participation in the European Union's space programs should be regarded not merely as an issue of industrial competitiveness or technological excellence, but as a strategic means to enhance collective security, strengthen EU cohesion and uphold the principle of European solidarity. It is therefore important to ensure that the benefits and opportunities generated by this sector are shared broadly across all Member States, preventing their excessive concentration in a limited number of established industrial hubs and fostering a more inclusive and geographically balanced development of the EU space ecosystem. Also, this approach would broaden EU's knowledge and technological base, generating more possibilities of innovating in the EU.
1. Activities supported under this section shall contribute to the general objectives set out in Article 3(1) and the specific objectives set out in Article 3(2), point (e).	AT (Drafting Suggestions): 1. Activities supported under this section shall contribute to the general objectives set out in Article 3(1) and the specific objectives set out in Article 3(2), point (~~ed~~) **(3)**. AT

Commission proposal	Drafting Suggestions and Comments
	(Comments): Editorial change. CZ (Comments): It essential that detailed breakdown of the proposed budget be provided, in line with the structure described in Article 58. Given the nature of the subject matter, we do not consider flexibility to be an advantage but rather a risk. The development and operation of all systems are planned years in advance and the necessary amounts can therefore be calculated. A detailed budget breakdown is also foreseen in Article 77(1)(c) on governance and security principles, which requires "strong control of the activities and components, including strict adherence to cost, schedule and performance by all the entities, within their respective roles and tasks", as well as in point (d) which refers to "transparent and cost-efficient management." We understand that the budget is not the primary subject of discussion in this subgroup. Nevertheless, once the ECF allocation is decided, we kindly ask for the incorporation of concrete figures into the respective Regulation. The budget must be fixed and allow only limited flexibility. The reason for this is the need for certainty regarding how much funding will be available for predictable activities, such as system construction or operation. ES (Drafting Suggestions):

PUBLIC

Commission proposal	Drafting Suggestions and Comments
	1. Activities supported under this section shall contribute to the general objectives set out in Article 3(1) and the specific objectives set out in Article 3(2), point (~~e~~**d**). ES (Comments): Correct cross-reference: the Space-related objective is Article 3(2)(d), not (e). For consistency with the rest of the ECF document. IE (Comments): IE: Article 3(2), point (e) does not seem to exist – was it intended to be Article 3(2), point (d)? Within point (d), item 3 is the one specifically dedicated to space. LU (Drafting Suggestions): 1. Activities supported under this section shall contribute to the general objectives set out in Article 3(1) and the specific objectives set out in Article 3(2), point ~~(e)~~ **(d)(3)**. SI (Drafting Suggestions): 1. Activities supported under this section shall contribute to the general objectives set out in Article 3(1) and the specific objectives set out in Article 3(2), point (~~e~~**3**). SI (Comments): We spoted what could be considered as a clerical error in designating place of the text in Article 3(2). DE

Commission proposal	Drafting Suggestions and Comments
	(Drafting Suggestions): 1. Activities supported under this section shall contribute to the general objectives set out in Article 3(1) and the specific objectives set out in Article 3(2), **(d)(3)**~~point (e)~~. DE (Comments): Delete incorrect reference and replace with draft Art. 3(2)(d)(3). IT (Drafting Suggestions): 1. Activities supported under this section shall contribute to the general objectives set out in Article 3(1) and the specific objectives set out in Article 3(2), point (**d** ~~e~~)**(3).** IT (Comments): Correct internal cross-references (the current pointer in Article 57 to Article 3(2)(e) appears intended to read 3(2)(d)(3)).
2. Support for activities under this section shall be financed from the budget set out in Article 4(2), point (e), and any additional contributions assigned in accordance with Article 6.	AT (Drafting Suggestions): 2. Support for activities under this section shall be financed from the budget set out in Article 4(2), point (e), and any additional contributions assigned in accordance with Article**s 5 and** 6. AT (Comments): To ensure coherence with Article 15 of the IRIS2 Regulation. EL

Commission proposal	Drafting Suggestions and Comments
	(Comments): Budget predictability and long-term planning are essential for space programmes. Recommend inclusion of a multi-annual funding roadmap and limits on reallocations to guarantee service continuity. FR (Comments): Can the Commission specify what flexibility will be available for this component in the event of a need arising during the programming period? Can the Commission specify the budget nomenclature envisaged for this component? Will there be a budget line for each type of activity listed in this article?
	AT (Drafting Suggestions): **Article 57 bis: Definitions** **For the purpose of this Regulation, the following definitions apply:** **(1) 'spacecraft' means an orbiting object designed to perform a specific function or mission, such as communications,** **navigation or Earth observation, including satellites, launcher upper stages, and a re-entry vehicle; a spacecraft that** **can no longer fulfil its intended mission is considered non-functional; spacecraft in reserve or standby modes** **awaiting possible reactivation are considered functional;** **(2) 'space object' means any man-made object in outer space;** **(3) 'near-Earth objects' or 'NEO' means natural objects in the solar system which are approaching the Earth;** **(4) 'space debris' means any space object including spacecraft or fragments and elements thereof in Earth's orbit or**

Commission proposal	Drafting Suggestions and Comments
	re-entering Earth's atmosphere, that are non-functional or no longer serve any specific purpose, including parts of rockets or artificial satellites, or inactive artificial satellites; **(5) 'space weather events' or 'SWE' means naturally occurring variations in the space environment at the Sun and around the Earth, including solar flares, solar energetic particles, variations in the solar wind, coronal mass ejections, geomagnetic storms and dynamics, radiation storms and ionospheric disturbances, potentially impacting Earth and space-based infrastructures;** **(6) 'space situational awareness' or 'SSA' means a holistic approach, including comprehensive knowledge and understanding, of the main space hazards, encompassing collision between space objects, fragmentation and re-entry of space objects into the atmosphere, space weather events, and near-Earth objects;** **(7) 'space surveillance and tracking system' or 'SST system' means a network of ground-based and space-based sensors capable of surveying and tracking space objects, together with processing capabilities aiming to provide data, information and services on space objects that orbit around the Earth;** **(8) 'SST sensor' means a device or a combination of devices, such as ground-based or space-based radars, lasers and telescopes, which is able to perform space surveillance or tracking and that can measure physical parameters related to space objects, such as size, location and velocity;** **(9) 'SST data' means physical parameters of space objects, including space debris, acquired by SST sensors, or orbital parameters of space objects derived from SST sensors' observations in the framework of the SST sub-component;** **(10) 'SST information' means processed SST data which are readily meaningful to the recipient;**

Commission proposal	Drafting Suggestions and Comments
	(11) 'Copernicus Sentinels' means the Copernicus dedicated satellites, spacecraft or spacecraft payloads for space-based Earth observation; **(12) 'Copernicus data' means data provided by the Copernicus Sentinels, including their metadata;** **(13) 'in-situ and other ancillary data' means observation data from ground-based, seaborne or airborne sensors, as well as reference and ancillary data licensed or provided for use in Copernicus;** **(14) 'Copernicus information' means information generated by the Copernicus Services following processing or modelling, including their metadata;** **(15) 'Copernicus users' means Copernicus core users and other Copernicus users;** **(16) 'Copernicus Services' means value-added services of general and common interest to the Union and the Member States, which are financed by the Programme and which transform Earth observation data, Copernicus in-situ data and other ancillary data into processed, aggregated and interpreted information tailored to the needs of Copernicus users;** **(17) 'GOVSATCOM user' means a public authority, a body entrusted with the exercise of public authority, an international organisation or a natural or legal person, duly authorised and entrusted with tasks relating to the supervision and management of' security-critical missions, operations and infrastructures;** **(18) 'GOVSATCOM Hub' means an operational centre the main function of which is to link, in a secure manner, the GOVSATCOM users to the provid** **(19) 'payload' means equipment carried by a spacecraft for the performance of a particular mission in space;**

Commission proposal	Drafting Suggestions and Comments
	(20) 'space ecosystem' means a network of interacting undertakings operating in value chains in the space sector, from the smallest start-ups to the largest undertakings, encompassing the upstream and downstream segments of the space market; **(21) 'EuroQCI ' means an interconnected space, ground and terrestrial infrastructure integrated into the secure connectivity system, using quantum-based technology;** **(22) 'the Agency' means the European Union Agency for the Space Programme established by Regulation (EU)[XXX] [EUSPA founding Reg];** **[to be continued as necessary]** AT (Comments): For better understanding and readability. Relevant definitions were copied from the Space and IRIS2 Regulations.
Article 58	

Commission proposal	Drafting Suggestions and Comments
Components	ES (Drafting Suggestions): Components **and supporting activities to space policy** ES (Comments): To be coherent with the rest of the document The definition of the term "component" has not been clarified yet. FI (Comments): What is the initially planned relative size of these space activity components in the budget, and how is it distributed between the different parts? Does the new components or planned actions have priorities? Flexibility during the MFF period is acceptable, but it is essential to understand the baseline situation. IT (Comments): Italy welcomes the dedicated section for Space. To enhance transparency and planning, we ask that follow-up work programme provide per-component resource visibility and list the expected implementing/delegated acts with subject matter and scope, in line with requests for budgetary visibility and clearer secondary-law perimeter.
	EE (Comments): Estonia considers the development and new structuring of the ECF space programme components to be important. The combination of existing and new activities creates a more comprehensive picture of European space sector actions and strengthens the Union's technological capacity.

Commission proposal	Drafting Suggestions and Comments
	However, it is essential to ensure that new initiatives do not duplicate existing activities already carried out by Member States in cooperation with ESA and other international partners. Several activities described in the articles overlap with the content of ESA programmes, which means the EU should carefully assess whether and how to intervene in these areas. Currently, potential overlaps are visible in areas such as the ESA business incubator network, launch vehicle R&D, and infrastructure investments, but further discussion may reveal additional cases where duplication could occur instead of synergy. In such cases, intervention by ESA Member States may be necessary. Estonia supports an approach that promotes cooperation and synergy with existing mechanisms, rather than replacing them.
1. The Union space systems and space policy shall be implemented in particular through the following components:	ES (Drafting Suggestions): 1. The Union space systems and space policy shall be implemented in particular through the following ~~components~~ **specific dedicated parts of the work programmes adopted in accordance with the rules of this Regulation under this section (components):** ES (Comments): A clearer definition of the component is required. General comment: In order to ensure coherence, MS sub-committees per component shall be stablished. This is only commented for the Access to Space component. However it is foreseen in Article 83 paragraph (g) “In accordance with its rules of procedure, the Space Committee may set up sub-committees and working groups, such as the ‘User Forum’, to advise on user requirements aspects, evolution of the services and user uptake.” Detailed information of the opportunities (one month in advance) and of results (grant, procurements, prizes) including the consortium (coordinator and partners) or

Commission proposal	Drafting Suggestions and Comments
	contractual participation down to level N-1 (prime and subcos) shall be provided to MS in those commitees. FR (Drafting Suggestions): 1. The Union space systems and space policy shall ~~be implemented in particular through~~ **consist of** the following components: FR (Comments): Can the Commission explain why it chose to use the term "in particular" to describe the space components covered by the regulation? We can find this type of wording throughout all the paragraphs describing the components and subcomponents. The regulation is supposed to establish a clear framework. We do not understand this openness to other components or missions that we are not aware of and which are therefore not defined in the regulation. This also leaves open the possibility that components may evolve without Member States being consulted and creates uncertainty. Wording from the Regulation 2021/696 such as "shall consist of" should be preferred. SE (Comments): SE would appreciate further clarification regarding the scope of the implementation of space systems and space policy, as the article lists the components that "in particular" shall be implemented.

PUBLIC

Commission proposal	Drafting Suggestions and Comments
(a) Positioning, Navigation & Timing (PNT), including Galileo and EGNOS sub-components;	AT (Drafting Suggestions): (a) Positioning, Navigation & Timing (PNT), including Galileo and **the European Geostationary Navigation Overlay Service (**EGNOS**)** sub-components; ES (Drafting Suggestions): Positioning, Navigation & Timing (PNT), including Galileo, **the European Geostationary Navigation Overlay Service** (EGNOS) **and LEO-PNT** sub-components;
(b) Earth Observation (EO), including Copernicus and Earth Observation Governmental Service (EOGS) sub-components;	DE (Drafting Suggestions): (b) Earth Observation (EO), including **the two sub-components** Copernicus and Earth Observation Governmental Service (EOGS) ~~sub-components;~~
(c) Secure Connectivity, including Infrastructure for Resilience, Interconnectivity and Security by Satellite (IRIS²) and Governmental Satellite Communication (GOVSATCOM) sub-components;	ES (Drafting Suggestions): **Space** Secure Connectivity, including Infrastructure for Resilience, Interconnectivity and Security by Satellite (IRIS²) and Governmental Satellite Communication (GOVSATCOM) sub-components; ES (Comments): The statement of GOVSATCOM as sub-component represents a change of concept, since originally GOVSATCOM was the component according to the Secure Connectivity regulation.

Commission proposal	Drafting Suggestions and Comments
	DE (Drafting Suggestions): (c) Secure Connectivity, including **the Governmental Satellite Communication (GOVSATCOM) sub-component and the** Infrastructure for Resilience, Interconnectivity and Security by Satellite (IRIS²) **sub-component**; ~~Governmental Satellite Communication (GOVSATCOM) sub-components;~~ IT (Drafting Suggestions): (c) Secure Connectivity, including Infrastructure for Resilience, Interconnectivity and Security by Satellite (IRIS²), ~~and~~ Governmental Satellite Communication (GOVSATCOM) **and EuroQCI space segement** sub-components; IT (Comments): Adds EuroQCI explicitly to reflect the cybersecurity/quantum dimension of secure connectivity and to align with the policy intent and later operational provisions on EuroQCI integration
(d) Space Situational Awareness (SSA), including Space Surveillance and Tracking (SST), Space Weather Events (SWE), and Near Earth Objects (NEO) sub-components;	
(e) access to space;	ES (Drafting Suggestions): ~~A~~access to space; PT

Commission proposal	Drafting Suggestions and Comments
	(Drafting Suggestions): **Space Transportation** SE (Comments): SE requests further elaboration on the concept of "access to space". IT (Drafting Suggestions): (e) ~~access to space~~ **space trasportation**; IT (Comments): For drafting clarity and consistency with comments to Article 65 (see above)
(f) Space commercialisation and space economy;	ES (Comments): Shall they be considered supporting activities to space policy SE (Comments): SE requests further elaboration on the concept of "space commercialisation and space economy". SE believes "space economy" remains a multifaceted and somewhat ambiguous term. IT (Drafting Suggestions): (f) Space commercialisation and space economy; **including downstream market uptake** IT

Commission proposal	Drafting Suggestions and Comments
	(Comments): Across all space components, the Commission shall foster downstream market uptake and the integration of space data and services into public policies and the wider economy, ensuring continuity with existing policies." This mirrors repeated IT and others requests to recognise downstream explicitly at component level
(g) Technological sovereignty, research and innovation.	AT (Comments): To ensure coherence with other policy windows, the space window should also explicitly allow for collaborative research and innovation activities, safeguarding excellence and avoiding fragmentation with Horizon Europe. ES (Comments): Shall they be considered supporting activities to space policy FR (Drafting Suggestions): Technological sovereignty, research and innovation **of space activities** SE (Comments): SE requests further elaboration on the concept of "technological sovereignty".
	RO (Drafting Suggestions): **(e) Technological clustering and development of industrial capacities in the field of small satellites** RO

Commission proposal	Drafting Suggestions and Comments
	(Comments): Technological clustering can be promoted through targeted actions and calls, alongside the development of industrial capacities in the field of small satellites and their associated subsystems. This approach entails supporting partnerships with smaller member states to foster sector growth and facilitate integration into advanced technology domains. In this context, priority can be given to projects that incorporate infrastructure serving the space sector in countries with emerging industries, such as satellite communication ground segments, small launch facilities, landing sites, and ground stations.
Work programmes adopted in accordance with the rules of this Regulation under this section shall integrate in a specific dedicated part and ensure coherence with the Competitiveness and Society activities supported under the Regulation (EU) [XXX][*Framework programme Horizon Europe*] and taking into account the specific rules under this Section.	CZ (Drafting Suggestions): ~~Work programmes adopted in accordance with the rules of this Regulation under this section shall integrate in a specific dedicated part and ensure coherence with the Competitiveness and Society activities supported under the Regulation (EU) [XXX][*Framework programme Horizon Europe*] and taking into account the specific rules under this Section.~~ **The above mentioned components shall be implemented by specific and fully separate work programmes for each system of part of the component. Work programmes shall set out the actions and associated budget required to meet the objectives of the components and, where applicable, the overall amount reserved for blending operations.** **The Commission shall adopt work programmes by means of implementing acts. Those implementing acts shall be adopted in accordance with the examination procedure referred to in Article 83(5).** CZ (Comments):

Commission proposal	Drafting Suggestions and Comments
	Each of the systems or components must be implemented in accordance with work programs, as is current good practice. These WPs are to be approved through an examination procedure, as is current good practice. ES (Drafting Suggestions): **2.** Work programmes adopted in accordance with the rules of this Regulation under this section shall integrate in a specific dedicated part and ensure coherence with the Competitiveness and Society activities supported under the Regulation (EU) [XXX][***Horizon Europe*** *Framework programme* ~~*Horizon Europe*~~ ***for Research and Innovation***] ~~and taking into account the specific rules under this Section~~. ES (Comments): For coherence with other section chapters. FR (Comments): Can the Commission clarify the interplay between ECF and HE including the potential specificities for spatial activities? In particular : how is collaborative research distinguished between the FEC and Horizon Europe and by who ? Can the Commission be more explicit and detail what will be the rules of participation or eligibility on calls for space R&I ? IE (Comments): IE propose to move this to a separate numbered paragraph (i.e. Article 58(2)) LU (Comments):

Commission proposal	Drafting Suggestions and Comments
	We emphasise retaining the requirement for coherence with the Horizon Europe Framework Programme. This coherence must ensure that collaborative research funded under this ECF component focuses on developing and swiftly diffusing high-quality results for industrial competitiveness, demonstrating a clear path from fundamental research (lower TRLs) to industrial application (higher TRLs). SI (Drafting Suggestions): Work programmes adopted in accordance with the rules of this Regulation under this section shall integrate in a specific dedicated part and ensure coherence with the Competitiveness and Society activities ~~supported~~ under the Regulation (EU) [XXX][*Framework programme Horizon Europe*] and taking into account the specific rules under this Section. SI (Comments): We propose word "supported" to be deleted to enable better clarity of the text (also in comparison to similar texts elsewhere in the proposal). DE (Comments): Through which approach does the Commission plan to ensure the envisaged coherence with FP10?
	FR (Drafting Suggestions): **2. The implementation of the EU Space Programme through this Regulation shall prioritize the full operationalisation of its existing and decided components and sub-components, furthermore taking into account the strategic priorities of the Union and the available financial resources.**

Commission proposal	Drafting Suggestions and Comments
	FR (Comments): Proposal to add a provision declaring that the full operationalisation of already decided components shall be a priority as opposed to newly envisioned services which shall be implemented if i) deemed a priority by the Member States and ii) provided that sufficient financial resources be made available.
Article 59	BE (Comments): Art. 59 does not mention the geodetic supply chain. The European Commission in coordination with the UN aims to address needs for EU autonomy due to shortage in the geodetic supply chain. Europe does not have a sovereign ground station network required to operate European satellites. This poses a threat to critical infrastructure operations, the European economy and security. The European Commission has been requested to analyse Galileo dependencies on the geodetic supply chain and the creation of an EU taskforce on making the geodetic supply chain robust has been proposed. An EU-only solution complementary to the wider cooperation on the international level is required to ensure geodetic autonomy for the provision of necessary data to Galileo and EGNOS. CZ (Comments): We propose dividing the article so that Galileo is in a separate article, EGNOS in a separate article and LEO-PNT also in a separate article.

PUBLIC

Commission proposal	Drafting Suggestions and Comments
Positioning, Navigation & Timing (PNT)	FR (Comments): Can the Commission clarify the budget nomenclature envisaged for this article? EE (Comments): Estonia considers the development of PNT services to be critically important and is supporting the underlying activities under this Article. Ensuring the uninterrupted and high-quality availability of Galileo and EGNOS signals across Europe is a strategic priority. Reliable PNT services are essential for European autonomy, infrastructure safety, and the functioning of critical infrastructure, and must be guaranteed even in crisis situations and under geopolitical pressure. IT (Comments): Italy supports the update of the PNT service portfolio. For predictability and legal certainty, we ask to (i) explain in recitals or work programmes how LEO-PNT fits into the Union PNT roadmap and its implications for standards and user terminals; and (ii) confirm that the implementing act under paragraph 5 will also detail access/data-handling and user categories for RF interference monitoring, ensuring coordination with Member States' competent authorities given national-security intersections.
1. The Positioning, Navigation & Timing (PNT) component (Galileo and EGNOS sub components) supported under this section shall provide long-term, state-of-the-art and secure positioning, navigation and timing services,	AT (Drafting Suggestions):

Commission proposal	Drafting Suggestions and Comments
without interruption including in adverse conditions, and wherever possible at global level, and be able to support the Union's political priorities.	1. The Positioning, Navigation & Timing (PNT) component **shall consist of** ~~(~~Galileo and EGNOS**.** ~~sub-components)~~ **Galileo is an autonomous civil global navigation satellite system (GNSS) under civil control, which consists of a constellation of satellites, centres and a global network of ground stations**. **EGNOS is a civil regional satellite navigation system under civil control, which consists of centres and stations on the ground and several transponders installed on geosynchronous satellites, which augments and corrects the open signals emitted by Galileo and other GNSSs. PNT** supported under this section shall provide long-term, state-of-the-art and secure positioning, navigation and timing services, without interruption including in adverse conditions, ~~and~~ wherever possible at global level, and be able to support the Union's political priorities. AT (Comments): We miss a definition of Galileo and EGNOS including that those are civil systems under civil control. In comparison, for Copernicus a definition is foreseen under Article 60. ES (Drafting Suggestions): "1. The Positioning, Navigation & Timing (PNT) component (Galileo and EGNOS sub components) supported under this section shall provide **resilient**, long-term, state-of-the-art ~~and~~**,** secure **and sovereign** positioning, navigation and timing services **at global level**, without interruption including in adverse conditions, ~~and wherever possible at global level~~, and be able to support the Union's political priorities **and the operational requirements of Member States in security and defence**. ES (Comments):

Commission proposal	Drafting Suggestions and Comments
	To reinforce resilience, sovereignty and defence operational use, beyond generic continuity of service. FR (Drafting Suggestions): 1. The Positioning, Navigation & Timing (PNT) component (Galileo and EGNOS sub components) supported under this section shall provide long-term, state-of-the-art and secure positioning, navigation and timing services, without interruption including in adverse **or hostile** conditions, and wherever possible at global level, and be able to support the Union's political priorities**, in coherence and complementarity with other programmes such as the Regulation (EU)[XXX] [Connecting Europe Facility]** FR (Comments): Activities mentionned in this article should be interlinked with other programmes of the Union such as the CEF. EGNOS will be qualified in face of hostile conditions. LEO PNT or complem-PNT could escape such requirements of hostile / adverse conditions. Consider splitting the requirements for each subcomponent. PT (Drafting Suggestions): 1. The Positioning, Navigation & Timing (PNT) component (Galileo and EGNOS sub components) supported under this section shall provide long-term, state-of-the-art and secure positioning, navigation and timing services, without interruption including in adverse conditions **for all European territories**, and wherever possible at global level, and be able to support the Union's political priorities. PT (Comments):

Commission proposal	Drafting Suggestions and Comments
	PNT services are essencial and should be available to all European citiziens. In particular, PNT services (including EGNOS) shall be fully available, namely, in the outermost regions, including in adverse conditions (as adverse space weather). RO (Drafting Suggestions): The Positioning, Navigation & Timing (PNT) component (Galileo and EGNOS sub components) supported under this section shall provide long-term, state-of-the-art and secure positioning, navigation and timing services, without interruption including in adverse conditions, and wherever possible at global level, and be able to support the Union's ~~political~~ priorities. RO (Comments): Support for Union's political priorities is vague, and it could lead to unaccepted restrictions against the service definitions. We suggest to delete the word "political" DE (Drafting Suggestions): 1. The Positioning, Navigation & Timing (PNT) component (Galileo and EGNOS sub components) supported under this section shall provide **independent** long-term, state-of-the-art and secure positioning, navigation and timing services, without interruption including in adverse conditions, and wherever possible at global level, and be able to support the Union's political priorities. DE (Comments): Galileo und EGNOS shall have minimum dependecy on non-EU services or data e. g. geodetic supply chain.

Commission proposal	Drafting Suggestions and Comments
	IT (Drafting Suggestions): 1. The Positioning, Navigation & Timing (PNT) component (Galileo and EGNOS sub components) supported under this section shall provide long-term, state-of-the-art and secure positioning, navigation and timing services, without interruption including in adverse conditions, and wherever possible at global level, and be able to support the Union's political priorities**,** **including protection of strategic capabilities**. IT (Comments): This edit highlights that PNT actions under the ECF cover also the protection of strategic capabilities.
	DE (Drafting Suggestions): **1 bis. The Component supports European autonomoy in space based PNT infrastructure and PNT dependent critical infrastructres.** DE (Comments): European autonomy in PNT infrastructures as achieved with Galileo and EGNOS must be maintained. In crisis situation European critical infrastructure shall be capable to operate only on EU-provided PNT-services.
2. The eligible activities of the PNT component shall include:	FI (Comments): Galileo CAS service seems to be missing from the list. The continuation of the service in addition to OSNMA must be ensured.

Commission proposal	Drafting Suggestions and Comments
(a) at least the management, operation, maintenance, continuous improvement and protection of space-and ground infrastructure and services provided;	BE (Drafting Suggestions): (a) at least the management, operation, maintenance, continuous improvement and protection of space-and ground infrastructure and services provided, **including the creation of an sovereign ground station network to ensure geodetic autonomy for the provision of necessary data to Galileo and EGNOS**'; BE (Comments): See comment above FR (Drafting Suggestions): (a) ~~at least~~ the management, operation, maintenance, continuous improvement and protection of space-and ground infrastructure and services provided; FR (Comments): Could the Commission specifiy what is meant by "at least"? Does this mean that the other services are deemed secondary in terms of priority? DE (Drafting Suggestions): (a) ~~at least~~ the management, operation, maintenance, continuous improvement and protection of space-and ground infrastructure and services provided DE (Comments):

Commission proposal	Drafting Suggestions and Comments
	Question to COM: Why "at least" - Conversely, does this mean that all other activities are optional? IT (Drafting Suggestions): (a) ~~at least the~~ management, operation, maintenance, continuous improvement and protection of ~~space and ground~~ **current PNT** infrastructure and **related** services provided; IT (Comments): Terminological precision to anchor ECF support in the current Galileo/EGNOS estate and directly related services; keeps the original structure intact.
(b) the evolution of the PNT services and the development and deployment of future generations of the systems ; including for Low Earth Orbits (LEO-PNT);	AT (Drafting Suggestions): (b) the evolution of the PNT services and the development and deployment of future generations of the systems **by taking into account the needs of the relevant stakeholders**; including for Low Earth Orbits (LEO-PNT); AT (Comments): It is crucial to take into account stakeholder needs. ES (Drafting Suggestions): (b) the evolution of the PNT services and the development and deployment of future generations of the systems ; including for Low Earth Orbits (LEO-PNT); **building on and making full use of the preliminary**

Commission proposal	Drafting Suggestions and Comments
	developments and demonstrators implemented in previous phases, with a roadmap ensuring their transition from R&D to initial operational capability, and synergies with Secure Connectivity (IRIS²). ES (Comments): To make sure LEO-PNT does not remain at research stage but becomes an operational capability aligned with IRIS² FI (Comments): As a new part of Galileo, the purpose of LEO-PNT must be described here or in a referred document before this can be agreed. FR (Drafting Suggestions): (b) the evolution of the PNT services and the development and deployment of future generations of the systems ; ~~including~~ **development of** ~~for~~ Low Earth Orbit services complementary to Galileo and EGNOSs (LEO-PNT) **with no impact on Galileo security level (in G1 and G2);** FR (Comments): LEO PNT is not a part of the Galileo and EGNOS programme. It should be standalone and not diminishing the expectations towards Galileo G2 security & robustness LEO PNT OS services shall not affect the Galileo security management (RESTRICTED). IT (Drafting Suggestions):

Commission proposal	Drafting Suggestions and Comments
	(b) the evolution of the PNT services and the development and deployment of future generations of **current** systems **and additional layers** including Low Earth Orbits (LEO-PNT); IT (Comments): Positions LEO-PNT as a layer within Galileo/EGNOS evolution, consistent with the Commission's clarification that LEO-PNT is not a separate component; avoids over-reading while signalling roadmap integration.
(c) the research and development activities supporting the modernization of the infrastructure ('upstream R&D') and the development of applications, user technology, standardisation and certification ('downstream R&D');	ES (Drafting Suggestions): (c) the research and development activities supporting the modernization of the infrastructure ('upstream R&D') and the development of applications, user technology, standardisation and certification ('downstream R&D'); **building on and making full use of the preliminary developments and demonstrators implemented in previous phases, with a roadmap ensuring their transition from R&D to initial operational capability, and synergies with Secure Connectivity (IRIS²).** ES (Comments): Alternatively the text suggested to add in (b) can be included in (c) FR (Drafting Suggestions): (c) the research and development activities supporting the modernization of the infrastructure ('upstream R&D') and the development of applications, user technology, standardisation, **regulation** and certification ('downstream R&D'); FR

Commission proposal	Drafting Suggestions and Comments
	(Comments): The CE shall report also on any mandate for use of Galileo or EGNOS. BIS EASA on IR PBN identifies a weakness in EGNOS adoption. IE (Comments): IE - Ideally this would clearly provide for R&D to scope out the need for potential future services (to be included in any future revision of this legislation). As worded, it seems to be limited only to upgrades of infrastructure related to the currently-defined services, and the development of applications etc. that are based on currently-defined services, without recognising that in the future other services might become necessary/possible. Will ESA's continuing role be foreseen in these activities?; will participation by industry HQ'd in non-EU strategic partner states be welcome? EE (Drafting Suggestions): (c) the research and development activities supporting the modernization of the infrastructure ('upstream R&D') and the development of applications, user technology, standardisation and certification ('downstream R&D'**), including the market uptake of PRS-receivers/PRS-capable user equipment across Member States;** EE (Comments): Estonia recommends that the development, certification, and market access of PRS-capable devices be explicitly included under the downstream R&D activities of the PNT component. Addressing this gap through the European Competitiveness Fund (ECF) would help ensure the effective uptake of PRS

Commission proposal	Drafting Suggestions and Comments
	services and support broader resilience and accessibility across Member States. IT (Drafting Suggestions): (c) the research and development activities supporting the modernization of the infrastructure ('upstream R&D'), and the development of applications, user technology, standardisation and certification ('downstream R&D') **and the extension of PNT services for cis-lunar use**; IT (Comments): The Moon is the next strategic frontier: major actors (US, China, Japan, India, UAE, etc.) plan orbital/surface outposts where lunar/cis-lunar PNT is a core enabler. Adding a preparatory R&D line for the extension of PNT services to cis-lunar use equips Europe with the technologies and knowledge base to assess a future EU role, ensures interoperability with international efforts and the Galileo/EGNOS evolution, and supports standards/interface work. This is a forward-looking signal, focused on research and feasibility.
	AT (Drafting Suggestions): **(c bis) the continuous provision of the PNT services and, in complementarity with Member States and private sector initiatives, the market development of those services.** AT (Comments): For the competitiveness of Europe, the main focus should be on market development.
(d) the cooperation with other regional or global satellite navigation systems, including to facilitate compatibility and interoperability and the	FR (Drafting Suggestions):

Commission proposal	Drafting Suggestions and Comments
promotion of the role of the Union as a global actor in the space sector, encourage international cooperation, and support European space diplomacy.	d) the cooperation with other regional or global satellite navigation systems, including to facilitate compatibility and interoperability**, contributing to the reinforcement** ~~and the promotion~~ of the role of the Union as a global actor in the space sector, encourage**~~s~~ of** international cooperation, and ~~support~~ **of** European space diplomacy. FR (Comments): The last part about promoting the EU as a global actor, etc., does not correspond to an activity of the PNT component. It is rather an objective or a positive outcome that cooperation and the pursuit of interoperability can enable us to achieve. We propose a rewording that better reflects this logic NL (Drafting Suggestions): the cooperation with other regional or global satellite navigation systems, including to facilitate compatibility and interoperability, **as well as security and defence use cases with trusted partners,** and the promotion of the role of the Union as a global actor in the space sector, encourage international cooperation, and support European space diplomacy. NL (Comments): • On Article 59(2)(d) Does the reference *"to facilitate compatibility and interoperability"* provide sufficient legal basis to ensure interoperability of PRS also in the context of military use with non-EU allies? It is important that interoperability extends to security and defence use cases with trusted partners. SE

Commission proposal	Drafting Suggestions and Comments
	(Drafting Suggestions): (d) the cooperation with other regional or global satellite navigation systems, ~~including~~ **organizations such as the International Civil Aviation Organization (ICAO) and the International Maritime Organization (IMO)** to facilitate compatibility and interoperability and the promotion of the role of the Union as a global actor in the space sector, encourage international cooperation, and support European space diplomacy. SE (Comments): The cooperation with other regional and global satellite navigation systems should be strengthened to facilitate compatibility and interoperability. In this context, engagement with international organizations such as the International Civil Aviation Organization (ICAO) and the International Maritime Organization (IMO) is essential to ensure the harmonization of standards and the integration of satellite navigation services across sectors.
3. The services provided by the Union's PNT component shall in particular cover:	LU (Comments): It appears that the Galileo Signal Authentication Service (SAS) has not been included in this list. We would suggest considering including it. DE (Comments): Could COM please explain this list in detail in the next SPC-GEC? This would be particularly useful since on the one hand, new services seem to be listed, while on the other hand, services already under development (such as The Signal Authentication Service (SAS) and quasi-pilot), seem to be missing. As in the current space programme regulation, there should be a short explanation on each service.

Commission proposal	Drafting Suggestions and Comments
(a) an open service for use by consumers (OS);	ES (Drafting Suggestions): an open service **(OS)** for use **free of charge** by consumers ~~(OS)~~; FR (Drafting Suggestions): (a) an open service (OS) for use by ~~consumers~~ **every user**; FR (Comments): We don't see the need to distinguish "consumers" as the service is freely available to all users
(b) a high-accuracy service for professional or commercial use (HAS);	ES (Drafting Suggestions): a high-accuracy service **(HAS)** for professional or commercial use ~~(HAS)~~; FR (Drafting Suggestions): (b) a high-accuracy service ~~for professional or commercial use~~ (HAS) **for users requiring higher performance than what is offered by the OS with high grade receivers**; FR (Comments): We don't see the need to distinguish professional or commercial user as this service is freely available to all users (it needs a E6 & PPP compatible receiver, far from smartphone adoption)

Commission proposal	Drafting Suggestions and Comments
(c) an open service navigation message authentication (OSNMA) for the authentication of the Galileo open service); 	ES (Drafting Suggestions): (c) an open service navigation message authentication (OSNMA) for the authentication of the Galileo open service ~~)~~; IE (Comments): IE notes the previous definitions given in the Galileo Regulation (which are now being repealed) provided much more detail on these services. Is it intended that these services should no longer meet the minimum requirements set out in the Galileo Regulation? Is it intended that the purposes of these services is no longer as given in the Galileo Regulation? Furthermore, the Galileo Regulation specified that the services in points (a)-(b), (e)-(f) and (i)-(j) were required o be free of charge for users (in some cases «free of charge for users» and in others «free of direct user charges»). Is it intended that all these services can now be charged for, and/or that this will be left to the implementing acts under para 5? IT (Drafting Suggestions): (c) an open service navigation message authentication (OSNMA) **and signal authentication service (SAS)** for the authentication of the Galileo open service; IT (Comments): (1) Fixes the typographical issue (stray parenthesis). (2) Adds SAS as a further authentication means, consistent with the current service set

Commission proposal	Drafting Suggestions and Comments
	FR (Drafting Suggestions): **(cc) a Signal Authentication Service (SAS) to complement OSNMA;** FR (Comments): This future service is not identified in the current list of services
(d) a public regulated service restricted to government-authorised users (PRS);	ES (Drafting Suggestions): a public regulated service **(PRS)** restricted to government-authorised users ~~(PRS)~~; FR (Comments): Does this include equivalent hardening of space or ground equipments against external threats (cyber, …)? Included within PRS section?
	AT (Drafting Suggestions): **(d bis) a signal authentication service (SAS);** AT (Comments): The SAS is missing and need to be added.
(e) a multi-hazard emergency warning service (EWSS);	FR (Drafting Suggestions): (e) a multi-hazard emergency warning **satellite** service (EWSS); FR

Commission proposal	Drafting Suggestions and Comments
	(Comments): EWS is TM registered for civil protection, only EWSS is known by the Space programme. IE (Comments): IE - This should be either "emergency warning satellite service (EWSS)" or "emergency warning service (EWS)"
(f) a timing service (TS);	
(g) a space navigation service for use by operators of space assets;	ES (Drafting Suggestions): (g) a space navigation service **(SNS)** for use by operators of space assets ES (Comments): To be coherent with acronyms of different services LU (Comments): This aspect would benefit from further clarification. Are we to understand that this refers to a new service planned for the near future? DE (Comments): We are not yet aware of the service. Could COM please specify in writing the scope and content in advance.

Commission proposal	Drafting Suggestions and Comments
(h) a global stand-alone search and rescue service, including for governmental users, integrating return communication capabilities to support rescue operation (SAR);	ES (Drafting Suggestions): a global stand-alone search and rescue service **(SARS)**, including for governmental users, integrating return communication capabilities to support **search and** rescue operation ~~(SAR)~~; ES (Comments): To be coherent with acronyms of different services FR (Drafting Suggestions): **(h) a space infrastructure detecting distress signals transmitted by beacons and relaying messages to them via a return link, contributing to the International Cospas-Sarsat System and enabling Member States to provide search and rescue services in the frame of the International Cospas-Sarsat Programme;** **(h') the development of additional EU services linked to the services mentioned in (h), and possibly for governmental users on a worldwide basis** FR (Comments): The delegation may indicate that item 3(h) does not seem to reflect the actual and anticipated contribution of the Commission to search and rescue activities. This contribution can be divided into three types of activities: the Commission's contribution to the international Cospas-Sarsat system, the development of additional services related to the service provided by member states under the Cospas-Sarsat Program, and possibly services for governmental users. RO

Commission proposal	Drafting Suggestions and Comments
	(Comments): The support/ collaboration with the existing COSPAS-SARSAT system is not mentioned, as in previous Space Regulations. DE (Comments): COM proposes a Governmental Search and Rescue Service. Germany sees no need for this, also because the cost of implementation, at least in our view, would be enormous.
(i) a safety of life services for users for whom safety is essential, including civil aviation, maritime, and other transport applications (SoL);	ES (Drafting Suggestions): a safety-of-life services **(SoLS)** for users for whom safety is essential, including civil aviation, maritime, and other transport applications ~~(SoL)~~; ES (Comments): To be coherent with acronyms of different services FR (Comments): This article should be linked with article 71. Could the Commission share its vision and proposals for addressing the liability issues related to these matters? DE (Comments): Please provide written information on what the proposed PNT safety of life service comprises. Does this mean the regional EGNOS or a new service on Galileo? Does this cover communication as well?

Commission proposal	Drafting Suggestions and Comments
(j) a data dissemination service (EDAS);	IE (Comments): IE This should be either "EGNOS data access service (EDAS)" or "data dissemination service (DSS)" DE (Comments): Please provide written information on what kind of data should be disseminated through PNT services and on what drives the requirements of this service - is it user requirements?
(k) radio-frequency interference monitoring services for different authorised user communities of all space components;	CZ (Drafting Suggestions): radio-frequency interference monitoring services for different authorised user communities of all space components, **including European Global Interference Protection Network (EGIPRON)**; CZ (Comments): EGIPRON should be specifically included in ECF as well ES (Drafting Suggestions): radio-frequency interference monitoring services for different authorised user communities of all space components **in this section**; FI (Comments): As a new component of PNT, the purpose RFI monitoring services must be described here or in a referred document before this can be agreed.

PUBLIC

Commission proposal	Drafting Suggestions and Comments
	FR (Drafting Suggestions): ~~(k) radio-frequency interference monitoring services for different authorised user communities of all space components;~~ FR (Comments): Can the Commission clarify the mention of a radio frequency interference monitoring service, whose necessity and establishment are not confirmed and deserve thorough discussions with member states in light of security and defence concerns? Pending further discussions with the Member States, such a provision should be put on hold. LT (Comments): In general we welcome the attention to radio-frequency interference monitoring. We would welcome more clarity how it would be implemented and whether the actions planned will be detailed through specific secondary legislation. PT (Comments): Agreeing RFI monitoring services are of critical importance, such component should seek synergies with other components of the EU Space Programme and cover RF spectrum relevant for PNT, SATCOM, EO and other components. DE (Comments): 1. It is unclear to us whether this explanation is actually necessary. Could COM please clarify in writing why this wording was chosen?

Commission proposal	Drafting Suggestions and Comments
	2. Please also provide written information as to why RF interference monitoring is part of PNT. Shouldn't this be rather interference detection and mitigation? Otherwise, the paragraph should only focus on RFI monitoring for PNT. 3. The newly proposed radio-frequency interference monitoring service has military relevance and touches upon the national security prerogatives of the Member States. The governance structure and design of such a potential service therefore needs to be developed together with the Member States and ensuring an adequate role of national security actors. EE (Comments): Estonia particularly supports the development and enhancement of radio-frequency interference monitoring services. Given the recent increase in GNSS signal disruptions at the Baltic external border, it is crucial for the EU to strengthen its capacity to detect, identify sources, and mitigate the impact of such interference. This capability is important for both civil and security purposes and will help reinforce European strategic autonomy. IT (Comments): Clarify via a dedicated Article 59(5) implementing act (see proposal below) the scope of "RF interference monitoring services" (e.g., treatment of intentional vs non-intentional interference) and the modalities for coordination with national competent authorities. This ensures legal certainty and respects national-security prerogatives.
(l) a contribution to complementary PNT services, which shall increase the resilience in case of disruptions to the services provided by the PNT component.	FR (Drafting Suggestions): (l) a contribution to **terrestrial** complementary PNT services, **new or existing**, which shall increase the resilience in case of disruptions to the

Commission proposal	Drafting Suggestions and Comments
	services provided by the **space** PNT component, **with standardisation, promotion and regulation as well**. SE (Comments): SE believes that it would be valuable to take into consideration the services that will be provided by the second generation of Galileo satellites (such as e.g. CAS). DE (Comments): It is unclear what "complementary PNT services" refer to. Please provide specific written information thereon. IT (Comments): Please clarify the extent and boundaries of "a contribution to complementary PNT services" (e.g., nature of support, interfaces, non-duplication with core PNT) and indicate whether details will be set out under Article 59(5)
4. PRS shall be free of charge for the Member States, the Council, the Commission, EEAS and, where appropriate, duly authorised Union agencies. The services of the PNT component shall be provided as a priority over the territories geographically located in Europe of all Member States and third countries participating in the PNT sub-components.	AT (Drafting Suggestions): 4. **The services shall be free of charge.** PRS shall be free of charge for the Member States, the Council, the Commission, EEAS and, where appropriate, duly authorised Union agencies. The services of the PNT component shall be provided as a priority over the territories geographically located in Europe of all Member States and third countries participating in the PNT sub-components. AT (Comments):

PUBLIC

Commission proposal	Drafting Suggestions and Comments
	We do not agree to regulate the pricing policy only through implementing acts. This should be stated in the regulation itself as done so far in the Space Regulation. To be competitive and for the secure provision of critical services, PNT must be free of charge. CZ (Drafting Suggestions): **~~PRS~~ Union's PNT component services** shall be free of charge for the Member States, the Council, the Commission, EEAS and, where appropriate, duly authorised Union agencies. The services of the PNT component shall be provided as a priority over the territories geographically located in Europe of all Member States and third countries participating in the PNT sub-components. CZ (Comments): All services should be free of charge for these stakeholders ES (Drafting Suggestions): 4. PRS shall be free of charge for the Member States, the Council, the Commission, EEAS and, where appropriate, duly authorised Union agencies. The services of the PNT component shall be provided as a priority ~~over the territories geographically located in Europe of~~ **throughout the territories of** all Member States in Europe and third countries participating in the PNT sub-components. FR (Comments): The delegation will request that the mention of the regionalization of services be separated from the definition of access to the PRS, which must aim for worldwide, uninterrupted coverage, including in the event of a threat to the EU. This distinction of the EU territory in Europe results from the sharing of

Commission proposal	Drafting Suggestions and Comments
	articles between EGNOS and Galileo, even though they target different geographical objectives. EE (Comments): Estonia supports free access to the Public Regulated Service (PRS) for Member States. However, we are concerned about the limited availability of PRS-capable devices, which has hindered broader service uptake. Estonia recommends that the European Commission and Member States develop measures to support the development, certification, and market access of PRS devices to ensure the effective implementation of the service. Estonia recommends that the development, certification, and market access of PRS-capable devices be considered as an eligible activity under the ECF in order to address the current gap in device availability and ensure the effective implementation of the service. See suggestion for art 59.2.c)
	FR (Drafting Suggestions): **The Galileo infrastructure shall include infrastructure necessary to enable the provision of full Galileo services.** FR (Comments): Proposal to ensure that infrastructure needs are covered.
5. The Commission may adopt, by means of implementing acts, measures required to establish and regulate access policies for PNT data and services. These implementing acts shall be adopted in accordance with the advisory procedure referred to in Article 83, paragraph 2.	AT (Drafting Suggestions): 5. The Commission may adopt, by means of implementing acts, measures required to establish and regulate access policies for PNT data and services. These implementing acts shall be adopted in accordance with the ~~advisory~~ **examination** procedure referred to in Article 83, paragraph ~~2~~**3**.

Commission proposal	Drafting Suggestions and Comments
	AT (Comments): We prefer less implementing acts and more details in the basic act. CZ (Drafting Suggestions): The Commission may adopt, by means of implementing acts, measures required to establish and regulate access policies for PNT data and services. These implementing acts shall be adopted in accordance with the ~~advisory~~ **examination** procedure referred to in Article 83, paragraph 2. FR (Drafting Suggestions): 5. The Commission may adopt, by means of implementing acts, measures required to establish and regulate access policies for PNT data and services. These implementing acts shall be adopted in accordance with the **examination** procedure referred to in Article 83, paragraph **3**. FR (Comments): Examination procedure is requested for this article.
	IT (Drafting Suggestions): 5bis. The Commission shall adopt implementing acts laying down the detailed policy for access and use of the radio-frequency interference monitoring services referred to in paragraph 3(k), including interfaces with national authorities and incident notification procedures. IT (Comments):

Commission proposal	Drafting Suggestions and Comments
	The RF-monitoring service intersects national security; an implementing act shall ensures harmonised interfaces and predictable operations Union-wide, while preserving national prerogatives and interests.

PUBLIC

Article 60	BE (Comments): 1. We welcome the consolidation of Copernicus and EOGS under Article 60 but recommend clearer articulation of Copernicus' role in climate monitoring, mitigation, and adaptation, especially considering increasing economic loss and damage from extreme weather. Copernicus should be explicitly linked to the EU's climate resilience strategy and to the Destination Earth program. Furthermore, we urge the preservation of the Copernicus budget and the strengthening of national collaboration programs (NCPs) to ensure Member States can co-develop and benefit from EO services. CZ (Comments): We propose dividing the article so that Copernicus is in a separate article and EOGS is also in a separate article. FI (Comments): Basic principles and high-level user requirements of EOGS are under discussion in the EOGS working group. Texts of article 60 (sections 7-13) should be updated later according to the working group outcome. SE (Comments): SE would appreciate clarification as to whether the intention of Article 60 is to establish EOGS through the ECF regulation, or whether this work is expected to proceed in parallel. The proposed EOGS warrants more detailed information and consideration given it is a new addition to the EU Space Programme and given its explicit defence use, which is within the exclusive competence of Member States.

Commission proposal	Drafting Suggestions and Comments
	Due to the explicit defence use, Members States need to be able to assess the benefits of EOGS from a cost and governance perspective and in relation to national programs and Nato-initiatives. SE requests clarification from the Commission regarding the data policy for EOGS. For instance, will access be free of charge for Member States, similar to the arrangements under Copernicus (Article 60.1), Galileo PRS (Article 59.4), and GOVSATCOM/IRIS² (Article 61.5)? Sweden requests clarification on the planned governance structure of the EOGS, especially how it will interact with Copernicus and other civil EO systems and EO programmes of the Member States. SE requests more detailed supporting documentation regarding EOGS, including the complete studies conducted by the two consortia, to enable Member States to properly assess the proposed new component. Based on the information currently provided by the Commission, Member States are not able to formulate a position on the proposal.

Commission proposal	Drafting Suggestions and Comments
Earth Observation	FR (Comments): Can the Commission clarify the budget nomenclature envisaged for this article? Regarding the differences of the two sub-components of EO, has it been considered to divide these dispositions into two different articles? If yes, why has it not been retained? EE (Comments): Estonia supports the further development of Earth Observation services, including Copernicus and the new Earth Observation Governmental Service (EOGS), which enable data-driven decision-making for both civil and security purposes. From Estonia's perspective, both national EOGS missions and the availability of third-party space-based EO data for Member States are important. IT (Comments): Italy supports the clear separation between Copernicus (civil, open data) and EOGS (governmental/sensitive) in governance, services and data policies. Commission to sequence EOGS implementation so that Union-Member States' user requirements are defined before tasks are entrusted (e.g., to ESA). For legal certainty, please list the expected implementing/delegated acts for Article 60 (subject matter and scope).

PUBLIC

Commission proposal	Drafting Suggestions and Comments
1. The Earth Observation (EO) system shall consist of Copernicus, and of the Earth Observation Governmental Service (EOGS). Copernicus is an operational, autonomous, user-driven, civil Earth observation system under civilian control, building on the existing national and European capacities. It shall offer geo-information data and services, comprising satellites, ground infrastructure, data and information processing facilities, and distribution infrastructure, based on a free, full and open data policy and, where appropriate, integrating the needs and requirements of security.	ES (Drafting Suggestions): The Earth Observation (EO) system shall consist of Copernicus **sub-component**, and of the Earth Observation Governmental Service (EOGS) **sub-component**. Copernicus is an operational, autonomous, user-driven, civil Earth observation system under civilian control, building on the existing national and European capacities**, while ensuring interoperability with defence and security requirements defined by Member States**. It shall offer geo-information data and services, comprising satellites, ground infrastructure, data and information processing facilities, and distribution infrastructure, based on a free, full and open data policy and, where appropriate, integrating the needs and requirements of security. ES (Comments): To guarantee that Copernicus products meet operational needs beyond purely civil applications. FI (Comments): It is essential to ensure the continuation and further development of Copernicus. FR (Drafting Suggestions): 1. The Earth Observation (EO) system shall consist of Copernicus, and of the Earth Observation Governmental Service (EOGS). Copernicus is an operational, autonomous, user-driven, civil Earth observation system under civilian control, building on the existing national and European capacities **based on a dedicated space infrastructure and six operational Services**. It shall offer geo-information data and services, comprising satellites, ground infrastructure, data and information processing facilities, and distribution

Commission proposal	Drafting Suggestions and Comments
	infrastructure, based on a free, full and open data policy and, where appropriate, integrating the needs and requirements of security FR (Comments): Regarding the respectives objectives and governance, a clear distinction among EOGS and Copernicus must be guaranted. Discussions on this article shall bear in mind that the creation of a potential EOGS has not been agreed upon yet and that the operational and governance structures remain subject to discussions between the Commission and the Member States. To ensure the continuity of the programme, direct mention of its space component and the six services provided. IE (Comments): IE Welcome the recollection that Copernicus is a “civil Earth observation system under civilian control” LT (Comments): In our view, more clear distinction is needed between general Earth Observation (EO) services and the Earth Observation Governmental Service (EOGS) in order to clarify the specifics of such service. NL (Comments): • We welcome the explicit and strict separation in Article 60 between *Copernicus* as an open, civil programme and *EOGS* as a restricted and secure service for security and defence. This distinction provides legal

Commission proposal	Drafting Suggestions and Comments
	and operational clarity and safeguards the civil character of Copernicus. At the same time, we note that Article 60(1) describes Copernicus in detail, but does not provide a comparable clarification for EOGS. This asymmetry may create confusion. Therefore, we request a comparable clarification regarding EOGS. PT (Comments): No mention of what EOGS is – just what Copernicus is. It would be good to clarify already the objective of EOGS – highlighting the complementarity to Copernicus. SE (Drafting Suggestions): 1. The Earth Observation (EO) system shall consist of Copernicus, and of the Earth Observation Governmental Service (EOGS). Copernicus is an operational, autonomous, user-driven, civil Earth observation system under civilian control, building on the existing national and European capacities. It shall offer geo-information data and services, comprising satellites, ground infrastructure, data and information processing facilities, and distribution infrastructure, based on a free, full and open data policy and, where appropriate, integrating the needs and requirements of security. **Copernicus shall continue to ensure strong coordination with Member States' national EO programs and infrastructures, including data interoperability and shared governance mechanisms**. SE (Comments): SE believes that Copernicus should continue to be under civilian control and transparency, any security-related integration respects these principles.

Commission proposal	Drafting Suggestions and Comments
	DE (Drafting Suggestions): 1. The **two** Earth Observation (EO) ~~system~~ **sub-components** shall ~~consist of~~ **be** Copernicus, and ~~of~~ the Earth Observation Governmental Service (EOGS). ~~Copernicus is an operational, autonomous, user-driven, civil Earth observation system under civilian control, building on the existing national and European capacities. It shall offer geo- information data and services, comprising satellites, ground infrastructure, data and information processing facilities, and distribution infrastructure, based on a free, full and open data policy and, where appropriate, integrating the needs and requirements of security.~~ DE (Comments): 1. Since EOGS concerns security (and defence aspects) and not the competitiveness of space activities, it is questionable whether it should be managed in a programme established on a TFEU legal basis. Given the underlying treaties and Member State sovereignty, if at all, it could be set up under the mandate of the Council, rather than the Commission. 2. From the point of view of the German federal government, the proposed EOGS service is not a “done deal”. To Germany, an EOGS would only be acceptable if our conditions are being met. Such an EOGS would still require far-reaching coordination with MS, in particular with regard to the governance structure and system architecture, based on an analysis of needs that has not yet been carried out, taking into account the interests and (future) capabilities of inter alia military actors. 3. A newly proposed EOGS service needs to be based on clearly established needs and requirements of the Member States, including military and national security actors. This is currently not the case.

Commission proposal	Drafting Suggestions and Comments
	4. If, despite no 1 above, EOGS is momentraily kept in the draft ECF, we request that it be in a *separate* article from Copernicus. See below. IT (Drafting Suggestions): 1. The Earth Observation (EO) ~~system~~ **component** shall consist of Copernicus, and of the Earth Observation Governmental Service (EOGS) **subcomponents**. IT (Comments): To ensure consistent wording across Articles 58–60 (component/sub-component/system) in the EO section. Commission to clarify the final clause “, where appropriate, integrating the needs and requirements of security”: indicate whether this concerns (i) security screening of data/outputs, (ii) tasking/operations, or (iii) access/authorisation, preferably by linking to the implementing/delegated acts foreseen under this Article.
	DE (Drafting Suggestions): **New Article 60(1)bis** **1. Copernicus is an operational, autonomous, user-driven, civil Earth observation system under civilian control, building on the existing national and European capacities. It shall offer geo- information data and services, comprising satellites, ground infrastructure, data and information processing facilities, and distribution infrastructure, based on a free, full and open data policy and, where appropriate, integrating the needs and requirements of security.** DE

PUBLIC

Commission proposal	Drafting Suggestions and Comments
	(Comments): Copernicus and EOGS each require separate articles as these 2 components address very different needs and users and hence require different structures.
2. Copernicus shall also support the formulation, implementation and monitoring of the Union's and its Member States' policies in particular in the fields of environment, climate change, marine, maritime, atmosphere, agriculture and rural development, preservation of cultural heritage, civil protection, infrastructure monitoring, safety and security, as well as digital economy, under the Digital Leadership window, which shall be aligned with the objective of Copernicus.	BE (Drafting Suggestions): 2. Copernicus shall also support the formulation, implementation and monitoring of the Union's and its Member States' policies in particular in the fields of environment, climate ~~change~~ **monitoring, mitigation, and adaptation**, marine, maritime, atmosphere, agriculture and rural development, preservation of cultural heritage, civil protection, infrastructure monitoring, safety and security, as well as digital economy, under the Digital Leadership window, which shall be aligned with the objective of Copernicus. BE (Comments): Copernicus is described as supporting EU and Member State policies in areas like climate change, environment, agriculture, and civil protection. **Suggested improvement**: Explicitly highlight Copernicus' role in **climate monitoring, mitigation, and adaptation**, especially considering increasing **economic loss and damage from extreme weather**. This could include: • Enhanced support for **loss and damage assessments**. • Integration with **climate resilience planning** at national and regional levels. • Use of Copernicus data in **early warning systems** and **disaster risk reduction**. SE

Commission proposal	Drafting Suggestions and Comments
	(Drafting Suggestions): 2. Copernicus shall also support the formulation, implementation and monitoring of the Union's and its Member States' policies in particular in the fields of environment, climate change, marine, maritime, atmosphere, agriculture and rural development, preservation of cultural heritage, civil protection, infrastructure monitoring, safety and security, as well as digital economy, under the Digital Leadership window, which shall be aligned with the objective of Copernicus. **Copernicus shall ensure that its services are developed in close collaboration with the Member States, leveraging on national expertise and infrastructure, and maintaining flexibility to address evolving national and regional priorities.** SE (Comments): SE recommends to strengthen user engagement and related mechanisms to ensure that Copernicus services remain user-driven, in particular, to satistfy needs of local and regional authorities. DE (Drafting Suggestions): 2. Copernicus shall also support the formulation, implementation and monitoring of the Union's and its Member States' policies in particular in the fields of environment, climate change, marine, maritime, atmosphere, agriculture and rural development, preservation of cultural **and natural** heritage, civil protection, infrastructure monitoring, safety and security, as well as digital economy, under the Digital Leadership window, which shall be aligned with the objective of Copernicus.
3. Copernicus shall promote the international coordination of Earth observation systems and related exchanges of data in order to strengthen its	SE (Comments):

Commission proposal	Drafting Suggestions and Comments
global dimension and complementarity taking account of international agreements and coordination processes.	SE strongly supports international coordination in EO, particularly through initiatives such as GEO and CEOS. Copernicus should continue to play a leading role globally and ensuring open data and sustainabilit. SE also encourages the inclusion of Arctic monitoring as a strategic priority in international cooperation. IT (Comments): Support for international coordination is welcome. Please indicate how reciprocity and interoperability principles will be implemented (reference to future implementing acts acceptable).
4. 'Copernicus core users' are the Union institutions and bodies and European, national or regional public bodies in the Union or associated third countries entrusted with a public service mission for the definition, implementation, enforcement or monitoring of civilian public policies, such as environmental, civil protection, safety, including safety of infrastructure, or security policies, which benefit from Copernicus data and Copernicus information and have the additional role of driving the evolution of Copernicus.	AT (Drafting Suggestions): 4. 'Copernicus core users' are the Union institutions and bodies and European, national or regional public bodies in the Union or associated third countries entrusted with a public service mission for the definition, implementation, enforcement or monitoring of civilian public policies, such as environmental, civil protection, safety, including safety of infrastructure, or security policies, which benefit from Copernicus data and Copernicus information and have the additional role of driving the evolution of Copernicus. **A Copernicus User Forum is set up in accordance with Article 83 (1) (g), to advise on Copernicus user needs and user uptake.** AT (Comments): The Copernicus User Forum should be mentioned here. BE (Drafting Suggestions):

Commission proposal	Drafting Suggestions and Comments
	4. 'Copernicus core users' are the Union institutions and bodies and European, national or regional public bodies in the Union or associated third countries entrusted with a public service mission for the definition, implementation, enforcement or monitoring of civilian public policies, such as environmental, civil protection, safety, including safety of infrastructure, or security policies, which benefit from Copernicus data and Copernicus information and have the additional role of driving the evolution of Copernicus. **A Copernicus User Forum is set up according to Article 83 1 (g), to advise on Copernicus user needs and user uptake.** BE (Comments): Belgium supports the introduction of a specific reference to the Copernicus User Forum. ES (Drafting Suggestions): 4. 'Copernicus core users' are the Union institutions and bodies and European, national or regional public bodies in the Union or associated third countries entrusted with a public service mission**, including security and defence missions under the responsibility of Member States,** for the definition, implementation, enforcement or monitoring of civilian public policies, such as environmental, civil protection, safety, including safety of infrastructure, or security policies, which benefit from Copernicus data and Copernicus information and have the additional role of driving the evolution of Copernicus. ES (Comments): To explicitly recognise defence bodies as core users with priority needs. FR

Commission proposal	Drafting Suggestions and Comments
	(Drafting Suggestions): 4. 'Copernicus core users' are the Union institutions and bodies and European, national or regional public bodies in the Union or associated third countries entrusted with a public service mission for the definition, implementation, enforcement or monitoring of civilian public policies, such as environmental, civil protection, safety, including safety of infrastructure, or security policies, which benefit from Copernicus data and Copernicus information and have the additional role of driving the evolution of Copernicus. **A Copernicus User Forum is set up according to Article 83 1 (g), to advise on Copernicus user needs and user uptake.** FR (Comments): User Forum : This configuration is only optional with current Article 83(1)(g). In order to reflect the user-driven nature of the program in its governance, this shall be the case for Copernicus. This corresponds to Article 107(6) of current Regulation 2021/696 IE (Drafting Suggestions): Please add … "A Copernicus User Forum is set up according to Article 83 1 (g), to advise on Copernicus user needs and user uptake." IE (Comments): Discussed and agreed at SPC-CC amongst delegates

Commission proposal	Drafting Suggestions and Comments
	LU (Drafting Suggestions): 4. 'Copernicus core users' are the Union institutions and bodies and European, national or regional public bodies in the Union or associated third countries entrusted with a public service mission for the definition, implementation, enforcement or monitoring of civilian public policies, such as environmental, civil protection, safety, including safety of infrastructure, or security policies, which benefit from Copernicus data and Copernicus information and have the additional role of driving the evolution of Copernicus. **A Copernicus User Forum is set up according to Article 83(1)(g), to advise on Copernicus user needs and user uptake.** LU (Comments): We would recommend adding the following point at the end of the text: "A Copernicus User Forum is set up according to Article 83(1)(g), to advise on Copernicus user needs and user uptake." NL (Drafting Suggestions): Copernicus core users' are the Union institutions and bodies and European, national or regional public bodies in the Union or associated third countries entrusted with a public service mission for the definition, implementation, enforcement or monitoring of civilian public policies, such as environmental, civil protection, safety, including safety of infrastructure, or security policies, which benefit from Copernicus data and Copernicus information and have the additional role of driving the evolution of Copernicus. **A Copernicus User Forum is set up according to Article 83(1)(g), to advise on Copernicus user needs and user uptake.** PT

Commission proposal	Drafting Suggestions and Comments
	(Drafting Suggestions): Add in the end of the paragraph: **A Copernicus User Forum is set up according to Article 83 1 (g), to advise on Copernicus user needs and user uptake**. PT (Comments): The Programme is User-driven and a User Forum is critical to get user feedback and continuous assessment of needs for the evolution of the programme. DE (Drafting Suggestions): 4. 'Copernicus core users' are the Union institutions and bodies and European, national or regional public bodies in the Union or associated third countries entrusted with a public service mission for the definition, implementation, enforcement or monitoring of civilian public policies, such as environmental, civil protection, safety, including safety of infrastructure, or security policies, which benefit from Copernicus data and Copernicus information and have the additional role of driving the evolution of Copernicus. **A Copernicus User Forum is set up according to Article 83 1.(g), to advise on Copernicus user needs and user uptake.** DE (Comments): While Article 83 1.(g) is only giving the potential of setting a User Form in general for programme elements of the ECF, ist is essential for Copernicus to maintain the well-established Copernicus User Forum also beyond 2027. IT (Drafting Suggestions):

PUBLIC

Commission proposal	Drafting Suggestions and Comments
	4. […] **A Copernicus User Forum is set up according to Article 83 1 (g), to advise on Copernicus user needs and user uptake.** IT (Comments): Confirms the current structured user interface to capture core users' needs and orient uptake, consistent with Member States' calls for user-driven evolution and with current Space Programme's committee architecture.
5. To ensure its continuity and evolution, and meet the evolving users' needs, in particular Union institutions and bodies and European, national, or regional public bodies in the Union or associated third countries, Copernicus shall in particular be composed of:	
(a) Copernicus Infrastructure, including development, deployment, and operations of the Copernicus Sentinels, access to third-party space-based Earth observation data and sustained access to in-situ and other ancillary data, including possible contributions to international in-situ networks;	FR (Drafting Suggestions): (a) Copernicus Infrastructure, **based on** ~~including~~ development, deployment, and operations of the Copernicus Sentinels, **including futures capacities,** access to third-party space-based Earth observation data and sustained access to in-situ and other ancillary data, including possible contributions to **and from** international in-situ networks; FR (Comments): Precisions to the Copernicus infrastructure to ensure continuity, without forgetting the contribution of international in situ date to the programme. RO (Comments): Please define ancillary data

Commission proposal	Drafting Suggestions and Comments
	DE (Drafting Suggestions): (a) Copernicus Infrastructure, including development, deployment, and operations of the **high quality** Copernicus Sentinels **including Next Generation and Expansion Sentinels**, access to third-party space-based Earth observation data and sustained access to in-situ and other ancillary data, including possible contributions to international in-situ networks; DE (Comments): In our view, it is important to include here an explicit reference to high quality Sentinely, Next Generation and Expansion Sentinels.
(b) Copernicus Services, including environmental monitoring on a global level for land, climate change, atmosphere and marine environments; emergency management services; prevention and preparedness services; security services within the Union; including maritime surveillance and border monitoring; support to Union external action and Common Foreign and Security Policy;	AT (Drafting Suggestions): (b) Copernicus Services, including environmental monitoring on a global level for land, climate change, atmosphere and marine environments; emergency management services; prevention and preparedness services; security services within the Union; including maritime surveillance and border monitoring; support to Union external action and Common Foreign and Security Policy; **promotion of Copernicus core user uptake shall be part of the Copernicus Services' activities (both service-specific user uptake and across-service user uptake measures), including the collection and analysis of Copernicus core users' needs;** AT (Comments): For the competitiveness of Europe a strong focus on user uptake is necessary. BE (Drafting Suggestions):

Commission proposal	Drafting Suggestions and Comments
	Copernicus Services, including environmental monitoring on a global level for land, climate change, atmosphere and marine environments; emergency management services; prevention and preparedness services; security services within the Union; including maritime surveillance and border monitoring; support to Union external action and Common Foreign and Security Policy; **Promotion of Copernicus core user uptake shall be part of the Copernicus Services' activities (both service-specific user uptake and across-service user uptake measures), including the collection and analysis of Copernicus core users' needs;** BE (Comments): Belgium supports the introduction of a specific reference to the user uptake. FR (Drafting Suggestions): (b) Copernicus Services, including environmental monitoring ~~on a~~ **from local to** global level for land, climate change, atmosphere and marine environments; emergency management services; prevention and preparedness services; security services within the Union **and at its external borders**; ~~including~~ maritime surveillance and border monitoring; support to Union external action and Common Foreign and Security Policy; FR (Comments): This part could have a level of details similar to Regulation (EU) 2021/696 ; and be explicitely linked to delegation to expert entrusted entities listed in Article 75(5).

Commission proposal	Drafting Suggestions and Comments
	Services include but are not limited to global monitoring. Border surveillance service is assumed to cover external borders. Maritime surveillance service is assumed to be provided not only within the Union. IE (Drafting Suggestions): Please add .. "Promotion of Copernicus core user uptake shall be part of the Copernicus Services' activities (both service-specific user uptake and across-service user uptake measures), including the collection and analysis of Copernicus core users' needs" IE (Comments): Discussed and agreed at SPC-CC amongst delegates NL (Drafting Suggestions): Copernicus Services, including environmental monitoring on a European and global level for land, climate change, atmosphere and marine environments; emergency management services; security services within the Union; including maritime surveillance and border monitoring. support to Union external action and Common Foreign and Security Policy. **Promotion of Copernicus core user uptake shall be part of the Copernicus Services' activities (both service-specific user uptake and across-service user uptake measures), including the collection and analysis of Copernicus core users' needs;** PT (Drafting Suggestions): Add in the end of the paragraph: **Promotion of Copernicus core user uptake shall be part of the Copernicus Services' activities (both service-specific**

Commission proposal	Drafting Suggestions and Comments
	user uptake and across-service user uptake measures), including the collection and analysis of Copernicus core users' needs; PT (Comments): Continuation and expansion of the National Collaboration Programms of the Copernicus services engaging the core users should continue and increase to allow addressing specific national uptake needs but also cross-service uptake activities. SE (Drafting Suggestions): (b) Copernicus Services, including environmental monitoring on a global level for land, climate change, atmosphere and marine environments; emergency management services; prevention and preparedness services; security services within the Union; including maritime surveillance and border monitoring; support to Union external action and Common Foreign and Security Policy; **Copernicus services shall be co-designed with Member States to reflect regional priorities, including Arctic monitoring, forestry, and climate adaptation.** SE (Comments): Services should be more flexible to address areas likeforest health, water quality, and climate resilience. DE (Drafting Suggestions): (b) Copernicus Services, including environmental monitoring on a **European and** global level for land, climate change, atmosphere and marine environments; emergency management services; ~~prevention and preparedness services~~ security services within the Union; including maritime surveillance and border monitoring; support to Union external action and

Commission proposal	Drafting Suggestions and Comments
	Common Foreign and Security Policy**. Promotion of Copernicus core user uptake shall be part of the Copernicus Services' activities (both service-specific user uptake and across-service user uptake measures), including the collection and analysis of Copernicus core users' needs;** DE (Comments): We suggest deletion as it is unclear~~,~~ to what needs the term "Prevention and prepardness services" points to. IT (Drafting Suggestions): (b) Promotion of Copernicus core user uptake shall be part of the Copernicus Services' activities (both service-specific user uptake and across-service user uptake measures), including the collection and analysis of Copernicus core users' need IT (Comments): The user-uptake sentence operationalises IT and other delegations requests for market uptake/ downstream adoption by embedding core-user-driven measures directly in services, without altering task scope.
(c) Copernicus data access and distribution, including infrastructure and services to ensure the discovery, viewing, access to, distribution and exploitation and long-term preservation of Copernicus data and Copernicus information, in a user-friendly manner, notably the synergies with other data spaces, such as the European Green Deal Data Space or Digital Twins.	FR (Drafting Suggestions): (c) Copernicus data access and distribution, including infrastructure and services, **such as Digital Twins**, to ensure the discovery, viewing, access to, distribution and exploitation and long-term preservation of Copernicus data and Copernicus information, in a user-friendly manner, notably the synergies

Commission proposal	Drafting Suggestions and Comments
	with other data spaces, such as the European Green Deal Data Space ~~or Digital Twins~~. FR (Comments): Digital twins refers to an infrastructure not a policy. SE (Drafting Suggestions): (c) Copernicus data access and distribution, including infrastructure and services to ensure the discovery, viewing, access to, distribution and exploitation and long-term preservation of Copernicus data and Copernicus information, in a user-friendly manner, notably the synergies with other data spaces, such as the European Green Deal Data Space or Digital Twins. **Copernicus shall ensure that data access platforms are inclusive, multilingual, and adapted to the needs of regional and local authorities, research institutions, and SMEs.** SE (Comments): SE supports the development of user-friendly platforms. Nevertheless there is a need to smaller actors to acces to data and to training, ex: municipalities. DE (Drafting Suggestions): (c) Copernicus data access and distribution, including infrastructure and services to ensure the discovery, viewing, access to, distribution, **traceability** and exploitation and long-term preservation of Copernicus data and Copernicus information, in a user-friendly manner, notably the synergies with other data spaces, such as the European Green Deal Data Space or Digital Twins **and acknowledge the relevance of data traceability**

PUBLIC

Commission proposal	Drafting Suggestions and Comments
	FR (Drafting Suggestions): **(d) Research and development activities shall support the evolution of Copernicus, including their services, and downstream R&D for applications and user technology for the uptake of Earth Observation services. activitities of research and technological development to maitain at state-of-the-art the Union Services supporting formulation, implementation and monitoring of the Union's and its Member States' policies, including those reffered to in Article 60(2)** FR (Comments): Staying at the state of the art requires continuous improvement of the system, both for the space component and the services compponent.
(d) The Commission may adopt, by means of implementing acts, technical specifications referring to the eligible actions listed in paragraph 4. Those implementing acts shall be adopted in accordance with the advisory procedure referred to in Article 83, paragraph 2.	AT (Drafting Suggestions): (d) The Commission may adopt, by means of implementing acts, technical specifications referring to the eligible actions listed in paragraph ~~4~~**5**. Those implementing acts shall be adopted in accordance with the ~~advisory~~ **examination** procedure referred to in Article 83, paragraph ~~2~~**3**. AT (Comments): What does "technical specifications" mean/include? We prefer less implementing acts and more details in the basic act. ES (Drafting Suggestions): (d) The Commission may adopt, by means of implementing acts, technical specifications referring to the eligible actions listed in paragraph

Commission proposal	Drafting Suggestions and Comments
	45. Those implementing acts shall be adopted in accordance with the advisory procedure referred to in Article 83, paragraph 2 ES (Comments): Paragraph 4 defines core users; eligible actions are listed in paragraph 5. FR (Drafting Suggestions): **(e)** The Commission may adopt, by means of implementing acts, technical specifications referring to the eligible actions listed in paragraph 4. Those implementing acts shall be adopted in accordance with the **examination** procedure referred to in Article 83, paragraph **3**. FR (Comments): Examination procedure is suggested for this item. SI (Drafting Suggestions): (d) The Commission may adopt, by means of implementing acts, technical specifications referring to the **"eligible actions listed in paragraph 4".** Those implementing acts shall be adopted in accordance with the advisory procedure referred to in Article 83, paragraph 2. SI (Comments): Paraghaph 4 of this article is not explanatory obout the "eligible actions". Better reference need to be used or further adaptation of paragraph 4 is to be made. DE (Drafting Suggestions):

PUBLIC

Commission proposal	Drafting Suggestions and Comments
	4. Those implementing acts shall be adopted in accordance with the ~~advisory~~ **examination** procedure referred to in Article 83, paragraph ~~2~~**3**.
	FR (Drafting Suggestions): **(f) Actions for the promotion of Copernicus user uptake for Copernicus core users with, market development and capacity building, including promotion of Copernicus data and services, downstream applications and their development at all levels should aim to maximise socio-economic benefits, as well as the collection and analysis of Copernicus users' needs.** **A horizontal grant mechanism for Copernicus user uptake, enabling Member States and their competent public entities, individually or jointly, to design and implement needs driven activities identified at national or regional level, including those requiring cross border cooperation could also been established** FR (Comments): Actions related to "Core users" currently in Article 67 shall be included in this component.
6. The Commission may also adopt delegated acts in accordance with Article 84 to supplement Copernicus data and information policy as regards the security limitations as well as the specifications, conditions and procedures for the access to and use of Copernicus data and Copernicus information.	AT (Comments): We prefer less delegated acts and more details in the basic act (similar to Article 53 of the Space Regulation). CZ (Drafting Suggestions):

Commission proposal	Drafting Suggestions and Comments
	~~The Commission may also adopt delegated acts in accordance with Article 84 to supplement Copernicus data and information policy as regards the security limitations as well as the specifications, conditions and procedures for the access to and use of Copernicus data and Copernicus information.~~ **1. Copernicus data and Copernicus information shall be provided to Copernicus users under the following free, full and open data policy:** **(a) | Copernicus users may, on a free and worldwide basis, reproduce, distribute, communicate to the public, adapt, and modify all Copernicus data and Copernicus information and combine them with other data and information;** **(b) | the free, full and open data policy shall include the following limitations: | (i) | the formats, timeliness and dissemination characteristics of Copernicus data and Copernicus information shall be pre-defined; | (ii) | the licensing conditions of Copernicus third-party data and information used in the production of Copernicus information shall be abided by where applicable; | (iii) | the security limitations resulting from the general security requirements referred to [place to put the reference]; | (iv) | the protection against the risk of disruption of the system producing or making available Copernicus data and Copernicus information and of the data itself shall be ensured; | (v) | the protection of reliable access to Copernicus data and Copernicus information for European users shall be ensured.** **2. The Commission shall adopt delegated acts in accordance with Article [place to put right reference] to supplement the specific provisions set out in paragraph 1 of this Article as regards the specifications and conditions and procedures for the access to and use of Copernicus data and Copernicus information.** **3. Where imperative grounds of urgency so require, the procedure provided for in [place to put right reference] shall apply to delegated acts adopted pursuant to this Article.**

Commission proposal	Drafting Suggestions and Comments
	4. The Commission shall issue licences and notices for access and use of Copernicus data and Copernicus information, including attribution clauses, in compliance with the Copernicus data policy as set out in this Regulation and applicable delegated acts adopted pursuant to paragraph 2. CZ (Comments): We consider the preservation of the current data policy, based on free, open and cost-free access to data, to be key. We believe that this principle should be enshrined directly in the Regulation, and we would support transposing the wording from Regulation (EU) 2021/696 in this respect. FR (Drafting Suggestions): 6. The Commission may also ~~adopt delegated acts in accordance with Article 84 to~~ supplement Copernicus data and information policy as regards the security limitations as well as the specifications, conditions and procedures for the access to and use of Copernicus data and Copernicus information, **in accordance with the examination procedure referred to in Article 83, paragraph 3.** FR (Comments): Examination procedure is suggested for this item. DE (Drafting Suggestions): 6. The Commission may also adopt **implementing acts by way of examination procedure referred to in Article 83, paragraph 3** ~~delegated acts in accordance with Article 84~~ to supplement Copernicus data and information policy as regards the security limitations as well as the

Commission proposal	Drafting Suggestions and Comments
	specifications, conditions and procedures for the access to and use of Copernicus data and Copernicus information.
	DE (Drafting Suggestions): **6bis** **Research and development activities shall support the evolution of Copernicus, including their services, and downstream R&D for applications and user technology for the uptake of Copernicus and other reated Earth Observation data and services.** DE (Comments): Text from 13., adapted to Copernicus only.
7. EOGS shall provide enhanced situational awareness in support of preparedness, decision-making and the action of the Union and Member States in the fields of security and defence. EOGS shall in particular comprise satellites, ground infrastructure, data and information processing facilities, and distribution infrastructure. It shall provide secure, reliable, timely, persistent and targeted space-based Earth observation data, reinforcing existing and planned capabilities. It shall complement and build on existing capabilities provided through the European Union Satellite Centre, including those from Member States. EOGS may also provide complementary information to Copernicus Services, in particular for civil protection and security.	AT (Comments): We would appreciate more information about the role and needs of SatCen with regard to EOGS. BE (Drafting Suggestions): EOGS shall provide enhanced situational awareness in support of preparedness, decision-making and the action of the Union and Member States in the fields of security and defence. EOGS shall in particular comprise **military-graded** satellites, ground infrastructure, data and information processing facilities, and distribution infrastructure. It shall provide secure, reliable, timely, persistent and targeted space-based Earth observation data, reinforcing existing and planned capabilities. It shall complement and build on existing capabilities provided through the European Union Satellite Centre, including those from Member States.

Commission proposal	Drafting Suggestions and Comments
	EOGS may also provide complementary information to Copernicus Services, in particular for civil protection and security ES (Drafting Suggestions): 7. EOGS shall provide enhanced situational awareness**, based on imagery products and information,** in support of preparedness, decision-making and the action of the Union and Member States in the fields of security and defence. EOGS shall in particular comprise satellites, ground infrastructure, data and information processing facilities, and distribution infrastructure. It shall provide secure, reliable, timely, persistent and targeted space-based Earth observation data, reinforcing existing and planned capabilities. It shall complement and build on existing capabilities provided through the European Union Satellite Centre, including those from Member States. EOGS may also provide complementary information to Copernicus Services, in particular for civil protection and security ES (Comments): The main subject of EOGS are the Earth Observation and "situational awareness" could be a little confusing, concerning the SSA component FI (Comments): As EOGS is a whole new component, it should be described clearly. A practical way to do this would be to add a reference to EOGS high-level user requirements document. Basic principles and high-level user requirements of EOGS are under discussion in the EOGS working group. Texts of this article (sections 7-13) should be updated later according to the working group outcome. FR

Commission proposal	Drafting Suggestions and Comments
	(Drafting Suggestions): 7. EOGS shall provide enhanced situational awareness in support of preparedness, decision-making and the action of the Union and Member States in the fields of security and defence. EOGS shall in particular comprise satellites, ground infrastructure, data and information processing facilities, and distribution infrastructure. It shall provide secure, reliable, timely, persistent and targeted space-based Earth observation data, reinforcing existing and planned capabilities. It shall complement and build on existing capabilities provided through the European Union Satellite Centre, including those from Member States. EOGS may also provide complementary ~~information~~ **data** to Copernicus Services, in particular for civil protection and security. FR (Comments): What are the foreseen interaction of this paragraph with the UCPM ? EOGS information does not enhance Copernicus services; it is a specific service that meets different needs. EOGS will be able to provide data (and not information) to Copernicus when possible. How the articulation with the Copernicus security service will be ensured ? Pending further discussions with the Member States, such a provision should be put on hold. If the creation of such a service were to be decided, detailed provisions should be added, notably concerning : – The operational structure of the service; – The governance architecture of the service, including the central role of the SATCEN;

Commission proposal	Drafting Suggestions and Comments
	– Guarantees in terms of dissemination of classified information and access of EU instituions and potential third parties based on the need-to-know principle; – Rules on the potential access of third parties to such a service, which shall be based on a mutually beneficial agreement and discussed with Member States prima facie; – The relationship with ESA, including regarding the technical implementation of EOGS. We are already proposing initial modifications below, but these are conditional on the continuation of discussions between the Commission and the Member States. NL (Drafting Suggestions): EOGS shall provide enhanced situational awareness in support of preparedness, decision-making and the action of the Union and Member States in the fields of security and defence, **in transparency and with respect to the national competences on security and defense.** EOGS shall in particular comprise satellites, ground infrastructure, data and information processing facilities, and distribution infrastructure. It shall provide secure, reliable, timely, persistent and targeted space-based Earth observation data, reinforcing existing and planned capabilities. It shall complement and build on existing capabilities provided through the European Union Satellite Centre, including those from Member States. EOGS may also provide complementary information to Copernicus Services, in particular for civil protection and security. NL (Comments): • We support the establishment of EOGS but stress that governance must be transparent and respect national competences on security and defence.

Commission proposal	Drafting Suggestions and Comments
	Clear authorisation procedures are needed for access and use of EOGS services. PT (Drafting Suggestions): EOGS shall provide enhanced situational awareness in support of preparedness, decision-making and the action of the Union and Member States in the fields of security and defence. EOGS shall in particular **potentially** comprise satellites, ground infrastructure, data and information processing facilities, and distribution infrastructure. It shall provide secure, reliable, timely, persistent and targeted space-based Earth observation data, reinforcing existing and planned capabilities. It shall complement and build on existing capabilities provided through the European Union Satellite Centre, including those from Member States. EOGS may also provide complementary information to Copernicus Services, in particular for civil protection and security. PT (Comments): The EOGS user needs and architecture, including the need for new EU-owned satellites is still under discussion. DE (Drafting Suggestions): New Article 60ter for EOGS starting here 7. EOGS shall provide enhanced situational awareness in support of preparedness, decision-making and the action of the Union and Member States in the fields of security. EOGS provide secure, reliable, timely, persistent and targeted space-based Earth observation data **through pooling and sharing** of ~~reinforcing~~ existing and planned capabilities. It shall

Commission proposal	Drafting Suggestions and Comments
	complement and build on existing capabilities provided through the European Union Satellite Centre, including those from Member States. ~~EOGS may also provide complementary information to Copernicus Services, in particular for civil protection and security.~~ DE (Comments): 1. If included, EOGS requires an article that is separate from Copernicus (see above, the comment on draft Article 60(1),). 2. Germany could be open to a potential EU EOGS that is established separately from Copernicus, that starts small and is built incrementally, with a clear focus and priority on pooling and sharing, interoperability and flexible architecture, with maximum integration of commercial offerings and national systems. 3. If included, there should not be any mixing of Copernicus and EOGS. IT (Drafting Suggestions): 7. […] **User requirements and high-level needs shall be co-defined by the Union and the Member States before procurement or tasking decisions.** IT (Comments): Ensures the user-driven nature of EOGS and reflects IT request for joint EU–MS definition of requirements prior to any mandates/procurements, preserving complementarity with Copernicus and SatCen and avoiding premature lock-ins. PL (Comments):

Commission proposal	Drafting Suggestions and Comments
	The EOGS will constitute a new sub-component and is currently undergoing intensive preparatory activities both at the ESA level - where the so-called precursor, ERS-EO, is anticipated to be developed - and at the EU level, where the European Commission is actively engaged in collecting and aligning user requirements and system specifications in coordination with Member States. It is therefore imperative to consider both streams of this process to ensure a seamless transition towards the operational deployment of the outcomes, including those delivered by ESA, by 2028.
8. EOGS shall in particular be composed of:	BE (Comments): The merging of Copernicus and EOGS into a single legislative framework may risk diluting the visibility and budgetary autonomy of Copernicus. **Recommendation**: Include safeguards to **maintain or increase the Copernicus budget**, especially given its growing importance in climate and environmental domains. Consider earmarking funds for: • Socio-economic impact modelling. • Support for vulnerable regions and sectors. EE (Comments): Estonia supports linking EOGS missions to ESA optional programmes (such as ERS), enabling Member States to develop industrial capacity via ESA, with the EU as a user of these systems. This approach creates synergy between ESA and the EU and strengthens European strategic autonomy. IT (Comments):

Commission proposal	Drafting Suggestions and Comments
	Commission to clarify EOGS mission scope, governance model, and operational concept (including tasking, prioritisation, and interfaces with Copernicus/SatCen), together with the data/access policy and security/accreditation requirements. PL (Comments): Paragraph 8 refers to a new subcomponent, namely the EOGS (Earth Observation Governmental Service), which is currently the subject of intensive negotiations both at the ESA level (which will most likely be responsible for developing and advancing the so-called precursor of this subcomponent, i.e. ERS-EO) and within the EU (the European Commission is in the process of collecting and agreeing with the Member States on user needs and requirements, as well as defining system requirements). Therefore, it is important to take both aspects of this activity into account and ensure the smooth utilisation of the results of the work carried out by 2028 (including at the ESA level).
(a) EOGS Infrastructure, including, development and operations of new Earth-observation space missions designed for sensitive governmental applications; access to complementary third-party space-based Earth observation data; access to in-situ and other ancillary data;	BE (Drafting Suggestions): EOGS Infrastructure, including, development and operations of new Earth-observation space missions designed for sensitive governmental applications **and military activity**; access to complementary third-party space-based Earth observation data; access to in-situ and other ancillary data; FI (Comments): A discussion on necessary EOGS infrastructure is on-going in the EOGS working group. A balance between third-party EO data and a potential new EOGS space mission should be agreed and updated into text accordingly.

Commission proposal	Drafting Suggestions and Comments
	FR (Drafting Suggestions): (a) EOGS Infrastructure, including, development and operations of new Earth-observation space missions designed for sensitive governmental applications; access to complementary third-party space-based Earth observation data~~; access to in-situ and other ancillary data;~~ FR (Comments): At this stage of the discussions regarding EOGS, no access to other types of data is being envisaged PT (Drafting Suggestions): EOGS Infrastructure, including, **if needed,** the development and operations of new Earth- observation space missions designed for sensitive governmental applications; **relying mostly on the** access **of existing national and commercial EU-** third-party space-based Earth observation data; access to in-situ and other ancillary data; PT (Comments): The need for new satellites is still being discussed. The service should firstly rely on exisiting EU national and EU commercial missions. DE (Drafting Suggestions): (a) EOGS ~~Infrastructure~~ pooling and sharing **infrastructure**, ~~including, development and operations of new Earth- observation space missions~~ designed for sensitive governmental applications~~;~~ **that implements** access to complementary third-party space-based Earth observation data; access to in-situ and other ancillary data;

Commission proposal	Drafting Suggestions and Comments
	DE (Comments): If included, it is necessary to avoid any preemption of finalised user needs; furthermore, a gap analysis is yet to be carried out. EE (Comments): Estonia emphasizes the importance of including the possibility to use third-party satellite mission data and making this data accessible to Member States. Purchasing data from third-party missions would also allow the EU to act as a client for missions developed by EU entities, supporting EU industry. IT (Comments): Commission to confirm that the security accreditation and interoperability criteria applicable to contributed assets will be specified to ensure seamless integration with EU infrastructures.
(b) EOGS Services, including activities for the generation of value-added geo-spatial information restricted to government-authorised users for sensitive situational awareness applications, in support of preparedness, decision-making in the fields of security and defence;	BE (Drafting Suggestions): EOGS Services, including activities for the generation of value-added geo-spatial information **and intelligence** restricted to government-authorised users for sensitive situational awareness applications **and combat support functions**, in support of preparedness, decision-making **and actions** in the fields of security and defence; FR (Drafting Suggestions): ~~(b) EOGS Services, including activities for the generation of value-added geo-spatial information restricted to government-authorised users for~~

Commission proposal	Drafting Suggestions and Comments
	~~sensitive situational awareness applications, in support of preparedness, decision-making in the fields of security and defence;~~ FR (Comments): At this stage of the discussions, no furniture of services other than the furnishing of earth observation data is being envisaged. Request to delete.
(c) EOGS Data access and distribution, including infrastructure and services to ensure the access to, distribution and exploitation and long-term preservation of EOGS data and information, in a secure manner.	AT (Drafting Suggestions): (c) EOGS ~~D~~**d**ata access and distribution, including infrastructure and services to ensure the access to, distribution and exploitation and long-term preservation of EOGS data and information, in a secure manner. AT (Comments): Editorial change. IT (Drafting Suggestions): (c) EOGS Data access and distribution, including infrastructure and services to ensure the access to, distribution and exploitation and long-term preservation of EOGS data and information, in a secure manner **and in accordance with Article 69**. IT (Comments): Adds a concise cross-reference to the general security framework, improving legal certainty without changing scope

Commission proposal	Drafting Suggestions and Comments
9. The Commission may adopt, by means of implementing acts, technical specifications referring to EOGS eligible actions, as listed in paragraph 8. Those implementing acts shall be adopted in accordance with the advisory procedure referred to in Article 83, paragraph 2.	AT (Drafting Suggestions): 9. The Commission may adopt, by means of implementing acts, technical specifications referring to EOGS eligible actions, as listed in paragraph 8. Those implementing acts shall be adopted in accordance with the ~~advisory~~ **examination** procedure referred to in Article 83, paragraph ~~2~~**3**. AT (Comments): We prefer less implementing acts and more details in the basic act. FR (Drafting Suggestions): The Commission may adopt, by means of implementing acts, technical specifications referring to EOGS eligible actions, as listed in paragraph 8. Those implementing acts shall be adopted in accordance with the **examination** procedure referred to in Article 83, paragraph **3**. FR (Comments): Examination procedure is requested for this paragraph. DE (Drafting Suggestions): 9. The Commission may adopt, by means of implementing acts, technical specifications referring to EOGS eligible actions, as listed in paragraph 8. Those implementing acts shall be adopted in accordance with the ~~advisory~~ **examination** procedure referred to in Article 83, paragraph ~~2~~**3.** DE (Comments):

Commission proposal	Drafting Suggestions and Comments
	It is not acceptable that the Commission decides on technical specifications of a newly proposed system that supposedly is intended to serve military purposes alone through implementing acts. IT (Drafting Suggestions): 9. The Commission shall adopt, by means of implementing acts EOGS user requirements and high-level system needs, as referred to in paragraph 7. […] IT (Comments): Responds to MS requests that user needs guide design/entrustment
10. The users of EOGS shall be duly authorised by the Commission or Member States, and shall comply with the general security requirements referred to in Article 69. The following entities may be authorised as users of EOGS:	ES (Drafting Suggestions): 10. The users of EOGS shall be duly authorised by the Commission or Member States, and shall comply with the general security requirements referred to in Article ~~69~~ **77**. The following entities may be authorised as users of EOGS: ES (Comments): General security requirements are set out in Article 77 (Security), not in Article 69 (Eligibility/Participation). FR (Drafting Suggestions): *[10. The users of EOGS shall be duly authorised by the Commission or Member States, and shall comply with the general security requirements referred to in Article 69. The following entities may be authorised as users of EOGS]:*

Commission proposal	Drafting Suggestions and Comments
	FR (Comments): Discussions on EOGS are preliminary and ongoing. It is difficult to comment at this stage on the proposed EOGS provisions, which are actually very incomplete, as many elements still need to be clarified in the working group. **We suggest to let this disposal into brackets.** For instance, can the Commission define what is a user in the frame of EOGS ? (not "who" but what it implies being a user). Which users will need to be authorized by the Commission and which will need to be authorized by the Member States ? Who exactly will authorize these users and according to what procedure ? What exactly will these users be allowed to do? It seems there is a reference mistake as the only reference we can find to the general security requirements is in article 77.3.
(a) a Union or Member State public authority or body entrusted with the exercise of public authority;	
(a) a natural or legal person acting on behalf and under the control of an entity referred to in point (a).	AT (Drafting Suggestions): (~~a~~**b**) a natural or legal person acting on behalf and under the control of an entity referred to in point (a). AT (Comments): Editorial change. ES

Commission proposal	Drafting Suggestions and Comments
	(Drafting Suggestions): ~~(a)~~**(b)** a natural or legal person acting on behalf and under the control of an entity referred to in point (a). FR (Drafting Suggestions): (~~a~~**b**) a natural or legal person acting on behalf and under the control of an entity referred to in point (a). PT (Drafting Suggestions): **(b)** a natural or legal person acting on behalf and under the control of an entity referred to in point (a). PT (Comments): Typo (b) instead of (a) IT (Comments): Fix lettering of the second indent: should be (b).
11. Member States may contribute to EOGS with satellite capacities, ground segment sites or part of the ground segment facilities.	ES (Drafting Suggestions): 11. Member States may contribute to EOGS with satellite capacities, ground segment sites or part of the ground segment facilities**, and/or provision of services or applications**. ES (Comments): This is key for for national contributions

Commission proposal	Drafting Suggestions and Comments
	FI (Comments): The role of commercial data providers and international organisations (e.g. ESA) is under discussion in the EOGS working group. Text should be updated according to the working group outcome. FR (Drafting Suggestions): 11. Member States may contribute to EOGS with satellite capacities, ground segment sites or part of the ground segment facilities, **provided the adequate security requirements are complied with**. IT (Drafting Suggestions): 11. Member States may contribute to EOGS with satellite capacities, ground segment sites or part of the ground segment facilities, **subject to security accreditation and technical compatibility requirements.** IT (Comments): Makes explicit that contributed assets must pass security/compatibility gates, ensuring coherent operations and safeguarding sensitive chains.
12. Union agencies may have access to EOGS only insofar as necessary to fulfil their tasks and in accordance with detailed rules laid down in an administrative arrangement concluded between the agency concerned and the Union institution that supervises it.	

Commission proposal	Drafting Suggestions and Comments
13. Research and development activities shall support the evolution of Copernicus and EOGS, including their services, and downstream R&D for applications and user technology for the uptake of Earth Observation services.	AT (Drafting Suggestions): 13. Research and development activities shall support the evolution of Copernicus and EOGS, including their services, and downstream **research and development** ~~R&D~~ for applications and user technology for the uptake of Earth Observation services. AT (Comments): Editorial change. ES (Drafting Suggestions): 13. Research and development activities shall support the evolution of Copernicus and EOGS, including their services, and downstream R&D for applications and user technology for the uptake of Earth Observation services, **in coordination with ESA activities**. ES (Comments): The implementation of EOGS activities must be closely coordinated with, and build upon, the preparatory work undertaken by the European Space Agency (ESA) in this domain. This alignment is essential to ensure institutional coherence, optimize resource utilization, and maintain continuity with the strategic objectives established at European level. (AEE) FR (Drafting Suggestions): **13. Research and development activities shall support the evolution of EOGS, including their services, and downstream R&D for applications and user technology for the uptake of Earth Observation services.**

Commission proposal	Drafting Suggestions and Comments
	FR (Comments): What are the foreseen interaction of this paragraph with Horizon Europe ? This could be distinct for the two components. IE (Comments): IE Query Is ESA's continuing role foreseen in these activities?; extent of implementation of Strategic Autonomy measures – will participation by industry HQ'd in non-EU strategic partner states be welcome? DE (Drafting Suggestions): 13. Research and development activities shall support the evolution of ~~Copernicus and~~ EOGS, including their services, and downstream R&D for applications and user technology for the uptake of **security and defence** Earth Observation **data and** services. DE (Comments): Amendment to separate Copernicus and EOGS, also with respect to R&D. See also 6bis.

PUBLIC

Commission proposal	Drafting Suggestions and Comments
Article 61	AT (Comments): We have not yet finished our internal consultaion about Article 61. We reserve the right to send first comments at a later date. Why do so many provisions of the Space and IRIS2 Regulations seem obsolete? CZ (Comments): We propose dividing the article so that IRIS2 is in a separate article and GOVSATCOM is also in a separate article. NL (Comments): • Article 61 currently lacks in general an explicit reference to the importance of *interoperability*. We request that this will be added to ensure seamless use with allied systems and within EU structures.

PUBLIC

Secure Connectivity	BE (Comments): If the articles in this proposal are to replace 2023/588, then a lot of detail is omitted. One important article in 2023/588 is art. 7, where eg the ability for new entrants, startups, SMEs and mid-caps to deliver their own services leveraging IRIS2. Such emphasis on new space is not part of this proposal, and is regrettable. FR (Comments): Can the Commission clarify the budget nomenclature envisaged for this article? IE (Comments): IE General question: Is ESA's continuing role foreseen in these activities (Secure Connectivity/ IRIS2, EuroQCI, GOVSATCOM?; extent of implementation of Strategic Autonomy measures – will participation by industry HQ'd in non-EU strategic partner states be welcome? DE (Comments): Please make a clear distinction between Govsatcom and IRIS2, by separating the text into two different articles, following an introductory paragraph on Secure Connectivity in general. (As proposed, the draft paragraph does not draw a clear line between Govsatcom and IRIS2). Clear priority should be given to the pooling & sharing (Govsatcom) – it is the only service available short/mid-term.

Commission proposal	Drafting Suggestions and Comments
	Questions: Why is a commercial IRIS2 infrastructure mentioned, what role/goal does this have for secure connectivity? Why is this a requirement to have a commercial IRIS2 part? Please provide detailed written explanations to these questions. EE (Comments): Estonia supports the objectives of the Secure Connectivity programme and emphasizes the importance of ensuring the programme's agility to adapt to changes in technology, political circumstances, and market conditions. IT (Comments): Commission to clarify the relationship between IRIS² governmental services and GOVSATCOM services, define interoperability/non-impairment where government and commercial infrastructures interface (Art. 61(18)), and explain links with EUROQCI and the GOVSATCOM Hub. Also, the concession-as-default approach (Art. 61(15)) vis-à-vis the secure connectivity regulation model is not justified. PL (Comments): We suggest clearer definition of the objectives, scope, and purpose of the Secure Connectivity components, specifically IRIS2 and GOVSATCOM. The relationship and distinctions between these two systems remain unclear. For example, descriptions like those used for the Earth Observation component could provide useful guidance. It is not yet clear whether GOVSATCOM is meant to evolve into IRIS2 or if they are to remain separate systems, nor is the reasoning behind either approach defined. Clarification would enhance the legal framework and ensure a common understanding of their future roles.

Commission proposal	Drafting Suggestions and Comments
1. The scope of the Secure Connectivity component shall in particular be:	BE (Comments): The objective for IRIS2 in 2023/588 was very clear: governmental communication services and provision of commercial services. The goal for IRIS2 to complement and integrate GOVSATCOM (2023/588 art.3.2.(a)) is now taken for granted when ECF art.61.1 refers solely to GOVSATCOM for governmental services and to IRIS2 only for commercial services. In our opinion, art.61.1(a) should at least also make reference to IRIS2. FR (Drafting Suggestions): 1. The scope of the Secure Connectivity component shall ~~in particular~~ be: FR (Comments): Same comment than in art. 58.1. The regulation must provide a framework for the activities set out in the program. The use of "in particular" suggests that other activities, not planned or budgeted for, could be considered at any time. We prefer to go back to the wording of Regulation 2023/588.
(a) ensuring the long-term availability of reliable, secure and cost-effective governmental services and GOVSATCOM services;	ES (Drafting Suggestions): (a) ensuring the long-term availability of reliable, secure**, sovereign, resilient** and cost-effective **IRIS² governmental services** and GOVSATCOM services. ES

Commission proposal	Drafting Suggestions and Comments
	(Comments): Recognising however that "secure" and "cost-effective" are not always fully aligned: achieving realistic levels of security often requires higher financial efforts, while cost-effectiveness is generally linked to commercial solutions and market competitiveness, which may diverge from the strict security requirements; FR (Drafting Suggestions): (a) ensuring the **provision and** long-term availability of reliable, secure and cost-effective **IRIS²** governmental services and GOVSATCOM services **to government-authorised users**; FR (Comments): We propose to keep the text from Regulation 2023/588 for clarity. The sentence does not make sense unless we specify that we are talking about the provision of services. Furthermore, the current wording suggests that Govsatcom would only provide commercial services as we make a distinction between "governmental services" on a side and "Govsatcom services" on another side. It is important to clarify that the governmental services referred to are those of IRIS² and that all Govsatcom services are covered. Finally, we should specify who these services are intended for in order to clarify the reading of the article. NL (Drafting Suggestions): ensuring the long-term availability of reliable, secure and cost-effective governmental services, **including IRIS2** and GOVSATCOM services.

Commission proposal	Drafting Suggestions and Comments
	NL (Comments): GOVSATCOM is a governmental service, so double. DE (Comments): Please clarify in writing the currently unclear distinction between governmental services and GOVSATCOM IT (Drafting Suggestions): (a) ensuring the long-term availability of reliable, secure and cost-effective **satcom** governmental services **provided by IRIS²** and GOVSATCOM ~~services~~; IT (Comments): Unifies terminology and explicitly links governmental satcom to IRIS² alongside GOVSATCOM, addressing recurring requests to clarify the two notions and their interplay.
	FR (Drafting Suggestions): **(aa) ensuring the provision and long-term availability of reliable, secure and cost-effective GOVSATCOM services to government-authorised users;** FR (Comments): We propose dividing this general objective into two objectives. This is to ensure consistency with the proposal made in Article 15, which refers to objectives that must be implemented even if the concession contract fails.

Commission proposal	Drafting Suggestions and Comments
	Yet the concession contract only covers IRIS² and not Govsatcom. We must therefore be able to refer only to the main objective of the IRIS² component
(b) enabling IRIS² commercial services;	BE (Drafting Suggestions): (b) enabling IRIS² **governmental and** commercial services FR (Drafting Suggestions): (b) enabling **the provision of** IRIS² commercial services**, or services offered to government-authorised users based on commercial infrastructure at market conditions**; FR (Comments): Same comment than previously. PT (Comments): What kind of activities would be eligible for this scope? DE (Drafting Suggestions): ~~(b) enabling IRIS² commercial services;~~ DE (Comments): Please provide written explanations as to what *commercial* IRIS2 services are.

Commission proposal	Drafting Suggestions and Comments
(c) enabling, where possible, the development of communication and additional non-communication services, in particular by improving activities and components under this section, creating synergies between them and expanding their capabilities and services, as well as the development of non-communication services to be provided to Member States, by hosting additional satellite subsystems, including payloads;	ES (Drafting Suggestions): (c) enabling, where possible, the development of communication and additional non-communication services, in particular by improving activities and components under this section, creating synergies between them and expanding their capabilities and services, as well as the development of non-communication services to be provided to Member States, by hosting additional satellite subsystems, including payloads~~;~~ **, or –Third-party Satellites connected to IRIS²** ES (Comments): Such as Service#2 IRIS2 Space Data Relay from Third –party Sats which could be occasionally, temporarily or not, federated as service provider to the whole system. FR (Comments): Could the Commission specify what services would be included in the "non-communication services" ? Such provisions should be detailed in this Regulation, notably if such services should include the protection of IRIS² satellites. IT (Comments): Commission to explain the objective and conditions for hosting additional (non-)communication payloads (e.g., criteria, security hooks, non-impairment), to ensure a common understanding.

PUBLIC

Commission proposal	Drafting Suggestions and Comments
(d) improving secure connectivity over geographical areas of strategic interest such as Africa and the Arctic as well as the Baltic, the Black Sea, Mediterranean regions and the Atlantic.	ES (Drafting Suggestions): (d) improving secure connectivity over geographical areas of strategic interest **for the EU and its Member States** ~~such as Africa and the Arctic as well as the Baltic, the Black Sea, Mediterranean regions and the Atlantic~~. ES (Comments): allowing the areas to be adapted to regions other than those described in this section FR (Drafting Suggestions): (d) improving secure connectivity over geographical areas of strategic interest such as Africa and the Arctic as well as the Baltic, the Black Sea, Mediterranean regions and the Atlantic**, while ensuring the full availability of secure connectivity services over the territory of the EU as a priority**. FR (Comments): This comment aims at keeping the full operationalization of IRIS² services over the EU territory a priority. NL (Drafting Suggestions): improving secure connectivity over geographical areas of strategic interest such as Africa**,** ~~and~~ the Arctic**,** ~~as well as~~ the Baltic, the Black Sea, Mediterranean regions and the Atlantic NL (Comments):

Commission proposal	Drafting Suggestions and Comments
	• On Article 61(1)(d) Why specify particular geographical areas of interest? These may change over time. A more general formulation such as *"improving secure connectivity over geographical areas of strategic interest"* would provide flexibility and maintain constructive ambiguity. • If examples are to be given, remove 'as well as' which suggests a defined, exhaustive list. DE (Drafting Suggestions): (d) improving secure connectivity over geographical areas of strategic interest **which may include but are not limited to** ~~such as~~ Africa and the Arctic as well as the Baltic, the Black Sea, Mediterranean regions and the Atlantic. EE (Comments): Estonia strongly supports the prioritization of coverage for the Baltic sea region, given its geopolitical situation and the increased frequency of security incidents, including cyberattacks and hybrid threats targeting critical infrastructure. It is essential that secure connectivity solutions ensure that Estonia and other Baltic sea region states are protected and that critical communications remain operational even during crisis situations. Estonia therefore welcomes and recommends retaining the explicit mention of the Baltic region in the regulation text. We also recommend clarifying whether the reference is to the Baltic Sea or the Baltic States. IT (Drafting Suggestions):

Commission proposal	Drafting Suggestions and Comments
	(d) improving secure connectivity **capabilities** over geographical areas of strategic interest […] IT (Comments): The word capabilities recognises that needs and operating conditions vary by region; it preserves flexibility while reflecting the request for more precise geographical framing
2. This component shall cover in particular the following eligible activities:	ES (Drafting Suggestions): 2. This component shall cover ~~in particular~~ the following eligible activities ES (Comments): Which are the covered general activities? FR (Drafting Suggestions): 2. This component shall cover ~~in particular~~ the following eligible activities: FR (Comments): Same comment than in art. 61.1.
(a) the definition, design, development, validation and related deployment activities for the necessary space and ground infrastructure required for the provision of IRIS² governmental services;	ES (Drafting Suggestions): (a) the definition, design, development, validation and related deployment activities for the necessary space and ground infrastructure

Commission proposal	Drafting Suggestions and Comments
	required for the provision of IRIS² governmental services, **including the military ones**.
(b) exploitation activities providing IRIS² governmental services, comprising the operation, maintenance, continuous improvement and protection of the space and ground infrastructure, including replenishment and obsolescence management;	ES (Comments): No mention of IRIS² satellite commercial services as it is in (e) NL (Drafting Suggestions): exploitation activities providing IRIS² governmental services, comprising the operation, maintenance, continuous improvement and protection of the space and ground infrastructure **and connections themselves**, including replenishment and obsolescence management; NL (Comments): • On Article 61(2)(b) This should also explicitly refer to the *connections* themselves, in addition to the ground and space segments. Otherwise the service dimension risks being underdefined. IT (Comments): For drafting clarity, Commission to confirm that "exploitation activities" covers operation, maintenance, continuous improvement, protection, replenishment and obsolescence management, as listed, and does not include commercial valorisation beyond the service provision scope.

PUBLIC

Commission proposal	Drafting Suggestions and Comments
(c) the gradual integration of EuroQCI into the Secure Connectivity system;	ES (Drafting Suggestions): (c) the gradual integration of EuroQCI into the Secure Connectivity ~~system~~ **component**; FR (Comments): Can the Commission provide an estimate of the budget for this item ? What will be its perimeter ? NL (Comments): Could the Commission clarify what is meant by "gradual integration"? IT (Drafting Suggestions): c) ~~the gradual integration~~ **the development and deployment** of EuroQCI space component **and its integration** into the secure connectivity system; IT (Comments): To include explicitly the development and deployment of an EuroQCI Space segment
(d) research and development of activities for the future generations of space and ground infrastructure, the evolution of IRIS² governmental services; and GOVSATCOM services, technological development, notably to ensure Union technological sovereignty, and the uptake of secure connectivity services, including activities relating to the design, development and manufacturing of user terminals;	IT (Drafting Suggestions): (d) research and development of activities for the future generations of space and ground infrastructure, the evolution of **secure connectivity givernamental services, including** IRIS² governmental services~~;~~ and GOVSATCOM services, technological development, notably to ensure

Commission proposal	Drafting Suggestions and Comments
	Union technological sovereignty, and the uptake of secure connectivity services, including activities relating to the design, development and manufacturing of user terminals; IT (Comments): Helps to create consistency between IRIS2 and GOVSATCOM services
(e) the procurement and provision of governmental and commercial satellite communication capacities, services, and user equipment necessary for the pooling and sharing of GOVSATCOM services; capacities, services, and user equipment, which shall be provided by:	ES (Comments): Add a new point (f) for the same procurement and provision for IRIS² FR (Drafting Suggestions): (e) the procurement ~~and provision~~ of governmental and commercial satellite communication capacities, services, and user equipment necessary for the pooling and sharing **and provision** of GOVSATCOM services; ~~capacities, services, and user equipment,~~ which shall be provided by: FR (Comments): This paragraph was unclear. We propose a clarification. However, this is still not clear to who "which" refers : to the first part of the paragraph (provision of capabilities, user equipment, etc.) or to the last sentence on the provision of services ? What are we exactly talking about here ? DE (Drafting Suggestions): (e) the procurement ~~and provision~~ of governmental and commercial satellite ~~communication~~ capacities, services as well as the necessary infrastructure to provide the capacity and service and user equipment

Commission proposal	Drafting Suggestions and Comments
	necessary for the pooling and sharing of GOVSATCOM services; capacities, services, and user equipment, which shall be provided by: DE (Comments): Please clarify what is mean by "provision" The planned GOVSATCOM infrastructure shall be open to future services beyond communication capacity services, this should not be pre-empted by a narrow focus on satellite *communication* capacity.
(1) GOVSATCOM participants as referred to in paragraph 17; or	FR (Drafting Suggestions): (1) GOVSATCOM participants as referred to in paragraph**s ~~17~~ 11, 12 and 13**; or FR (Comments): Paragraph 17 does not refer to participants. Suggestion: participants in the Govsatcom programme are defined in paragraphs 11, 12, and 13. NL (Comments): Paragraph 17 only entails IRIS2 and no Govsatcom. Is this referral correct? SI (Drafting Suggestions): (1) GOVSATCOM **"participants as referred to in paragraph 17"**; or SI (Comments):

Commission proposal	Drafting Suggestions and Comments
	Paragraph 17 of this article is not explanatory about the "GOVSATCOM participants". Better reference need to be used or further adaptation of paragraph 17 is to be made. IT (Comments): Cross reference to be fixed
(2) legal persons duly accredited to provide satellite communication capacities or services in accordance with the security accreditation procedure referred to in Article 69, which shall be done in compliance with the general security requirements referred to in Article 77.	ES (Drafting Suggestions): (2) legal persons **and entitities** duly accredited to provide satellite communication capacities or services in accordance with the security accreditation procedure referred to in Article 69, which shall be done in compliance with the general security requirements referred to in Article 77. FR (Drafting Suggestions): (2) legal persons duly accredited to provide satellite communication capacities or services in accordance with the security accreditation procedure referred to in Article ~~69~~ **77a**, which shall be done in compliance with the general security requirements referred to in Article 77**, paragraph 3**. FR (Comments): Incorrect reference: Article 69 does not refer to the security accreditation procedure. This procedure is in fact absent from the proposed regulation and must be reinstated: see the proposed new Article 77a. SI (Drafting Suggestions): (2) legal persons duly accredited to provide satellite communication capacities or services in accordance with the **"security accreditation**

Commission proposal	Drafting Suggestions and Comments
	procedure referred to in Article 69", which shall be done in compliance with the general security requirements referred to in Article 77. SI (Comments): In the Aricle 69 the term "accreditation" is not used. This may have clarity implications of what exactly in the Article 69 is considered "security accreditation procedure" (paragraph 8?). We advice subject paragraph to be better aligned with the Article 69 or further improvements of both texts (subject paragraph and Article 69) are made, providing sufficient clarity.
3. IRIS² and GOVSATCOM infrastructures shall include the following requirements:	
(a) The IRIS² infrastructure shall be modular and consist of a governmental infrastructure and a commercial infrastructure. It shall include all the relevant ground and space segments which are required for the provision of the governmental services, including the relevant control centres.	ES (Comments): Is user equipment not included on purpose? FR (Drafting Suggestions): (a) The IRIS² infrastructure shall be modular and consist of a governmental infrastructure and a commercial infrastructure. ~~It~~ **The IRIS² governmental infrastructure** shall include all the relevant ground and space segments which are required for the provision of the governmental services, including the relevant control centres**, EuroQCI, the infrastructure for monitoring the security of the governmental infrastructure and governmental services and the GOVSATCOM Hub reffered to in paragraph 3 point d)**. FR

Commission proposal	Drafting Suggestions and Comments
	(Comments): It is necessary to clarify that we are referring to government infrastructure. Furthermore, this definition omits important elements of infrastructure such as the security monitoring structure, the Govsatcom Hub, and EuroQCI. We believe it is important to reiterate these points (from Regulation 2023/588). The definition cannot be limited to the current wording, which does not make it possible to understand the scope of government infrastructure. IT (Drafting Suggestions): ((a) The IRIS² infrastructure shall be modular and consist of a governmental infrastructure and a commercial infrastructure. ~~It~~ **The IRIS² governamental infrastructure** shall include all the relevant ground and space segments which are required for the provision of the governmental services, including the relevant control centres. **It shall complement and integrate the existing and future capacities used in the framework of the GOVSATCOM component.** IT (Comments): To enhance consistency with Regulation 588/2023, wich encompass the full integration of IRIS2 and GOVSATCOM into the Programme of the Secure Connectivity
(b) The IRIS² commercial infrastructure of the secure connectivity system shall include all space and ground assets other than those being part of the governmental infrastructure. The commercial infrastructure shall not impair the performance or security of the governmental infrastructure. The commercial infrastructure and any related risks shall be entirely financed by the private sector.	ES (Drafting Suggestions): The IRIS² commercial infrastructure of the ~~s~~**S**ecure ~~e~~Connectivity ~~system~~ **component** shall include all space and ground assets other than those being part of the governmental infrastructure. The commercial infrastructure shall not impair the performance or security of the

Commission proposal	Drafting Suggestions and Comments
	governmental infrastructure. The commercial infrastructure and any related risks shall be entirely financed by the private sector FR (Drafting Suggestions): (b) The IRIS² commercial infrastructure of the secure connectivity system shall include all space and ground assets other than those being part of the governmental infrastructure. The commercial infrastructure shall not impair the performance or security of the governmental infrastructure. The commercial infrastructure and any related risks shall be entirely financed by the ~~private sector~~ **contractors reffered to in paragraph 15**. FR (Comments): The expression "private sector" is vague and does not refer to any particular entity. We propose referring directly to the contractors mentioned in paragraph 15. It is these contractors who are responsible for financing the risks, not just any private sectorr acto. IT (Drafting Suggestions): (b) […]. The commercial infrastructure and ~~any related risks~~ shall be entirely financed by the private sector, **which shall bear any related risk in its own investment**.. IT (Comments): Adds a concise risk-bearing clarification consistent with a concession model.
(c) The IRIS² governmental infrastructure shall host, where appropriate, additional satellite subsystems, in particular payloads, that may be used as part of the space-based infrastructure of the other space components of the ECF, as	ES (Drafting Suggestions):

Commission proposal	Drafting Suggestions and Comments
well as satellite subsystems used for the provision of non-communication services to Member States.	(c) The IRIS² governmental infrastructure shall host, where appropriate, additional satellite subsystems, in particular payloads, that may be used as part of the space-based infrastructure of the other space components of the ECF, as well as satellite subsystems**, <u>or third-party federated satellites</u>** used for the provision of **<u>communications or</u>** non-communication services to Member States. FR (Drafting Suggestions): (c) The IRIS² governmental infrastructure shall host, where appropriate, additional satellite subsystems, in particular payloads, that may be used as part of the space-based infrastructure of the other space components of the ECF **section 3**, as well as satellite subsystems used for the provision of non-communication services to Member States. FR (Comments): Could the Commission specify what services would be included in the "non-communication services" ? Such provisions should be detailed in this Regulation, notably if such services should include the protection of IRIS² satellites. We understand that the space component is part of the ECF. However, it seems clearer to us to mention the space components in section 3, since this section is supposed to cover all space components. LU (Comments): Could you please clarify what this would involve? While the governmental infrastructure may accommodate additional subsystems (provided that space constraints allow) it should be noted that any associated costs should not be automatically assumed by the Member State concerned.

Commission proposal	Drafting Suggestions and Comments
	IT (Drafting Suggestions): (c) The IRIS² governmental infrastructure ~~shall~~ **may** host, where appropriate, additional satellite subsystems, […] IT (Comments): Using may (instead of "shall") preserves optionality, avoiding unfunded obligations while keeping the opportunity open case-by-case.
(d) The GOVSATCOM infrastructure shall include infrastructure necessary to enable the provision of GOVSATCOM services, particularly the GOVSATCOM Hub.	ES (Drafting Suggestions): (d) The GOVSATCOM infrastructure shall include infrastructure necessary to enable the provision of GOVSATCOM services, ~~particularly~~ **mainly through** the GOVSATCOM Hub. IE (Comments): IE notes GOVSATCOM Hub not defined anywhere, i.e. how it relates to other GOVSATCOM services, nor where it sits within the GOVSATCOM infrastructure. Also why is this particular service highlighted? IT (Drafting Suggestions): (d) The GOVSATCOM infrastructure shall include infrastructure necessary to enable the provision **of secure connectivity services, including** GOVSATCOM **services and IRIS² services**, particularly the GOVSATCOM Hub.

Commission proposal	Drafting Suggestions and Comments
(e) The ground and space segments referred in paragraphs 3 and 4 and their operation shall comply with the general security requirements referred to in Article 77 paragraph 3.	FR (Drafting Suggestions): (e) The ground and space segments referred in paragraph~~s~~ 3 ~~and 4~~ and their operation shall comply with the general security requirements referred to in Article 77**,** paragraph 3. FR (Comments): It seems there is a reference mistake. IT (Comments): Reference to par. 3 and 4 to be checked.
4. The provision of Secure Connectivity services shall be ensured as laid down in a service portfolio, and in accordance with operational requirements and in accordance with the security requirements referred to in Article 77. The provision of GOVSATCOM services shall also follow the sharing and prioritisation rules referred to paragraph 9.	BE (Comments): §4: refers to paragraph 9, though sharing and prioritization is mentioned in paragraph 8? Wrong reference? FR (Drafting Suggestions): 4. The provision of Secure Connectivity services shall be ensured as laid down in a service portfolio **reffered to paragraph 6**, and in accordance with operational requirements and in accordance with the security requirements referred to in Article 77 **paragraph 3**. The provision of **IRIS² and** GOVSATCOM services shall also follow the sharing and prioritisation rules referred to paragraph ~~9~~**8**. FR (Comments):

Commission proposal	Drafting Suggestions and Comments
	To complete or correct references. Furthermore, IRIS² services must also be provided in accordance with the sharing and prioritization rules set out in the relevant implementing act. The implementing act for the provision of IRIS² services is referred to in paragraph 8. LU (Drafting Suggestions): 4. The provision of Secure Connectivity services shall be ensured as laid down in a service portfolio, and in accordance with operational requirements and in accordance with the security requirements referred to in Article 77. The provision of GOVSATCOM services shall also follow the sharing and prioritisation rules referred to paragraph ~~9~~ **8**. SI (Drafting Suggestions): 4. The provision of Secure Connectivity services shall be ensured as laid down in a service portfolio, and in accordance with operational requirements and in accordance with the security requirements referred to in Article 77. The provision of GOVSATCOM services shall also follow the sharing and prioritisation rules **"referred to paragraph 9".** SI (Comments): Paragraph 9 of this article is not explanatory about the "sharing and prioritisation rules". It seems (analysintg the text of this article) that the right paragraph is paragraph 8. We advice to further analyse the detected inconsistency. IT (Drafting Suggestions):

Commission proposal	Drafting Suggestions and Comments
	The provision of Secure Connectivity services shall be ensured as laid down in a service portfolio, **referred to in paragraph 6**, and in accordance with operational requirements, **referred to in paragraph 7),** and in accordance with the security requirements referred to in Article 77. The provision of GOVSATCOM **and IRIS² governmental** services shall also follow the sharing and prioritisation rules referred to paragraph 9. IT (Comments): Ensures consistent prioritisation rules for both GOVSATCOM and IRIS² governmental services. Reference to paragraph 9 to be checked.
	FR (Drafting Suggestions): **4a. IRIS² service portfolio for governmental services shall comprise at least the following categories of service :** **(a) services known as "Hardgov Services", restricted to government-authorised users based on governmental infrastructure, which require a high level of security and which are not suitable for services referred to in paragraph 4b, such as robust worldwide low- latency service or robust space data relay;** **(b) quantum communication services, such as QKD services.** **4b. The service portfolio for governmental services shall also comprise services known as "Lightgov Services", to government-authorised users based on the commercial infrastructure or on a potential shared infrastructure where the governmental and commercial services rely on common subsystems or interfaces to ensure synergies, such as assured worldwide low latency service or worldwide narrowband service.**

Commission proposal	Drafting Suggestions and Comments
	FR (Comments): The different types of IRIS² services are not defined at any point in the proposed regulation. It refers to the infrastructure and the different users, but never to the types of services. However, this clarification is very important in order to ensure that we all have the same understanding of what the terms "governmental services" and "commercial services" cover and to clearly understand which services users should be authorized to access. We therefore propose a reinsertion inspired by Article 10 of Regulation 2023/588 regarding the governmental services. We also propose specifying what the terms "hard-gov" and "light-gov" mean, as they are now officially used in IRIS² procurement and implementation. This should in particular allow to avoid any confusion between "light gov" services and commercial services, which is very often observed in discussions.
5. Access to GOVSATCOM services and IRIS² governmental services shall be free of charge for institutional and governmental users unless the Commission sets out a pricing policy in accordance with paragraph 11.	BE (Comments): §5 : refers to paragraph 11, though pricing policy is mentioned in paragraph 9? Wrong reference? ES (Comments): Services allocation should be explained or referred to any Commission Decision. Tokens (unit of access to secure satellite com services/ shares) based on number of votes in the Council?? FR (Drafting Suggestions):

Commission proposal	Drafting Suggestions and Comments
	5. Access to GOVSATCOM services and IRIS² governmental services shall be free of charge for institutional and governmental users unless the Commission sets out a pricing policy in accordance with paragraph ~~11~~**9**. FR (Comments): Could the Commission specify what shape this pricing policy could take ? It seems there is a reference mistake. LU (Comments): Paragraph 11 does not appear to provide further information on this topic, which seems to be addressed in paragraph 9 instead. Could this be an error in referencing the relevant paragraph? SI (Drafting Suggestions): 5. Access to GOVSATCOM services and IRIS² governmental services shall be free of charge for institutional and governmental users unless the Commission sets out a pricing policy in accordance with **"paragraph 11".** SI (Comments): Paragraph 11 of this article is not explanatory about the "pricing policy". It seems (analysintg the text of this article) that the right paragraph is paragraph 9. We advice to further analyse the detected inconsistency. IT (Comments): Cross reference to be fixed.

PUBLIC

Commission proposal	Drafting Suggestions and Comments
6. The Commission shall adopt, by means of implementing acts, the service portfolio for GOVSATCOM services and IRIS² governmental services, including services to government-authorised users based on the commercial infrastructure.	ES (Drafting Suggestions): 6. The Commission shall adopt, by means of implementing acts, the service portfolio for GOVSATCOM services and IRIS² governmental services, including services to government-authorised users based on the **IRIS²** commercial infrastructure. IT (Comments): Commission has already adopted the "Implementing Decision (EU) 2023/1054 as regards governmental services of GOVSATCOM, and its amendment by COMMISSION IMPLEMENTING DECISION(EU) 2025/1211 of 23 June 2025. Commission has already adopted the "IMPLEMENTING DECISION (EU) 2023/1053 of 30 May 2023 laying down rules for the application of Regulation (EU) 2023/588 of the European Parliament and of the Council as regards operational requirements for governmental services provided under Union Secure Connectivity Programme and its service portfolio. Legal basis for these acts are the Regulation (EU) 2021/696 and Regulation 2023/588. Commission must ensure consistency with the already-adopted IRIS² implementing decisions on service portfolio and operational requirements; if new acts are envisaged under the ECF, avoid duplication and provide explicit cross-references.

PUBLIC

Commission proposal	Drafting Suggestions and Comments
7. The Commission shall adopt, by means of implementing acts, the operational requirements for GOVSATCOM services and IRIS² governmental services.	IT (Comments): Note that European Commission already has adopted the "IMPLEMENTING DECISION (EU) 2023/1053 of 30 May 2023 laying down rules for the application of Regulation (EU) 2023/588 of the European Parliament and of the Council as regards operational requirements for governmental services provided under Union Secure Connectivity Programme and its service portfolio" Legal basis for these acts is the Regulation (EU) Regulation 2023/588. Commission must ensure consistency with the already-adopted acts; if new acts are envisaged under the ECF, avoid duplication and provide explicit cross-references.
8. The sharing and prioritisation of GOVSATCOM services shall prioritise GOVSATCOM users according to their relevance and criticality. The Commission shall adopt, by means of implementing acts, the detailed rules on the sharing and prioritisation of GOVSATCOM capacities, services, and user equipment. The Commission shall also adopt, by means of implementing acts, detailed rules on the provision of IRIS² governmental services. When drawing those acts, the Commission shall take into account the expected demand for the different use-cases, the analysis of security risks for those use-cases and, where appropriate, cost-efficiency.	CZ (Drafting Suggestions): ~~The sharing and prioritisation of GOVSATCOM services shall prioritise GOVSATCOM users according to their relevance and criticality~~. The Commission shall adopt, by means of implementing acts, ~~the detailed~~ rules on the sharing and prioritisation of GOVSATCOM capacities, services, and user equipment. The Commission shall also adopt, by means of implementing acts, ~~detailed~~ rules on the provision of IRIS² governmental services. ~~When drawing those acts, the Commission shall take into account the expected demand for the different use-cases, the analysis of security risks for those use-cases and, where appropriate, cost-efficiency.~~ CZ (Comments):

Commission proposal	Drafting Suggestions and Comments
	The decision on token distribution should be in the hands of Member States. The same applies to IRIS^2. ES (Comments): relevance and criticality->This should be referred only to the share 10%? reserved for Crisis or 15% allocated to EU. Cannot affect to the allocation to each member state (Tokens) Shall also adopt-> How? This is the moment to set the framework FI (Comments): A basic principles of GOVSATCOM and IRIS2 capacity sharing must be agreed within this article not afterwards. Data sharing principles can be modified by means of Commissions implementing act. If necessary data sharing principles can be descriped in a separate document which is referred here. NL (Comments): • On Article 61(8) The provision places prioritisation fully with the Commission. How does this respect military operational needs under GOVSATCOM, and how does it relate to EU-level defence structures such as the EUMS? This could severely constrain military use. IT (Drafting Suggestions):

Commission proposal	Drafting Suggestions and Comments
	8. The sharing and prioritisation of ~~GOVSATCOM~~ **governamental** services shall prioritise GOVSATCOM **and IRIS²** users according to their relevance and criticality. […] IT (Comments): Aligns the prioritisation regime with the reality of both governmental service families (GOVSATCOM and IRIS²) Note that European Commission already have adopted the "Implementing Decision (EU) 2023/1055 as regards the division and distribution of tokens under GOVSATCOM" and its amendment COMMISSION IMPLEMENTING DECISION(EU) 2025/1216 of 26 June 2025. This act is applicable also to Secure Connectivity. Legal basis for these acts is the Regulation (EU) 2021/696. Commissione to ensure consistency with the already-adopted acts; if new acts are envisaged under the ECF, avoid duplication and provide explicit cross-references.
9. When the analysis of risks and expected demand referred to in paragraph 11 concludes there is a shortage of capacities or where demand exceeds the access capacity for IRIS² governmental services, which may lead of a distortion of the market, the Commission may adopt, by mean of implementing acts, a pricing policy. By adopting a pricing policy, the Commission shall ensure that the provision of GOVSATCOM services and the IRIS² governmental services does not distort competition, that there is no shortage of those services and that the price identified will not result in an overcompensation for the contracts referred to in paragraph 20.	CZ (Drafting Suggestions): ~~When the analysis of risks and expected demand referred to in paragraph 11 concludes there is a shortage of capacities or where demand exceeds the access capacity for IRIS² governmental services, which may lead of a distortion of the market, the Commission may adopt, by mean of implementing acts, a pricing policy. By adopting a pricing policy, the Commission shall ensure that the provision of GOVSATCOM services and the IRIS² governmental services does not distort competition, that there is no~~

Commission proposal	Drafting Suggestions and Comments
	~~shortage of those services and that the price identified will not result in an overcompensation for the contracts referred to in paragraph 20.~~ CZ (Comments): To leave out this paragraph, not to include any pricing policy. IRIS^2 tokens shall be distributed among member states. Purchase of tokens only from other MSs shall be possible (similarly to GOVSATCOM). ES (Drafting Suggestions): 9. When the analysis of risks and expected demand referred to in paragraph ~~11~~**8** concludes there is a shortage of capacities or where demand exceeds the access capacity for IRIS² governmental services, which may lead of a distortion of the market, the Commission may adopt, by mean of implementing acts, a pricing policy. By adopting a pricing policy, the Commission shall ensure that the provision of GOVSATCOM services and the IRIS² governmental services does not distort competition, that there is no shortage of those services and that the price identified will not result in an overcompensation for the contracts referred to in paragraph 20. ES (Comments): Cross- reference fix: the analysis is introduced in paragraph 8, not 11. FR (Drafting Suggestions): 9. When the analysis of risks and expected demand referred to in paragraph ~~11~~ concludes there is a shortage of capacities or where demand exceeds the access capacity for **Govsatcom services and** IRIS² governmental services, which may lead of a distortion of the market, the Commission may adopt, by mean of implementing acts, a pricing policy. By adopting a pricing policy, the Commission shall ensure that the provision of GOVSATCOM

Commission proposal	Drafting Suggestions and Comments
	services and the IRIS² governmental services does not distort competition, that there is no shortage of those services**, that Member States government-authorized users be prioritised in the access to secure connectivity services** and that the price identified will not result in an overcompensation for the contracts referred to in paragraph ~~20~~**15**. FR (Comments): Two references seems incorrect. Furthermore, we do not fully understand the paragraph and need clarification. What risk analysis are we talking about ? Why mention only IRIS² governmental services when the lack of capacity and excess demand for services clearly affects both programs ? Why distinguish between lack of capacity and demand exceeding available capacity? The two are linked: there is a lack of capacity relative to a given level of demand. The text could be simplified. Proposal to add a provision ensuring that in case of a shortage of secure connectivity capacities, Member States government-authorized users be prioritised in the access to the available capacities over other users. LU (Comments): The reference to the analysis of risks and expected demand in paragraph 11 appears unclear, as paragraph 11 does not seem to address either of these aspects. We would suggest verifying whether this is a referencing error or if the intended reference should be to another paragraph.

Commission proposal	Drafting Suggestions and Comments
	Moreover, and rather than a pricing mechanism, this paragraph appears to function as a compensation mechanism. It is recommended to align the terminology with that used in the GovSatCom Implementing Act 2023/1055. For reference, please find below an excerpt: (5) The sharing and prioritisation should support different priorities of participant requests for GOVSATCOM services and implement appropriate mechanisms for their processing. A GOVSATCOM services compensation mechanism should be foreseen in order to facilitate the efficient use of resources and avoid market distortions. To that effect, a system of tokens should be established with compensation values based on the level of priority of the requests. The possibility for buying additional tokens or donating tokens to another participant should also be foreseen." NL (Drafting Suggestions): When the analysis of risks and expected demand referred to in paragraph 11 concludes there is a shortage of capacities or where demand exceeds the access capacity for **GOVSATCOM services and the** IRIS² governmental services, which may lead of a distortion of the market, the Commission may adopt, by mean of implementing acts, a pricing policy. By adopting a pricing policy, the Commission shall ensure that the provision of GOVSATCOM services and the IRIS² governmental services does not distort competition, that there is no shortage of those services and that the price identified will not result in an overcompensation for the contracts referred to in paragraph 20. NL (Comments): Shortage of capacity is not only applicable to IRIS2 but also in combination with GOVSATCOM. SI

Commission proposal	Drafting Suggestions and Comments
	(Drafting Suggestions): 9. When the analysis of risks and expected demand referred to in paragraph 11 concludes there is a shortage of capacities or where demand exceeds the access capacity for IRIS² governmental services, which may lead of a distortion of the market, the Commission may adopt, by mean of implementing acts, a pricing policy. By adopting a pricing policy, the Commission shall ensure that the provision of GOVSATCOM services and the IRIS² governmental services does not distort competition, that there is no shortage of those services and that the price identified will not result in an overcompensation for the **"contracts referred to in paragraph 20".** SI (Comments): No paraghaph 20 exists in this article. It seems (analysintg the text of this article) that the right paragraph is paragraph 17. We advice to further analyse the detected inconsistency. IT (Drafting Suggestions): 9. […] **Implementing acts shall also set interoperability, priority, access and non-impairment rules for interfaces between governmental and commercial infrastructures, including contingency arrangements**. IT (Comments): Makes explicit the non-impairment/interoperability regime at common interfaces between governamental and comercial. Cross reference to be fixed.

Commission proposal	Drafting Suggestions and Comments
10. The implementing acts referred to in paragraphs 9 to 12 shall be adopted in accordance with the examination procedure referred to in Article 83 paragraph 3.	ES (Drafting Suggestions): 10. The implementing acts referred to in paragraphs ~~9 to 12~~**6 to 9** shall be adopted in accordance with the examination procedure referred to in Article 83 paragraph 3 ES (Comments): Scope of implementing acts in this article concerns paragraphs 6–9 (portfolio, operational requirements, prioritisation, provision). FR (Drafting Suggestions): 10. The implementing acts referred to in paragraphs ~~9~~**6** to ~~12~~**9** shall be adopted in accordance with the examination procedure referred to in Article 83 paragraph 3. FR (Comments): It seems there is a reference mistake. NL (Drafting Suggestions): The implementing acts referred to in paragraphs ~~9~~**6** to **9**~~12~~ shall be adopted in accordance with the examination procedure referred to in Article 83 paragraph 3. NL (Comments): We thank the Commission for calrifying that this was a typo. SI

Commission proposal	Drafting Suggestions and Comments
	(Drafting Suggestions): 10. The implementing acts **"referred to in paragraphs 9 to 12"** shall be adopted in accordance with the examination procedure referred to in Article 83 paragraph 3 SI (Comments): It seems (analysintg the text of this article) that the right paragraphs are paragraphs 6 to 9. We advice to further analyse the detected inconsistency. IT (Comments): Cross reference to paragraphs to be fixed
11. Member States, the Council, the Commission and the EEAS shall be Secure Connectivity participants insofar as they authorise users, or provide satellite communication capacities, ground segment sites or part of the ground segment facilities.	FR (Drafting Suggestions): 11. Member States, the Council, the Commission and the EEAS shall be Secure Connectivity participants insofar as they authorise users **of IRIS² governmental services and GOVSATCOM services**, or provide satellite communication capacities, ground segment sites or part of the ground segment facilities. FR (Comments): In line with the definition of the programme's scope, it is important to specify for which services users should be authorized. NL (Drafting Suggestions): Member States, the Council, the Commission and the EEAS shall be Secure Connectivity participants insofar as they authorise users, ~~or provide satellite~~

Commission proposal	Drafting Suggestions and Comments
	~~communication capacities, ground segment sites or part of the ground segment facilities.~~ NL (Comments): The use of the system should not be linked to the level or nature of a Member State's contribution, but should be based solely on user authorisation.
12. Union agencies may become secure connectivity participants only insofar as necessary to fulfil their tasks and in accordance with detailed rules laid down in an administrative arrangement concluded between the agency concerned and the Union institution that supervises it.	
13. Third countries and international organisations may become secure connectivity participants subject to a specific dedicated international agreement concluded in accordance with Article 218 TFEU and pursuant to Article 11, paragraph 3 of this Regulation.	FR (Drafting Suggestions): 13. Third countries and international organisations may become secure connectivity participants subject to a specific dedicated international agreement concluded in accordance with Article 218 TFEU and pursuant to Article 11, ~~paragraph 3~~ of this Regulation. **The Commission will inform the Member States of its intention to engage in discussions with third countries and international organisations.** FR (Comments): It seems to us that the whole of Article 11 applies, not just paragraph 3. France wishes that Member States be consulted prior to the engagement in discussions regarding the accession of a third state or international organisation to secure connectivity services. In this manner, the Member

Commission proposal	Drafting Suggestions and Comments
	States will be able to analyse the potential strategic and financial added-value for the EU and the Space Programme of such an accession
14. The users of governmental services shall be duly authorised by the participants to use GOVSATCOM services or the IRIS² governmental services and shall comply with the general security requirements referred to in Article 77, paragraph 3. The following entities may be authorised as users of GOVSATCOM services or IRIS² governmental services:	FR (Drafting Suggestions): 14. The users of **IRIS²** governmental services **and GOVSATCOM services** shall be duly authorised by the participants **competent authorities reffered to article 76** to use ~~GOVSATCOM services or the IRIS² governmental~~ **these** services and shall comply with the general security requirements referred to in Article 77, paragraph 3. The following entities may be authorised as users of GOVSATCOM services or IRIS² governmental services: FR (Comments): Proposal to clarify the text. As stated in Article 76, the competent authority appointed by each participant is responsible for supervising users
(a) a Union or Member State public authority or a body entrusted with the exercise of public authority;	
(b) a natural or legal person acting on behalf and under the control of an entity referred to in point (a).	
15. IRIS² shall be implemented through a concession contract. If the IRIS² concession contract fails, the Commission shall ensure an optimal implementation by procuring, as appropriate, a supply, service or works contract or a mixed contract.	ES (Drafting Suggestions): IRIS² shall be implemented through a concession contract. If the IRIS² concession contract fails, the Commission shall ensure an optimal

Commission proposal	Drafting Suggestions and Comments
	implementation by procuring, as appropriate, a supply, service or works contract or a mixed contract**, ensuring that governmental service continuity for Member States' defence and security is preserved without interruption**. ES (Comments): To protect operational continuity of secure satcom services for national defence in case of industrial or contractual failure. FI (Comments): If the current contract fails, the continuation shall not be automatic. An implementation decision, budget and the selected approach must be reconsidered together with MS before new contracts are agreed. FR (Drafting Suggestions): 15. IRIS² shall be implemented through a concession contract. If the IRIS² concession contract fails, the Commission shall ensure an optimal implementation **of the objectives reffered to paragraph 1(a) of this article** by procuring, as appropriate, a supply, service or works contract or a mixed contract FR (Comments): Could the Commission include provisions allowing for this Regulation provides for adequate measures to ensure that the concession contract does not fail? The paragraph does not seem clear to us unless we specify what the contract must implement.

Commission proposal	Drafting Suggestions and Comments
	NL (Drafting Suggestions): IRIS² shall be implemented through a concession contract. If the IRIS² concession contract fails, the Commission shall ~~ensure an optimal implementation by procuring, as appropriate, a supply, service or works contract or a mixed contract.~~ **explore other possibilities to safeguard secure connectivity.** NL (Comments): The article anticipates potential risks too strongly. RO (Comments): MS involvement is needed for changing the type of contract – from concession to public funding. Advisory procedure could be used as a tool. IT (Drafting Suggestions): 15. IRIS² shall be implemented through **several contracts awarded in compliance with the UE financial rules and may take the form of concession contracts, supply, service, or works contracts or mixed contracts**. ~~If the IRIS² concession contract fails, the Commission shall ensure an optimal implementation by procuring, as appropriate, a supply, service or works contract or a mixed contract.~~ IT (Comments): Closer alignment with the secure connectivity regulation model. If the concession route fails, assess whether an ECF-level adjustment is needed (e.g., to procurement forms, milestones, or risk allocation) to preserve

Commission proposal	Drafting Suggestions and Comments
	timelines and continuity while staying coherent with the Secure Connectivity framework.
16. The Commission shall take the necessary measures to ensure the continuity of the IRIS² governmental services if the contractors referred to in this Article are unable to fulfil their obligations.	FR (Comments): Could the Commission specify what could be envisaged in terms of "necessary measures"? NL (Drafting Suggestions): The Commission shall take the necessary measures to ensure the continuity of the IRIS² governmental services if the ~~contractors~~ **concessionaire** referred to in this Article are unable to fulfil their obligations. NL (Comments): As IRIS² operates under a concession model, could the Commission clarify what is meant by "contractors" in this context? RO (Comments): MS involvement is needed. Advisory procedure could be used as a tool.
17. The contracts referred to in this Article shall in particular ensure that the provision of services based on the IRIS² commercial infrastructure preserves the Union's essential interests and the objectives of the sub-component. Those contracts shall also include adequate safeguards to avoid any overcompensation of the contractors referred to in this Article, distortions of competition, conflicts of interest, undue discrimination or any other hidden indirect advantages. Such safeguards may include the obligation of accounting separation between the provision of IRIS² governmental services and the	FR (Drafting Suggestions): 17. The contracts referred to in this Article shall in particular ensure that the provision of services based on the IRIS² commercial infrastructure preserves the Union's essential interests and the objectives of the sub-component. Those contracts shall also include adequate safeguards to avoid any overcompensation of the contractors referred to in this Article,

Commission proposal	Drafting Suggestions and Comments
provision of IRIS² commercial services, including the setting up of a structurally and legally separate entity from the vertically integrated operator for the provision of governmental services, and the provision of open, fair, reasonable and non-discriminatory access to the infrastructure necessary for the provision of commercial services. The contracts shall also ensure that the conditions on eligibility are met throughout their duration.	distortions of competition, conflicts of interest, undue discrimination or any other hidden indirect advantages. Such safeguards may include the obligation of accounting separation between the provision of IRIS² governmental services and the provision of IRIS² commercial services, including the setting up of a structurally and legally separate entity from the vertically integrated operator for the provision of governmental services, and the provision of open, fair, reasonable and non-discriminatory access to the infrastructure necessary for the provision of commercial services. The contracts shall also ensure that the conditions on eligibility **reffered to article 69** are met throughout their duration FR (Comments): Proposal to include a reference to the applicable article for more clarity. LU (Comments): Could you clarify whether this proposal has been discussed with SpaceRise? We would further like to know whether the Commission has already received comments from SpaceRise regarding the possible inclusion of an obligation to ensure accounting separation between the provision of IRIS² governmental services and the provision of IRIS² commercial services. This would include the establishment of a structurally and legally distinct entity from the vertically integrated operator for the delivery of governmental services, as well as the provision of open, fair, reasonable, and non-discriminatory access to the infrastructure required for the delivery of commercial services. IT (Drafting Suggestions): 17. […] **They shall also designate a service meta-operator function, structurally and legally distinct from the IRIS² infrastructure**

Commission proposal	Drafting Suggestions and Comments
	concessionaire, to orchestrate governmental services and ensure a non-discriminatory user interface. IT (Comments): Insertion to make explicit the possibility of a service meta-operator distinct from the infrastructure operator; supports non-discrimination and separation of roles without altering the core scheme.
18. Where the IRIS² governmental and commercial services rely on common subsystems or interfaces to ensure synergies, the contracts referred to in this Article shall also determine which of those interfaces and common subsystems shall be part of the governmental infrastructure in order to ensure the protection of the security interests of the Union and its Member States.	ES (Drafting Suggestions): 18. Where the IRIS² governmental and commercial services rely on common subsystems or interfaces to ensure synergies, the contracts referred to in this Article shall also determine which of those interfaces and common subsystems shall be part of the governmental infrastructure in order to ensure the protection of the security interests of the Union and its Member States. **In this context, standardisation should be explicitly addressed, proposing clear mechanisms to guarantee the required level of interoperability, security, and consistency across governmental and commercial segments.**
19. The contractors referred to in this Article shall entirely finance the commercial infrastructure referred to in paragraph 3 in order to fulfil the objective referred to in paragraph 1, point (b).	ES (Drafting Suggestions): 19. The contractors referred to in this Article shall entirely finance the **IRIS²** commercial infrastructure referred to in paragraph 3 in order to fulfil the objective referred to in paragraph 1, point (b). FR (Drafting Suggestions):

Commission proposal	Drafting Suggestions and Comments
	19. The contractors referred to in this Article shall entirely finance the **IRIS²** commercial infrastructure referred to in paragraph 3 **point (b)** in order to fulfil the objective referred to in paragraph 1, point (b). FR (Comments): Proposed clarifications.
Article 62	ES (Comments): Articles 62, 63, and 64 address subcomponents of the SSA component. For greater coherence with the rest of the document, it would be beneficial to combine these into a single article. Additionally, the section lacks an introductory point outlining the objectives or scope of the SSA component, which is necessary to maintain consistency with the other components.

PUBLIC

Space Surveillance and Tracking	EE (Comments): Estonia supports a security- and quality-driven approach to SST services, with 24/7 operational reliability. However, Estonia considers it necessary to review the suitability of the current partnership model. At present, access to detailed data and services (including potential access to procurements) depends on partnership membership status, which may disadvantage smaller Member States. Estonia's limited participation so far is not due to lack of interest, but rather restricted administrative and technical resources, despite Estonian companies and research institutions having competencies that could strengthen European SST services. Estonia recommends that the partnership model be made more flexible, allowing Member States to contribute incrementally and with diverse competencies, such as software, data processing, or service components. Such an approach would help avoid systemic inequality, support innovation, and strengthen overall European space security. IT (Comments): Commission to provide visibility on secondary law by listing in the work programmes the expected implementing/delegated acts (subject matter and scope: catalogue policy, service access tiers, user categories, data-handling/security hooks). Also Commission to clarify the interface with Regulation (EU) [XXX] (safety, resilience, sustainability) and with Reg. (EU) 2021/696 to avoid overlaps and ensure continuity. PL (Comments): Within this sub-component, we envisage an enhanced coordinating role for the Agency (EUSPA), which would provide Member States involved with improved opportunities for collaboration, including in decision-making processes related to this component (more MS-neutral process).
	FR

Commission proposal	Drafting Suggestions and Comments
	(Comments): Can the Commission clarify the budget nomenclature envisaged for this article? We would like to suggest to have only one reference to implementing Acts and delegated acts for the SST sub-component
1. The SST sub-component of SSA shall in particular include:	ES (Comments): Is the SST grant mentioned in article 73 paragraph 4 included?
(a) the establishment, development and operation of a network of sensors of the Member States, be selected by architecture studies, comprising ground-based and space-based SST sensors of the Member States, be selected by architecture study, including sensors developed through the European Space Agency, of Union commercial sector, and of Union sensors aiming to survey and track space objects and produce an autonomous European catalogue of space objects;	ES (Drafting Suggestions): (a) the establishment, development and operation of a network of sensors of the Member States, be selected by architecture studies, comprising ground-based and space-based SST sensors of the Member States, ~~be selected by architecture study~~, including sensors developed through the European Space Agency, of Union commercial sector, and of Union sensors aiming to survey~~y~~**il** and track space objects and produce an autonomous European catalogue of space objects; ALTERNATIVE (a) the establishment, development and operation of a network of sensors of the Member States, **the Union and the Union commercial sector,** ~~be selected by architecture studies,~~ comprising ground-based and space-based SST sensors ~~of the Member States, be selected by architecture study~~ **on the basis of architecture studies**, including sensors developed through the European Space Agency, ~~of Union commercial sector, and of Union sensors~~ aiming to survey and track space objects and produce an autonomous European catalogue of space objects

Commission proposal	Drafting Suggestions and Comments
	ES (Comments): Remove repeated wording and re-organizes the subjects while keeping the technical scope for the sake of clarity. Alt drafting suggestion. FI (Comments): It would be beneficial for the EU SST organization to expand its observation network by adding more Satellite Laser Ranging (SLR) systems in order to enable accurate tracking of space debris re-entering and impacting the Earth's surface. That should be considered when developing the network of sensors of the Member States. FR (Drafting Suggestions): (a) the **ongoing establishment**, development and operation of a network of sensors of the Member States, be selected by architecture studies, comprising ground-based and space-based SST sensors of the Member States, be selected by architecture study, including sensors developed through the European Space Agency, of Union commercial sector, and of Union sensors, ~~aiming to~~ **in the objective of** survey**ing** and track**ing** space objects and produce~~e~~**ing** an autonomous European catalogue of space objects **so as to ensure the provision of SST services as requested at paragraph 5**; FR (Comments): We would like to have a clarification on the reference to the Union sensors. Pending further clarification on what is meant exactly by « Union Sensors », we would like to ask for this mention to be put into brackets.

Commission proposal	Drafting Suggestions and Comments
	Proposed additions to recall that the primary objective of SSA at the EU level remains the current SST services, through the fostering of a European strategic autonomy in this domain. IE (Comments): IE Suggest that this point would benefit from being reorganised. Perhaps it could refer to "space object sensors", defining this term, then define the purpose of the network, how MS will be selected, and how the network architecture will be defined, and finally explain the types of sensors to be included. Furthermore, the phrasing is unclear. The meaning of Union commercial sector should be clarified. Clarification is also needed on whether this is intended to refer to sensors that are: 1. Developed through the commercial sector 2. Developed by the commercial sector 3. Operated by the commercial sector 4. Some combination of the above The meaning of a "Union sensor" should be clarified. Does it mean a sensor owned and/or operated by the Union, or something else? LU (Comments):

Commission proposal	Drafting Suggestions and Comments
	It is important that the commercial sector be involved in the EU SST initiative. Could you clarify whether such involvement is currently foreseen? DE (Drafting Suggestions): (a) the establishment, development and operation of a network of sensors of the Member States, be selected by **transparently documented** architecture studies, comprising ground-based and space-based SST sensors of the Member States, be selected by **transparently documented** architecture ~~study~~ **studies**, including sensors developed through the European Space Agency, of Union commercial sector, ~~and of Union sensors~~ aiming to survey and track space objects and **help** produce an autonomous European catalogue of space objects; DE (Comments): - Architecture studies need to be conducted and documented in full transparency towards the affected stakeholders (i.e. potential sensor contributors). - The EU has no SST sensors as of today and there is no specified need for such. - SST sensors do not produce a catalogue of orbital objects but their measurements help produce such catalogue. Cataloguing requires a separate data processing chain. IT (Drafting Suggestions): (a) the establishment, development and operation of a network of sensors the establishment, development and operation of a network of sensors: **(1) Member States' ground- and space-based SST sensors, to be selected by**

Commission proposal	Drafting Suggestions and Comments
	architecture performance studies, including sensors developed through the European Space Agency; (2) Union commercial sector sensors; and (3) Union sensors, ~~aiming~~ to surve**ing** and track space objects and produc**ing** an autonomous European catalogue of space objects; IT (Comments): Harmonises the enumeration, introduces architecture performance studies as selection basis, and preserves the objective of an autonomous EU catalogue PL (Comments): We would appreciate further clarification and a more detailed understanding of how transparency will be ensured in the process of evaluating the system architecture and selecting sensors contributed by Member States. As currently outlined in Article 62.3 of the ECF, the EUSST framework assigns the responsibility for conducting the system-level architecture study to two Member States. However, the purpose and methodology of these studies are not always clearly defined, and the process would benefit from greater transparency and consistency. Given that the outcomes of the architecture study directly influence the organisation of national resources and the selection of sensors eligible for EU funding - often limited to specific Member States - clarity on the underlying principles and procedures is of particular importance. We would therefore welcome information on how the Commission intends to ensure a transparent, inclusive, and balanced approach going forward.
(b) the processing and analysis of SST data in order to produce SST information and SST services;	FR (Comments):

Commission proposal	Drafting Suggestions and Comments
	Discussions on a possible evolution of EUSST are preliminary and ongoing. The wording here seems to preempt the outcome of these discussions. We suggest to let this disposal into brackets. Furthermore, there is no definition of what "SST information and SST services" are. These two concepts should be defined in Article 2 of the CEF or in the Space section. IE (Comments): SST services" is not defined. IT (Comments): SST information is not defined. Commissione to provide a clear definition.
(c) the provision of the SST services to the SST users;	
(d) seeking, fostering and supporting synergies with initiatives promoting development and deployment of technologies for spacecraft disposal at the end of operational lifetime and of technological systems for the prevention and elimination of space debris,	FR (Drafting Suggestions): (d) seeking, fostering and supporting synergies with initiatives promoting development and deployment of technologies for spacecraft disposal at the end of operational lifetime and of technological systems for the prevention ~~and elimination~~ of space debris, FR (Comments): We do not see how SST sub-components could contribute to the elimination of space debris regarding its current objectives DE

Commission proposal	Drafting Suggestions and Comments
	(Comments): Please provide written information as to what activities/initiatives with potential synergies COM has in mind? IT (Drafting Suggestions): (d) seeking, fostering and supporting synergies with initiatives promoting development and deployment of technologies **and services** for spacecraft disposal at the end of operational lifetime and of technological systems **and services** for the prevention and elimination of space debris, IT (Comments): Broadening to reflect operational uptake and the services dimension referenced elsewhere.
(e) the cooperation, including at operational level, with the international initiatives in the space traffic coordination;	SI (Drafting Suggestions): the cooperation, including at operational level, with the international initiatives in the space traffic ~~coordination~~ **management**; SI (Comments): We propose to use space traffic management, as coordination is not sufficient to cover all needed regulatory and technical aspects of space traffic and its challenges DE (Drafting Suggestions): (e) the cooperation, including at operational level, with ~~the~~ international initiatives in the **domain of** space traffic coordination;

Commission proposal	Drafting Suggestions and Comments
	IT (Drafting Suggestions): (e) the cooperation, including at ~~operational~~ **coordination** level, with the international initiatives in the space traffic coordination, **which stays in charge of the Member States**; IT (Comments): Clarifies operational coordination and anchors MS competent authorities' role, while keeping cooperation with international STC initiatives. PL (Comments): In relation to the aforementioned reference to "international cooperation," we would welcome clarification as to how this aspect falls within the scope of the ECF. It is important to us that the regulatory framework supports, rather than inadvertently limits, the ability of participating countries to continue engaging in international cooperation in this domain.
(f) the delivery of the activities established by Regulation (EU) [XXX] [safety, resilience and environmental sustainability of space activities in the Union]	AT (Comments): How will this reference work as the EU Space Act is not supposed to be in force by 2028? FI (Comments): This must be removed as it refers to the proposed EU Space Act which is not mature enough. FR (Comments):

Commission proposal	Drafting Suggestions and Comments
	Could the Commission elaborate on the activities to be established by the EU Space Act that could be delivered under this provision ? NL (Drafting Suggestions): ~~the delivery of the activities established by Regulation (EU) [XXX] [safety, resilience and environmental sustainability of space activities in the Union]~~ NL (Comments): • Article 62 (1f) The Netherlands underlines that referencing future legislation that has not yet been agreed is premature. Such references should either be removed or reformulated in neutral terms to avoid prejudging the outcome of ongoing legislative negotiations. PT (Drafting Suggestions): To be deleted. PT (Comments): It is believed that all the activities are comprised within the above numbers; if that is not the case, please elaborate. In addition, the Regulation (EU) [XXX] [safety, resilience and environmental sustainability of space activities in the Union] is still under discussion. RO (Comments):

Commission proposal	Drafting Suggestions and Comments
	A correlation with the corresponding articles in the mentioned Regulation is needed. EE (Comments): Reference to the future EUSA premature at this stage. Consider deleting or qualifying the reference to Regulation (EU) [XXX] until its adoption and entry into force.
(g) research and development activities supporting the evolution of the SST, including its services	FR (Drafting Suggestions): (g) research and development activities supporting the evolution of the SST, including its services **and the consolidation of a commercial ecosystem delivering advanced SST services, on top of public SST services referred to in paragraph 5 (a), (b) and (c), including, inter alia, in the following areas: space debris mitigation in order to reduce their generation, the monitoring of launch after injection, advanced SST services for constellations, the establishment of a marketplace for SST services, support to Cislunar operations, support to in-space operations and services, and to dark and quiet sky.** (g) research and development activities supporting the evolution of the SST, including its services,. FR (Comments): Transferred from the 5.(d) How does this activity relate to R&I included in Horizon Europe ?
	AT (Drafting Suggestions): (h) the alignment of SST services with SST users' expectations;

Commission proposal	Drafting Suggestions and Comments
	(i) support, promotion and encouragement of the use of SST services. AT (Comments): For the competitiveness of Europe a strong focus on user uptake is necessary.
2. The SST sub-component shall also provide technical and administrative support to ensure the transition between the SST activities performed under the ECF and the SST activities performed under Regulation (EU) 2021/696.	FI (Comments): The current text is non-specific. It must be clearly described which activities are performed under ECF and which under the other regulation. (sections 2 and 3). FR (Comments): Can the Commission provide an estimate for the technical and admnistrative support mentionned ? We also want to recall that the change in activities performed under the ECF with regards to the activities performed under the current MFF is subject to continuing discussions on the evolution of the EU SST Partnership's architecture
3. The SST Partnership created under Regulation (EU) 2021/696 shall continue to be in effect under the ECF. The Commission may adopt, by means of implementing acts, detailed rules for the inclusion at a later stage of a Member State in the SST Partnership. Those implementing acts shall be adopted in accordance with the examination procedure referred to in Article 83, paragraph 3.	AT (Drafting Suggestions): 3. The SST Partnership created under Regulation (EU) 2021/696 shall continue to be in effect under the ECF **and shall be responsible for the implemention of SST**. The Commission may adopt, by means of implementing acts, detailed ~~rules~~ **provisions** for ~~the inclusion at a later stage of a Member State in~~ the **participation in the** SST Partnership**, especially on**

Commission proposal	Drafting Suggestions and Comments
	the inclusion of a Member State at a later stage. Those implementing acts shall be adopted in accordance with the examination procedure referred to in Article 83, paragraph 3. AT (Comments): For clarity reasons it is necessary to state that the SST Partnership will implement SST. We are in favor of a broader scope to ensure the continuity of the SST Partnership, guided by the question "what happens in the unlikely event that the current SST partnership decides to dissolve?". FR (Drafting Suggestions): 3. The SST Partnership ~~created~~ **initiated** under Regulation (EU) 2021/696 shall continue to be in effect under the ECF. The Commission may adopt, by means of implementing acts, detailed rules for the inclusion at a later stage of a Member State in the SST Partnership. Those implementing acts shall be adopted in accordance with the examination procedure referred to in Article 83, paragraph 3. PT (Comments): It is not clear what is the role of the SST Partnership under ECF, please clarify. IT (Drafting Suggestions): 3. The SST Partnership created under Regulation (EU) 2021/696 shall continue to be in effect under the ECF, **with an inclusive approach to Member States know-how and expertise** […] IT

Commission proposal	Drafting Suggestions and Comments
	(Comments): Insertion to reflect the inclusive approach, without altering legal effects. PL (Comments): Poland has some reservations regarding the continuation of the EU SST Partnership in its current form, as outlined in this paragraph. While fully recognising its significance for Poland and its strategic relevance at the EU level, our assessment of its present structure and functioning remains cautious. In this context, Poland suggests a review of the current distribution of EU funding among the Member States participating in the EU SST Partnership/Consortium, with a view to evaluating the outcomes and overall impact of the initiative to date. Furthermore, Poland proposes the development of a more structured decision-making process within the Expert Teams, as well as a clearer definition of the roles and responsibilities of the Heads of Expert Teams appointed under Article 58 of Regulation (EU) 2021/696. This would help ensure greater transparency and accountability in decisions concerning the allocation of funding for activities overseen by these teams.
4. The tasks of the SST Partnership referred to in paragraph 5 shall be extended to support the SST implementation. The Commission is empowered to adopt delegated acts in accordance with Article 84 to supplement this paragraph with the detailed list of tasks to be performed by the SST Partnership.	AT (Comments): What does “The tasks of the SST Partnership referred to in paragraph 5 shall be extended to support the SST implementation.” mean? Why is a delegated act necessary? We prefer less delegated acts and more details in the basic act. ES (Comments):

Commission proposal	Drafting Suggestions and Comments
	This provision allows the Commission to redefine the Partnership's tasks at any moment. However, the delegated procedure in Article 84 should involve the SPC-SST Committee, which does not appear to be ensured here. FR (Drafting Suggestions): 4. The ~~tasks~~ **services** of the SST Partnership referred to in paragraph 5 shall be extended to support the SST implementation. The Commission is empowered to adopt delegated acts in accordance with Article 84 to supplement this paragraph with the detailed list of tasks to be performed by the SST Partnership. **Those delegated acts shall be adopted in accordance with the examination procedure referred to in Article 83, paragraph 3**. FR (Comments): Paragraph 5 refers to services and not to task. Proposition made to harmonise the wording. We would like to understand why these tasks will not be defined in the partnership agreement. Furthermore, the examination procedure is requested for this article. DE (Drafting Suggestions): 4. The tasks of the SST Partnership referred to in paragraph 5 shall be extended to support the SST implementation. The Commission is empowered to adopt **~~delegated~~ implementing acts in accordance with the examination procedure referred to in Article 83, paragraph 3** ~~Article 84~~ to supplement this paragraph with the detailed list of tasks to be performed by the SST Partnership. DE

Commission proposal	Drafting Suggestions and Comments
	(Comments): In our view, COM does not have the technical-operational background and expertise in this area to act by delegated acts. Particularly the Member States of the EU SST Partnership need to be closely involved in drafting and deciding on any detailed list of tasks to be performed by the Partnership. IT (Drafting Suggestions): 4. The tasks of the SST Partnership referred to in paragraph ~~5~~ **3** shall ~~be extended to support~~ **include** the SST implementation. IT (Comments): Fixes the wrong paragraph reference and clarifies that tasks include implementation, which logically follows from para 2–3 continuity.
5. SST services shall be free of charge, available at any time without interruption and adapted to the needs of the SST users and shall comprise:	ES (Drafting Suggestions): 5. SST services shall be free of charge, ~~**available at any time**~~ without interruption and adapted to the needs of the SST users and shall comprise: ES (Comments): available at any time-> This is a technical requirement not adequate for a regulatory text. PT (Drafting Suggestions): SST services **provided by the SST partnership** shall be free of charge, … PT

Commission proposal	Drafting Suggestions and Comments
	(Comments): Comission shall not interfere in the commercial market of the commercial operators. IT (Drafting Suggestions): 5. SST services shall be free of charge **for their authorized users**, available at any time without interruption and adapted to the needs of the SST users and shall comprise: IT (Comments): Clarify that use of SST is limited to authorized users..
	IT (Comments): Updates the SST service set in line with operational needs (constellations, cislunar, in-space ops, dark/quiet sky) and makes LCOLA explicit.
(a) the risk assessment of collision between spacecraft or between spacecraft and space debris and the potential generation of collision avoidance alerts during the phases of launch, early orbit, orbit raising, in-orbit operations and disposal phases of spacecraft missions;	
(b) the detection and characterisation of in-orbit fragmentations, break-ups or collisions;	DE (Drafting Suggestions): (b) the detection and ~~characterisation~~ **analysis** of in-orbit fragmentations, break-ups or collisions; DE (Comments):

Commission proposal	Drafting Suggestions and Comments
	"Analysis" is the broader term used in the SST domain.
(c) the risk assessment of the uncontrolled re-entry of space objects and space debris into the Earth's atmosphere and the generation of related information, including the estimation of the timeframe and likely location of possible impact;	DE (Drafting Suggestions): (c) the risk assessment of the uncontrolled re-entry of space objects ~~and space debris~~ into the Earth's atmosphere and the generation of related information, including the estimation of the timeframe and likely location of possible impact; DE (Comments): "Space objects" encompasses all orbiting objects, including spacecraft and space debris.
(d) the development of activities related to space debris mitigation in order to reduce their generation, space debris remediation, the monitoring of launch after injection, specific services for constellations, the establishment of a marketplace for SST services, preparation of the system to Cislunar operations, support to in-space operations and services, and to dark and quiet sky.	AT (Drafting Suggestions): (d) the development of activities related to space debris mitigation in order to reduce their generation, space debris remediation **by managing the existing space debris**, the monitoring of launch after injection, specific services for constellations, the establishment of a marketplace for SST services, preparation of the system to Cislunar operations, support to in-space operations and services, and to dark and quiet sky. AT (Comments): What are "specific services for constellations"? The services or reason for services for constellations should be stated in the text. In addition, also the other activities mentioned, apart from space debris mitigation and remediation, need further clarification. Are these new services or will the existing services support those activities?

PUBLIC

Commission proposal	Drafting Suggestions and Comments
	ES (Drafting Suggestions): (d) the development of activities related to space debris mitigation in order to reduce their generation, space debris remediation, the monitoring of launch after injection, specific services for constellations, the establishment of a marketplace for SST services, preparation of the system to ~~C~~**c**islunar ~~operations~~, support to in- space operations and services, and support to **dark- and quiet- skies** initiatives. ES (Comments): Terminology/style: “cislunar” (lowercase), “operations” delated for redundancy, and standard phrasing for dark/quiet skies. FR (Drafting Suggestions): ~~(d) the development of activities related to space debris mitigation in order to reduce their generation, space debris remediation, the monitoring of launch after injection, specific services for constellations, the establishment of a marketplace for SST services, preparation of the system to Cislunar operations, support to in-space operations and services, and to dark and quiet sky~~ FR (Comments): The activities listed under this item can be considered as an operationnal service as the services mentionned under (a), (b) and (c). Moreover, these issues are preliminary and rely more on R&D activities. Consequently, we suggest to merge with the para 1.(g). IE (Comments):

Commission proposal	Drafting Suggestions and Comments
	IE notes that 5. (d.) – Neither "dark sky" nor "quiet sky" is defined anywhere; difficult to know/ascertain the differences between each, nor how the development of relevant SST services/activities related to space debris mitigation/remediation etc. will achieve either/both PT (Comments): What does the SST services marketplace entail? What are the rules? DE (Drafting Suggestions): (d) the development of activities related to space debris mitigation in order to reduce their generation, **including** space debris remediation, the monitoring of launch after injection, specific services for constellations, the establishment of a marketplace for SST ~~services~~, preparation of the system to Cislunar operations, support to in-space operations and services, and to dark and quiet sk**ies activities**. DE (Comments): The marketplace may include services and/or data. This should be formulated more open. The examination of the SST marketplace is still ongoing. No final conclusions have been drawn IT (Drafting Suggestions): (d) the development of activities related to space debris mitigation in order to reduce their generation, space debris remediation, ~~the monitoring of launch after injection~~, specific services for constellations, the establishment of a marketplace for SST services, preparation of the system to Cislunar operations, support to in-space operations and services, and to dark and quiet sky.

Commission proposal	Drafting Suggestions and Comments
	IT (Comments): Moved to point (e) PL (Comments): The inclusion of cislunar operations under development and dual-use activities is noted; however, there appears to be no explicit reference to the monitoring of potential collisions involving large, non-manoeuvrable space objects as a distinct information service. In this context, we would kindly suggest clarifying the scope of such activities, particularly as cislunar space lies beyond the current competences of the European Union. As the Moon and its surrounding space are part of the international domain, any EU involvement in this area should be carefully considered within the framework of existing international responsibilities and legal boundaries. In addition, the reference at the end of the paragraph to the "dark and quiet sky" appears to introduce new competences for SST, potentially extending into areas such as the regulation of satellite design or manufacturing processes. We believe such activities may go beyond the mandate of the ECF and would benefit from further clarification regarding their scope, legal basis, and implementation framework.
	IT (Drafting Suggestions): **(e) the generation of potential collision avoidance alerts during the phases of launch, early orbit, orbit raising including the monitoring of launch until the final orbit injection (LCOLA);** IT

Commission proposal	Drafting Suggestions and Comments
	(Comments): Updates the SST service set in line with operational needs and makes LCOLA explicit.
6. The SST services may comprise services for governmental SST users based on the catalogue referred to paragraph 1, point a.	AT (Comments): What services will governmental users get in comparison to all other SST users? Will those services be also free of charge? ES (Comments): The "services" shall be described in the document, anologously to the ones listed in paragraph 5. FR (Comments): Could the Commission specify what is envisioned at this stage in terms of "services for governmental SST users"? DE (Drafting Suggestions): ~~6. The SST services may comprise services for governmental SST users based on the catalogue referred to paragraph 1, point a.~~ DE (Comments): SST already delivers and shares data and services to/with governmental users. Thus, there is no added value to highlight a particular user group out of many. IT (Drafting Suggestions):

Commission proposal	Drafting Suggestions and Comments
	6. The SST services may comprise services for governmental SST users based on the catalogue referred to paragraph 1, point a., **including fast-track and sensitive services for specific governmental use cases.** IT (Comments): Acknowledges mission-critical timelines and sensitive cases for governmental users; details to be set in implementing acts to avoid overlap with other frameworks.
7. The Commission is empowered to adopt delegated acts to supplement the list of non-core users and specify the services that they may have access to.	AT (Drafting Suggestions): ~~7. The Commission is empowered to adopt delegated acts to supplement the list of non-core users and specify the services that they may have access to.~~ AT (Comments): Why is a delegated act necessary? We prefer less delegated acts and more details in the basic act. ES (Comments): Non core users are defined later. For the sake of understanding the paragraph shall be move after the definition PT (Drafting Suggestions): The Commission is empowered to adopt delegated acts to supplement the list of non-core users and specify the services **provided by the SST Partnership** that they may have access to.

PUBLIC

Commission proposal	Drafting Suggestions and Comments
	RO (Comments): MS involvement is needed. Advisory procedure could be used as a tool. DE (Drafting Suggestions): 7. The Commission ~~is empowered to adopt delegated acts~~ together with the EU SST Partnership decide in consensus to supplement the list of non-core users and specify the services that they may have access to. DE (Comments): In our opinion, this far-reaching decision cannot be taken without the Partnership. The EU provides the financial framework of EU SST. It does not set the boundaries of service provision alone and without having found a consensus with the concerned Member States of the EU SST Partnership. IT (Comments): Editorial request: move paragraph 7 after paragraph 9, so that the empowerment to supplement the list of non-core users follows the definition of user categories. If relocation is not feasible, add a cross-reference to "users defined in paragraph 9" PL (Comments): We fully understand and appreciate the rationale behind distinguishing between core and non-core users, as well as core and non-core tasks within the EU SST framework. However, our practical experience to date has highlighted some challenges associated with this approach. Specifically, this differentiation has led to varying levels of service provision, resulting in certain users - such as operators of non-manoeuvrable satellites -

PUBLIC

Commission proposal	Drafting Suggestions and Comments
	receiving a less comprehensive level of support compared to others, for example, operators of manoeuvrable satellites. Notably, non-manoeuvrable satellite operators do not currently have access to 24/7 telephone support, which is available free of charge to some core users (from certain MS), consistent with the principle of SST services being provided free of charge under Regulation 2021/696 and the ECF. We believe that addressing these disparities would contribute to a more equitable and effective service model, ensuring all users derive optimal benefit from the EU SST capabilities.
8. The Commission may adopt, by means of implementing acts, the operational and access requirements as well as the security and technical specifications for SST services. Those implementing acts shall be adopted in accordance with the examination procedure referred to in Article 83, paragraph 3.	AT (Comments): We prefer less implementing acts and more details in the basic act. Will EUSPA stay the SST front desk? Will there be more information on this topic in the new EUSPA Regulation? PT (Drafting Suggestions): The Commission may adopt, by means of implementing acts, the operational and access requirements as well as the security and technical specifications for SST services **provided by the SST Partnership**. Those implementing acts shall be adopted in accordance with the examination procedure referred to in Article 83, paragraph 3. DE (Drafting Suggestions): ~~8. The Commission may adopt, by means of implementing acts, the operational and access requirements as well as the security and technical specifications for SST services. Those implementing acts shall be adopted in~~

Commission proposal	Drafting Suggestions and Comments
	~~accordance with the examination procedure referred to in Article 83, paragraph 3.~~ DE (Comments): SST is a security-critical programme, run by the Member States of the Partnership. As a general principle, the Member States' competence for national security (Article 4.2 TEU) needs to be fully respected. COM must not assume any power or competence over the national prerogatives of the Member States in the domain of security. IT (Drafting Suggestions): 8. The Commission may adopt, by means of implementing acts, the operational and access requirements as well as the security and technical specifications for SST services **together with Member States**. Those implementing acts shall be adopted in accordance with the examination procedure referred to in Article 83, paragraph 3 IT (Comments): Explicitly involves Member States in shaping ops/access/security requirements, in line with the sensitive/sovereign nature of SST PL (Drafting Suggestions): 8. The Commission may adopt, by means of implementing acts, the operational and access requirements as well as the security and ~~technical specifications~~ **operational and service goals** for SST services. Those implementing acts shall be adopted in accordance with the examination procedure referred to in Article 83, paragraph 3.

Commission proposal	Drafting Suggestions and Comments
	PL (Comments): Rather than focusing primarily on technical specifications for SST services, it would be more constructive to emphasize the operational and service objectives these specifications are intended to support. While technical requirements are important, an overly rigid or detailed technical framework risks inadvertently excluding certain Member States from effectively accessing and benefiting from this component of the ECF. We therefore encourage a balanced approach that prioritizes clear, achievable operational goals and service outcomes, ensuring inclusivity and equitable participation across all Member States, while maintaining necessary technical standards. Such an approach would better align with the broader strategic objectives of the EU SST and promote cohesion within the Union.
9. SST Users shall comprise:	
(a) SST core users, which shall have access to all SST services: Member States, the EEAS, the Commission, the Council, the Agency as well as public and private spacecraft owners and operators established in the Union;	ES (Comments): It is understood that "Agency" refers to EUSPA. If so, introduction of "the Agency" shall appear earlier in the text. DE (Drafting Suggestions): (a) SST core users, which shall have access to all SST services: Member States, **the Council**, the EEAS, the Commission, ~~the Council,~~ the Agency as well as public and private spacecraft owners and operators established in the Union;

Commission proposal	Drafting Suggestions and Comments
(b) SST non-core users;	AT (Drafting Suggestions): (b) SST non-core users**, which shall have access to publicly available SST services referred to in paragraph (5) (a) (b) (c) (d): other public and private entities established in the Union**; FR (Comments): Same comment as in paragraph 1(b): there is no definition of what "non-core users" are. As in Regulation 2021/696, we would like to see the distinction between core and non-core users clarified by specifying the services to which core users have access and those to which non-core users have access. Furthermore, why are international users no longer mentioned ? IT (Comments): Italy requests precision on non-core users
(c) Governmental SST users for the governmental service: Member State authorities, the EEAS, the Council.	AT (Drafting Suggestions): (c) Governmental SST users for the governmental service**s referred to in paragraph (6)**: Member State authorities, the EEAS, the Council. ES (Comments): The SST "governmental service" shall be introduced. It is only mentioned in paragraph 6, but there is no definition or description of such a service. FR (Comments):

Commission proposal	Drafting Suggestions and Comments
	Pending further discussions with Member States on the potential governmental service, such a provision should be put on hold. Should the creation of such a service be decided, this Regulation should specify in detail how this service should be designed, notably in terms of i) governance, ii) operational structure, iii) services, iv) dissemination and protection of classified information, etc. DE (Drafting Suggestions): ~~(c) Governmental SST users for the governmental service: Member State authorities, the EEAS, the Council.~~ DE (Comments): Governmental users are already subsumed under 9 (a) above. There is no separate or specific governmental service. In our opinion, this is an unnecessary duplication. IT (Comments): Italy requests clarification on which Member State authorities there is a reference to.
	AT (Drafting Suggestions): **(d) International SST users, which shall have access to the publicly availabe SST services relating to collision avoidance and re-entry: third countries, international organisations which do not have their headquarters in the Union and private entities which are not established in the Union. They shall also have access to SST services referred to in paragraph (5) (d) under the following conditions:**

Commission proposal	Drafting Suggestions and Comments
	(i) third countries and international organisations which do not have their headquarters in the Union may have access to SST services pursuant to Article 68 (2); **(ii) private entities which are not established in the Union may have access to SST services subject to an international agreement concluded by the Union, in accordance with Article 68 (2), with the third country in which they are established granting them that access.**
10. The Commission may adopt, by means of implementing acts, detailed provisions concerning the access to SST services by the SST users and relevant procedures. Those implementing acts shall be adopted in accordance with the examination procedure referred to in Article 83, paragraph 3.	AT (Comments): We prefer less implementing acts and more details in the basic act. PT (Drafting Suggestions): The Commission may adopt, by means of implementing acts, detailed provisions concerning the access to SST services, **provided by the SST Partnership,** by the SST users and relevant procedures. Those implementing acts shall be adopted in accordance with the examination procedure referred to in Article 83, paragraph 3. IT (Drafting Suggestions): 10. The Commission may adopt, by means of implementing acts, detailed provisions concerning the access to SST services, **including fast-track and sensitive services referred to in Article 62.6,** by the SST users and relevant procedures**. […]** IT (Comments): Ensures that fast-track/sensitive governmental services are covered in the access rulebook, increasing predictability.

Commission proposal	Drafting Suggestions and Comments
11. The SST sub-component shall not be open to the participation of third countries, except Norway.	ES (Drafting Suggestions): 11. The SST sub-component ~~shall not be open to the participation of third countries, except Norway~~ **should allow participation of third countries that have signed a security and defence agreement with the European Union**. ES (Comments): The wording should allow for the possibility of opening the system to other countries that sign a security and defence agreement with the EU. The SST sub-component shall be structured in such a manner as to permit the accession of third countries that have entered into a security and defence agreement with the European Union, subject to compliance with applicable legal and institutional frameworks. FI (Comments): It is not meaningful to restrict the participation of other potential third countries so strictly. It would be good to leave the door slightly open and refer to the possibility of negotiating with other countries as well. FR (Comments): Can we have some explanations regarding this proposal ? In particular, we would like to understand what “participation of third countries” means : member state of EUSST, access to data… ? NL (Comments):

Commission proposal	Drafting Suggestions and Comments
	• article 62 (11) closes participation to third countries except Norway. Why this abrupt restriction compared to the more flexible regime in the current space programme? How does the Commission envision to include trusted partners such as the US and Japan? RO (Comments): A correlation with article 68(2) is needed. DE (Drafting Suggestions): 11. The SST sub-component shall not be open to the participation of third countries, except Norway **and the UK**. DE (Comments): The UK was one of the original Member States of the EU SST Consortium (today the Partnership). The UK is a very capable state with excellent SST sensor and data processing heritage. For the sake of the best possible provision of SST services, the SST sub-component shall be open to the UK. Norway, however, has an interesting location for sensors but possesses limited know-how and relevant technical assets. EE (Drafting Suggestions): **"Participation of third countries in the SST sub-component may be considered on a case-by-case basis, subject to specific agreements and appropriate safeguards."** EE

Commission proposal	Drafting Suggestions and Comments
	(Comments): Estonia recommends that the wording of Article 62(11) be made more flexible. While we understand the need for safeguards, the current formulation unnecessarily excludes potential future cooperation with other third countries and regions. Given the strategic and technical nature of space surveillance and tracking (SST), it is important to maintain the possibility for collaboration with trusted international partners. The regulation should not pre-emptively close off such options.
Article 63	FI (Comments): As NEO is a whole new service, clear service descriptions are needed before anything can be agreed upon.
Near-Earth Objects	FR (Comments): Can the Commission clarify the budget nomenclature envisaged for this article?
1. The objective of the NEO sub-component of SSA is the risk monitoring of natural objects in the solar system which are approaching the Earth.	FR (Comments): Can the Commission specify which entities will be involved in the activities referred to in this article? Who will be responsible for what? IT (Drafting Suggestions): 1. The objective of the NEO sub-component of SSA is the risk monitoring **and impact risk assessment** of natural objects in the solar system ~~which are approaching~~ that approach the Earth

Commission proposal	Drafting Suggestions and Comments
	IT (Comments): Clarification that NEO services cover risk monitoring and impact assessment, which is implicit in operational outputs; phrasing standardises the English and avoids ambiguity.
2. Eligible activities under NEO shall in particular cover relevant activities to fulfil the objective set out in paragraph 1, notably support activities related to the maintenance and data entries of the Union catalogue of physical properties of near-Earth objects.	AT (Comments): Why are other NEO activities not pursued any more? FR (Drafting Suggestions): 2. Eligible activities under **the** NEO **sub-component** shall in particular cover relevant activities to fulfil the objective set out in paragraph 1, notably support activities related to the maintenance and data entries of the Union catalogue of physical **and dynamical** properties of near-Earth objects.
3. and research and development activities supporting the evolution of the NEO, including its services, and downstream R&D for applications and user technology for the uptake of NEO services.	AT (Drafting Suggestions): 3. ~~and r~~**Research** and development activities **shall support**~~ing~~ the evolution of the NEO, including its services, and downstream **research and development** ~~R&D~~ for applications and user technology for the uptake of NEO services. AT (Comments): Editorial changes. FR

Commission proposal	Drafting Suggestions and Comments
	(Drafting Suggestions): 3. and research and development activities supporting the evolution of the NEO **sub-component**, including its services, and downstream R&D for applications and user technology for the uptake of NEO services, **and in particular the development of physical properties modeling tools as well as instruments, technologies and related data exploitation models to support the physical and dynamical characterization of NEOs by space missions and from the ground.** FR (Comments): It is proposed to be more specific on the needs to be covered for the NEO sub-component, considering the limited budget that could be allocated to this sub-component. How does this activity relate to R&I included in Horizon Europe ? DE (Drafting Suggestions): 3. and research and development activities supporting the evolution of the NEO **sub-component**, including its services, and downstream R&D for applications and user technology for the uptake of NEO services. DE (Comments): Here something was missing. Research and development activities do not support the evolution of Near Earth Objects (NEO) themselves. IT (Drafting Suggestions):

Commission proposal	Drafting Suggestions and Comments
	3. and research and development activities supporting the evolution of the NEO **subcomponent**, including its services, and downstream R&D for applications and user technology for the uptake of NEO services.
	AT (Drafting Suggestions): **4. The Commission, in its field of competence, may put in place procedures to coordinate, with the involvement of the appropriate UN bodies, the actions of the Union and national public authorities concerned with civil protection in the event a near-Earth object is found to be approaching Earth.** AT (Comments): A reference to the UN and national activities is necessary for the effectiveness of NEO activities.
Article 64	FI (Comments): As SWE is a whole new service, clear service descriptions are needed before anything can be agreed upon. FR (Comments): Can the Commission clarify the budget nomenclature envisaged for this article?
Space Weather Events	
1. The objective of the SWE is to monitor and assess natural changes related to space weather events, such as solar winds and solar flares.	ES (Drafting Suggestions):

Commission proposal	Drafting Suggestions and Comments
	1. The objective of the SWE is to monitor and assess natural changes related to space weather events, such as solar winds and solar flares**, and to provide early warning and resilience capabilities supporting the security, defence, and critical infrastructure protection needs of the Member States**. ALTERNATIVE 1. The objective of the SWE is to monitor and assess natural changes related to space weather events, such as solar winds and solar flares**, and to provide early warning, security, defence and resilience capabilities supporting critical infrastructure that depends on it, ensuring the resilience and continuity of vital national and European operations**. ES (Comments): To ensure SWE is not just scientific monitoring, but also a tool for defence and national resilience (important for operations) ALTERNATIVE It is essential to develop strong operational Space Weather services that can safeguard not only our space infrastructure, but also the critical ground infrastructure that depends on it, ensuring the resilience and continuity of vital national and European operations (AEE) -> alt text: FR (Drafting Suggestions): 1. The objective of the SWE **sub-component of SSA** is to monitor and assess **and forecast** natural changes **due to the solar variable activity** related to space weather events, such as solar winds and solar flares, **and their impacts on critical systems and infrastructures**. FR

Commission proposal	Drafting Suggestions and Comments
	(Comments): "Natural changes" is too vague. It shall be completed by "due to solar variable activity". SWE services shall include **forecast** to alert end users sufficiently in advance in case of a high risk event as well as evaluation of possible impacts of SWE on critical systems and infrastrutures. This is at the heart of the objectives of the SWE sub-component. IT (Drafting Suggestions): 1. The objective of the SWE is to monitor and assess natural changes related to space weather events, such as solar ~~winds~~ **wind** and solar flares.
2. Eligible activities under SWE shall encompass all the activities required to provide space weather services, including research and development activities supporting the evolution of the SWE, as well as its services and downstream R&D for applications and user technology for the uptake of SWE services.	AT (Drafting Suggestions): 2. Eligible activities under SWE shall encompass all the activities required to provide space weather services, including research and development activities supporting the evolution of ~~the~~ SWE, as well as its services and downstream **research and development** ~~R&D~~ for applications and user technology for the uptake of SWE services. AT (Comments): Editorial changes. FR (Drafting Suggestions): Eligible activities under SWE shall encompass all the activities required to provide space weather services, including research and development

Commission proposal	Drafting Suggestions and Comments
	activities supporting the evolution of the SWE **sub-component**, as well as its services and downstream R&D for applications and user technology for the uptake of SWE services. FR (Comments): Can the Commission clarify what model is proposed in the regulation: procurement of services? Capacity building? How does this activity relate to R&I included in Horizon Europe ? PT (Drafting Suggestions): Eligible activities under SWE shall encompass all the activities required to provide **operational** space weather services, including research and development activities supporting the evolution of the SWE, as well as its services and downstream R&D for applications and user technology for the uptake of SWE services. DE (Drafting Suggestions): 2. Eligible activities under SWE shall encompass all the activities required to provide space weather services, including **space weather mission operations**, research and development activities supporting the evolution of the SWE **sub-component**, as well as its services and downstream R&D for applications and user technology for the uptake of SWE services. DE (Comments): See comment on draft Article 63 (3).

Commission proposal	Drafting Suggestions and Comments
3. SWE services shall aim to be available at any time without interruption and shall in particular comprise:	AT (Comments): We do not understand the components of the SWE services. We would like an explanation what the aim of the services provided for each domain is.This part needs to be clearer. Will those services be free of charge? – If yes, this should be stated explicitly. Who will have access to this services and how? This also needs to be added. ES (Drafting Suggestions): 3. SWE services shall aim to be available at any time without interruption and shall in particular comprise **at least**: ES (Comments): According to Article 60(2), point (b) of Regulation (EU) 2021/696 PT (Drafting Suggestions): SWE services shall ~~aim to~~ be available at any time without interruption and shall in particular comprise: IT (Comments): Commission to clarify why b) c) and d) are not included in (a) Space domain.
(a) the Space domain;	ES (Comments): Space is already a defined 'domain'. The rest (PNT, EO, SATCOM, etc.) will be considered programmes or services.

Commission proposal	Drafting Suggestions and Comments
	FR (Drafting Suggestions): (~~a) the Space domain;~~ FR (Comments): What does this refer to? Why distinguish space from other domains that are also part of the space domain?
(b) the PNT domain;	ES (Comments): Space is already a defined 'domain'. The rest (PNT, EO, SATCOM, etc.) will be considered programmes or services.
(c) the EO domain;	ES (Comments): Space is already a defined 'domain'. The rest (PNT, EO, SATCOM, etc.) will be considered programmes or services.
(d) the Telecommunication / SATCOM domain.	ES (Comments): Space is already a defined 'domain'. The rest (PNT, EO, SATCOM, etc.) will be considered programmes or services.
	ES (Drafting Suggestions): **e)Transport** **f)electric power grids**

Commission proposal	Drafting Suggestions and Comments
	ES (Comments): According to Article 60(2), point (b) of Regulation (EU) 2021/696 FR (Drafting Suggestions): (e) **and shall encourage SME and start-up participation in downstream user applications** FR (Comments): It is important to encourage the participation of SMEs and start-ups in downstream user applications for SWE IT (Drafting Suggestions): **(e) Space transportation** IT (Comments): Adds Space Transportation
4. The Commission may adopt, by means of implementing acts, detailed provisions concerning SWE services, including requirements and technical specifications relating to those services. Those implementing acts shall be adopted in accordance with the examination procedure referred to in Article 83, paragraph 3.	AT (Comments): We prefer less implementing acts and more details in the basic act. DE (Drafting Suggestions): ~~4. The Commission may adopt, by means of implementing acts, detailed provisions concerning SWE services, including requirements and technical specifications relating to those services. Those implementing acts shall be~~

Commission proposal	Drafting Suggestions and Comments
	~~adopted in accordance with the examination procedure referred to in Article 83, paragraph 3.~~ DE (Comments): The process by which requirements and technical specifications for space weather services are set should not be carried out via implementing acts. They need to be based on user requirements and on the basis of the pre-operational space weather services developed at ESA.

PUBLIC

Commission proposal	Drafting Suggestions and Comments
Article 65	FR (Comments): Can the Commission clarify the budget nomenclature envisaged for this article? SE (Comments): SE notes that the balance between the need for autonomy and the ability of services to compete on the international market is not addressed. At present, there are limited opportunities for Europe to offer competitive alternatives to those provided by third countries. SE would therefore welcome further clarification on how this is intended to be achieved. IT (Comments): In the work programmes, the list of expected implementing/delegated acts under Article 65 (subject matter and scope), must be clarified, notably on: (i) the Union demand-aggregation platform; (ii) support to ground test/launch/return infrastructure; (iii) governance of the Steering Board and its relationship with existing ESA fora. This answers delegations' requests for visibility and avoids duplication. A clear separation of roles (Commission/EUSPA/ESA) in line with Articles 75–77 should be kept in place: the Steering Board should coordinate but not replace operational fora already active.

PUBLIC

Access to space	BE (Comments): European Union and ESA are engaging together in the European Launcher Challenge. A minimum reference to ESA in this article would make sense. PT (Drafting Suggestions): ~~Access to space~~ **Space Transportation** PT (Comments): We believe that the term "Access to space" is restrictive and not accurate. Space transportation is broader and includes not only launch (access to space), but also transporation in space, return from space to Earth and the necessary ground infrastructure to support these activities. EE (Comments): Estonia supports the principles of Article 65, which emphasize the EU's role as a smart customer in procuring launcher services and aggregating Union needs. However, we see that The EU should primarily act as a market-driven procurer, favoring private sector innovation and competition. To ensure that the ECF contributes to a resilient and dynamic launcher market, we recommend clarifying that ECF support should be designed to encourage and enhance competition. The ECF contribution should be complementary, aimed at addressing market gaps and enabling the emergence of multiple capable providers. IT (Drafting Suggestions): ~~Access to space~~ **Space transportation** IT (Comments):

PUBLIC

Commission proposal	Drafting Suggestions and Comments
	See comment below
1. Access to space is the ability to launch and transport spacecraft to, in and from space.	ES (Drafting Suggestions): 1. Access to space is the **cap**ability to launch and transport spacecraft to, **with**in and from space. ES (Comments): The use of "capability" is generally considered more formal and technical within the aerospace sector, while "within" offers greater precision in indicating internal space transportation. IE (Comments): IE Query - How will synergies between these proposed activities and ESA's launchers programme (ARIAN 6, VEGA, ELC,…) be realised? How will duplication be avoided across the proposal? PT (Drafting Suggestions): 1. **Space Transportation** ~~Access to space~~ is the ability to launch**,** ~~and~~ transport **and return** spacecraft to, in and from space. SE (Drafting Suggestions): 1. Access to space is the ability to launch and transport spacecraft to, in and from space. **Access to space may also include supporting in-orbit infrastructure such as hubs for replenishment of fuel, consumables and/or replacable cmponents of space systems.**

PUBLIC

Commission proposal	Drafting Suggestions and Comments
	SE (Comments): Access to space will also include the possibility to extend the duration in orbit or to top up reserves for propulsion systems or human needs for long duration space missions. IT (Drafting Suggestions): 1. ~~Access to space~~ **Space transportation** is the ability to launch and transport spacecraft to, in and from space. IT (Comments): The ability to launch and transport spacecraft to, in and from space is commonly refferred to as "space transportation".
2. The Union shall foster an autonomous and resilient access to space, by supporting European reliable and cost-efficient launch services together with a cohesive European approach, taking into account the essential security interests of the Union and its Member-States.	BE (Drafting Suggestions): 2. The Union shall, **without prejudice to ESA's activities in the area**, foster an utonomous and resilient access to space, by supporting European reliable and cost-efficient launch services together with a cohesive European approach, taking into account the essential security interests of the Union and its Member-States. BE (Comments): Today, without ESA, there is no autonomous access to space. Belgium thinks it would make sense to acknowledge ESA role. ES

Commission proposal	Drafting Suggestions and Comments
	(Drafting Suggestions): The ~~Union shall foster~~ **objective of this component is to** foster an autonomous and ~~resilient~~ **sustainable** access to space, by supporting European reliable and cost-efficient launch services together with a cohesive European approach, taking into account the essential security ~~interests~~ **priorities alongside prospective economic benefits** of the Union and its Member-States ES (Comments): In the context of access to space, the term 'sustainable' inherently encompasses the concept of 'resilient,' given that sustainability addresses the long-term economic viability and adaptability of activities, thereby covering resilience in a broader and more comprehensive manner. The 'economic' dimension of sustainable access to space ought to be acknowledged, extending beyond mere security considerations. PT (Drafting Suggestions): The Union shall foster an autonomous and resilient **space transportation capacity** ~~access to space~~, by supporting European reliable and cost-efficient launch services together with a cohesive European approach, taking into account the essential security interests of the Union and its Member-States. RO (Drafting Suggestions): The Union shall foster an autonomous, ~~and~~ resilient **and sustainable** access to space, by supporting European reliable and cost-efficient launch services together with a cohesive European approach, taking into account the essential security interests of the Union and its Member-States. RO

Commission proposal	Drafting Suggestions and Comments
	(Comments): The Union shall also promote sustainable space activities by implementing measures to prevent space debris, including collision avoidance and responsible disposal of satellites at the end of their mission. IT (Drafting Suggestions): 2. The Union shall foster an autonomous and resilient access to space, by supporting European reliable, **resilient** and cost-efficient launch services together with a cohesive **and cooperative** European approach, taking into account the essential security interests of the Union and its Member-States IT (Comments): This edit makes explicit two policy intents behind access-to-space support. "Resilient" means launch services able to deliver against specific mission/user requirements (e.g., cadence, payload classes, trajectories, security constraints) even under stress or disruption. "Cooperative" signals that the European value chain is to be valorised as a whole industrial base, coordinated, interoperable and scalable in the interest of Member States, without altering eligibility rules or the legal effect of the provision
3. In synergies with other Union programmes and funding schemes, the eligible activities shall cover in particular:	ES (Drafting Suggestions): 3. ~~In synergies with other Union programmes and funding schemes,~~ the eligible activities shall cover in particular: ES (Comments): (CDTI) FR

Commission proposal	Drafting Suggestions and Comments
	(Comments): Can the Commision detail the other Union programme and funding schemes ? NL (Drafting Suggestions): In synergies with other Union programmes and funding schemes, **complementary to ESA and without prejudice to ESA's long-standing mandate and activities in this domain**, the eligible activities shall cover in particular: NL (Comments): • Article 65(3) It is essential that EU access to space activities remain fully complementary to ESA, and without prejudice to ESA's long-standing mandate and activities in this domain. We request that this explicit reference be added.
(a) procurement and aggregation of launch services for the needs of the Union and, at their request, aggregation and joint procurement of launch services for the needs of Member States, international organisations, and other public entities;	AT (Comments): Will this part also cover IOD/IOV? ES (Drafting Suggestions): (a) procurement and aggregation of launch services for the needs of the Union; and, (b) **in synergies with other Union programmes and funding schemes,** at their request, aggregation and joint procurement of launch services at the

Commission proposal	Drafting Suggestions and Comments
	request ~~for the needs of~~ Member States, international organisations **as for example ESA or NATO**, and other **European** public entities; ES (Comments): Only other schemes should be used when activities are done in cooperation with others. FR (Comments): Can the Commission explain who the "and other public entities" referred to would be if these public entities are not entities of EU Member States? DE (Drafting Suggestions): (a) **demand-oriented** procurement and aggregation of **competitive** launch services for the needs of the Union and, at their request, aggregation and joint procurement of launch services for the needs of Member States, international organisations, and other public entities; DE (Comments): Explanation: the COM should only buy launch services with existing demands. We cannot support empty purchases to maintain industrial chains. Additionally, the tendering should be competitive to allow for potential new, commercial players to participate. EE (Comments): Estonia supports this provision. As stated above, the focus should be on procuring and aggregating launch services according to the needs of the Union and its Member States. This market-driven approach supports innovation and competition, and ensures efficient use of resources.

Commission proposal	Drafting Suggestions and Comments
	IT (Drafting Suggestions): (a) procurement and aggregation of launch services for the needs of the Union and, at their request, aggregation and joint procurement of launch services for the needs of Member States, international organisations, and other public entities, **including through a Union demand-aggregation platform**; IT (Comments): Reflects the Commission's stated intention to aggregate demand via a dedicated platform and gives programmes a clear implementation hook, with no scope expansion.
(b) access to space innovation, including the upgrade and development of new technologies and systems and services.	ES (Drafting Suggestions): (b) access to space innovation, including the upgrade and development of new technologies and systems and services. **This shall notably embrace technologically disruptive innovation with high potential risk, which is particularly welcomed in a discipline as challenging and rapidly evolving as access to space** ES (Comments): The term 'space innovation' shall be interpreted in its full rigor, encompassing significant technological advancements, engineering expertise, and the deliberate pursuit of disruptive breakthroughs essential for maintaining and advancing Europe's position in access to space. This is R&I component. Moved to article 67.

Commission proposal	Drafting Suggestions and Comments
	LT (Comments): In our view, there is more room to emphasize the potential of startups, innovative SMEs PT (Drafting Suggestions): (b) **space transportation** ~~access to space~~ innovation, including the upgrade and development of new technologies and systems and services. RO (Comments): Given the importance of space infrastructures, we suggest to include some provisions regarding protection against cyberattacks that could affect launch, control, and space communication systems. SI (Drafting Suggestions): (b) access to space **research and** innovation, including the upgrade and development of new technologies and systems and services. SI (Comments): Access to space may also be subject to research activities. DE (Drafting Suggestions): (b) access to space innovation, including the upgrade and development of new technologies and ~~systems and~~ services. DE

Commission proposal	Drafting Suggestions and Comments
	(Comments): Explanation: Development of system competences is the mandate of ESA. Given this fairly broad statement, DE considers a limitation of access to space innovation to the adaptation of existing launchers, where necessary for the launch of space systems, for the implementation of activities under this section (space window). EE (Comments): Estonia supports innovation and technology development, but emphasizes that such activities should be coordinated together with ESA and not lead to duplication. IT (Comments): For predictability, the Comission shall clarify the intended targets/tools under "access to space innovation" (e.g., demonstrators, reusability, in-space transportation/return), to avoid over-breadth while staying technology-neutral
(c) development, adaptation, construction, maintenance and operation of critical Union based ground infrastructure, including but not limited to the facilities necessary to test, launch and recover access to space technologies and services capabilities.	ES (Drafting Suggestions): (c) development, adaptation, construction, maintenance and operation of ~~critical~~ Union based ground infrastructure **for access to space**, including but not limited to the facilities necessary to test, **integrate,** launch and recover access to space technologies and services capabilities. ES (Comments): There is no precise definition of the scope associated with the term 'critical'

Commission proposal	Drafting Suggestions and Comments
	Funding for integration activities is essential alongside testing and launch phases within the space access value chain, as integration serves as the critical link ensuring that individual components and systems function cohesively, thereby enabling reliable, efficient, and successful missions. FR (Drafting Suggestions): (c) development, adaptation, construction, maintenance and operation of critical Union based ground infrastructure **dedicated to launch activities**, including but not limited to the facilities necessary to test, launch and recover access to space technologies and services capabilities. FR (Comments): We prefer to specify which ground infrastructure we are referring to, otherwise reading the paragraph alone could lead to the idea that eligible activities could potentially cover all EU ground infrastructure, outside the field of launchers.. PT (Drafting Suggestions): (c) development, adaptation, construction, maintenance and operation of critical Union based ground infrastructure, including but not limited to the facilities necessary to test, launch and recover **space transportation** ~~access to space~~ technologies and services capabilities. DE (Drafting Suggestions): (c) **market-driven support for the** development, adaptation **and** construction **by competitive commercial operators** ~~maintenance and operation~~ of critical Union based ground infrastructure, including but not limited to the facilities necessary to test, launch and recover access to space technologies and services capabilities.

Commission proposal	Drafting Suggestions and Comments
	DE (Comments): The launch vehicles not only serve the institutional market, but are also active in the commercial market. For this reason, the ground infrastructure should be operated by a private operator on a commercial basis. The EU Commission should contribute to the operating costs on the basis of payments for launch services, but should not directly cover the operating costs themselves. EE (Comments): Estonia notes the importance of ensuring that any EU investment in ground infrastructure - such as launch facilities or test sites - is based on clear market demand and complements existing capabilities managed by ESA or Member States. While we see value in strengthening Union-based infrastructure, we recommend that such investments be carefully assessed to avoid market distortion. Where EU funding is provided, the resulting infrastructure should be made accessible to Union industry on market-based conditions to promote competition, innovation, and efficient use of resources. IT (Drafting Suggestions): (c) development, adaptation, construction, maintenance and operation of critical Union based ground infrastructure, including but not limited to the facilities necessary to **manufacture, assembly, integrate**, test, launch and recover access to space technologies and services capabilities IT (Comments): Ensures end-to-end reliability and availability by explicitly covering the whole ground value chain. Manufacturing, assembly and integration facilities

Commission proposal	Drafting Suggestions and Comments
	can be as critical as test, launch and recovery for service cadence and mission readiness. The edit clarifies eligibility and planning focus without expanding scope
4. The Commission shall establish a Steering Board among European public entities, including Member-States, the Agency established in accordance with Regulation (EU) [XXX] [*future EUSPA founding Regulation*] other relevant international organisations and public entities to coordinate European activities in access to space.	AT (Drafting Suggestions): 4. The Commission shall establish a Steering Board among European public entities, including Member-States, the Agency established in accordance with Regulation (EU) [XXX] [future EUSPA founding Regulation]**, the European Space Agency,** other relevant international organisations and public entities to coordinate European activities in access to space. AT (Comments): It is essential that ESA is part of this Steering Board and should also be named specifically. Activities must be coordinated with ESA! Who shall be the members of this Committee exactly – will all Member States have a seat? ES (Drafting Suggestions): 4. The Commission shall establish a Steering Board among European public entities, including Member-States, the Agency established in accordance with Regulation (EU) [XXX] [*future EUSPA founding Regulation*] other relevant international organisations and public entities to coordinate European activities in access to space. **Furthermore, the Commission shall establish a Technical Board composed of fully independent experts of the highest calibre to provide consultative and**

PUBLIC

Commission proposal	Drafting Suggestions and Comments
	near-binding guidance on Europe's strategic direction in access to space, ensuring long-term coherence beyond political or national interests. ES (Comments): Funding for integration activities is essential alongside testing and launch phases within the space access value chain, as integration serves as the critical link ensuring that individual components and systems function cohesively, thereby enabling reliable, efficient, and successful missions FR (Drafting Suggestions): 4. The Commission shall establish a ~~Steering~~ **Consultative** Board among European public entities, including Member-States, the Agency established in accordance with Regulation (EU) [XXX] [future EUSPA founding Regulation] other relevant international organisations and **other European** public entities to coordinate European activities in access to space. FR (Comments): The delegation may question the Commission about the title, composition, and specific mandate of the 'Steering Board', which should be understood as a discussion forum rather than a decision-making body. Furthermore, which "public entities" are referred to at the end of the paragraph ? These entities, whatever they may be, should be European. We propose clarifying this point first, as it seems surprising to envisage non-EU entities participating in the coordination of activities relating to the EU access to space. LT (Comments):

Commission proposal	Drafting Suggestions and Comments
	Such new Steering Beard should complement, but not duplicate the role of already existing governance mechanisms. NL (Comments): • Article 65(4) What concrete role and decision-making powers will Member States have in the new Steering Board? Will their role be limited to an advisory capacity, or will they hold a formal mandate in setting priorities? In addition, could the Commission clarify how the governance role relates to what is foreseen in the future EUSPA founding regulation? PT (Drafting Suggestions): 4. The Commission shall establish a Steering Board among European public entities, including Member-States, the Agency established in accordance with Regulation (EU) [XXX] [*future EUSPA founding Regulation*] other relevant international organisations and public entities to coordinate European activities in **space transportation** ~~access to space~~. DE (Comments): Without the future EUSPA founding Regulation, DE cannot take a position on that draft paragraph. Pending its publication, we would like to ask for the rationale for the EU Commission to act as the coordinatitor for all public activities in Europe for access to space, while they are primarily driven through ESA.

Commission proposal	Drafting Suggestions and Comments
	IT (Drafting Suggestions): 4. The Commission shall establish a Steering Board among European public entities, including Member-States, ~~the Agency established in accordance with Regulation (EU) [XXX] [*future EUSPA founding Regulation*] other relevant international organisations and public entities~~ to coordinate European activities in access to space. IT (Comments): The dialogue between the commission and the Member States of utmost importance for steering the activities and this dialogue needs to set out the role of the other relevant organizationa and public entities.
5. In order to protect the security interests of the Union, the space assets of the governmental infrastructure shall be launched by service providers, that comply with the eligibility and participation conditions set out in Article 69 and, only in justified exceptional circumstances or on a basis of an international agreement providing for such activity, from the territory of a third country.	AT (Comments): What is meant by "governmental infrastructure"? This term should be defined in the ECF Regulation. ES (Drafting Suggestions): 5. In order to protect the security interests of the Union, the space assets of the **European** governmental infrastructure shall be launched by service providers, that comply with the eligibility and participation conditions set out in Article 69 and, only in justified exceptional circumstances or on a basis of an international agreement providing for such activity, from the territory of a third country, **that guarantees equivalent security and strategic safeguards compatible with Union interests. Such exceptions shall be limited in time and scope to prevent erosion of the Union's strategic**

Commission proposal	Drafting Suggestions and Comments
	autonomy, security, and the competitive benefits of its access to space ecosystem. ES (Comments): Explicitly indicate European This approach guarantees that Europe's strategic orientation is coherent, resilient, and competitive, preventing decisions from being left to political arbitrariness or influenced disproportionately by national sovereignties, thereby enabling Europe to assert itself as a significant actor in the future global space landscape FR (Drafting Suggestions): 5. In order to protect the security interests of the Union, the space assets of the governmental infrastructure shall be launched by service providers, that comply with the eligibility and participation conditions set out in Article 69 and, only in justified exceptionalcircumstances, ~~or on a basis of an international agreement providing for such activity,~~ from the territory of a third country FR (Comments): We ask to retain the initial wording as validated in the Regulation 2023/588 and to preserve what had previously and recently been validated, as this regulation came into force in March 2023. The addition "or on a basis of an international agreement" contradicts the application of European preference and consequently the EU's objective of strategic autonomy, despite the many references to this objective in the regulation.

Commission proposal	Drafting Suggestions and Comments
	Yet this article covers the launch of EU space programmes assets. The control of these launches is therefore essential in order to guarantee the monitoring and implementation of adequate security measures to protect the satellites. Indeed, until it is embarked on the launcher, a satellite is particularly vulnerable and subject to risks of sabotage or intrusion. Launching from a third country therefore remains a complex operation which, as we have already experienced with the Galileo launch from the US, requires complex and potentially long-term discussions in order to guarantee the security interests of the EU and its Member States. In this sense, launching from the territory of a third country must remain an exception and the need must be justified. Security and integrity of EU space assets are at stake NL (Comments): • Article 65(5) What objective and transparent criteria will be applied to determine when "justified exceptional circumstances" allow deviation from the European preference rule? How will these criteria be monitored and enforced in practice? DE (Drafting Suggestions): 5. In order to protect the security interests of the Union, the space assets of the ~~governmental~~ **EU** infrastructure shall be launched by service providers, that comply with the eligibility and participation conditions set out in Article 69. ~~and, only in justified exceptional circumstances or on a basis of an international agreement providing for such activity, from the territory of a third country~~. DE

Commission proposal	Drafting Suggestions and Comments
	(Comments): The exceptions are already regulated in draft Art. 69; waivers are possible under draft Art. 69 (5), in particular if "legal entity is established in a country which is a member of the EEA or EFTA" (draft Art. 69, 5. (b)). This should by no means be narrowed down here in draft Art 65. There is no justification for this artificial restriction. IT (Drafting Suggestions): 5. In order to protect the security interests of the Union, the space assets of the governmental infrastructure shall be launched by service providers, **with a proven track of record in launch service deployment ensuring the necessary reliability of the services and compliant with the state-of-the-art technical and safety standards**, that comply with the eligibility and participation conditions set out in Article 69 and, only in justified exceptional circumstances or on a basis of an international agreement providing for such activity, from the territory of a third country IT (Comments): Strengthening that adds proven reliability and state-of-the-art standards/flightworthiness as objective criteria for the sake of the security interest of the Union, while keeping Article 69 eligibility and the rule that third-country launches remain exceptional.
	MT (Drafting Suggestions): **6. The Commission shall, by means of an implementing act, establish a Union Rideshare Facility to ensure affordable, practical, and non-discriminatory launch opportunities for Union-authorised payloads, particularly those originating from Member States without sovereign launch capabilities.**

Commission proposal	Drafting Suggestions and Comments
	MT (Comments): We believe that this Article must mandate the establishment of a future EU Rideshare Facility, with an implementing act to define its operating procedures and guarantee prioritised access for Union-authorised payloads from Member States lacking sovereign launch capability. For a Maltese operator, gaining a Union authorisation is a hollow victory if there is no affordable, practical path to orbit. An EU Rideshare Facility would transform authorisation from a theoretical exercise into a tangible opportunity, directly enabling Malta's participation in space upstream activities. Thus, we are suggesting that a new sub-paragraph is added as per our drafting suggestion.
Article 66	

PUBLIC

Commission proposal	Drafting Suggestions and Comments
Space commercialisation and space economy	FR (Comments): **How does this article relate to other FEC initiatives and other Union programmes?** EE (Comments): Estonia supports EU efforts to boost space entrepreneurship, especially for start-ups and workforce development. However, EU funding for direct infrastructure or manufacturing investments should be carefully considered as these should preferrably be market-driven. The EU should focus on anchor customer models, strengthening local ecosystems, and ensuring open market access for all companies.
1. CASSINI shall constitute the Union's space entrepreneurship initiative. CASSINI shall undertake actions to support the commercialisation of the Union space industry and services, in particular focusing on entrepreneurship, and to leverage private investment, supporting entrepreneurs to grow and scale in the Single Market	FR (Comments): Can the Commission link this paragraph to Horizon Europe (EIC) and/or the Startup Scale Up initiave of the ECF ? IE (Comments): IE Query - How will synergies between CASSINI and ESA's commercialisation activities be realised? How will duplication be avoided across actions a – f PT (Drafting Suggestions):

PUBLIC

Commission proposal	Drafting Suggestions and Comments
	1. CASSINI shall constitute the Union's space entrepreneurship initiative. CASSINI shall undertake actions to support the commercialisation of the Union space industry and services, in particular focusing on entrepreneurship, and to leverage private investment, supporting entrepreneurs to grow and scale in the Single Market**, enter and grow in international markets and attract Foreign Direct Investment to the EU.** PT (Comments): As the text stands, CASSINI is focused solely in the Single Market. Being space a global sector, CASSINI should also promote exports (sales/growth in internaitonal markets) as well as the attraction of key foreign direct investments. The Single Market should be used as a leverage to be competitive worldwide. RO (Drafting Suggestions): CASSINI shall constitute the Union's space entrepreneurship initiative. CASSINI shall undertake actions to support the commercialisation of the Union space industry and services, in particular focusing on entrepreneurship, and to leverage private investment, supporting entrepreneurs to grow and scale in the Single Market **and beyond.** RO (Comments): The commercialization focus not only ensures that innovative space technologies and services successfully transition from development to initial market deployment (such as the launch of the first production line) but also supports scaling up their commercialization. This means helping businesses grow beyond early market entry, expanding their customer base, increasing production capacity, and strengthening their presence across the Single Market and beyond.

Commission proposal	Drafting Suggestions and Comments
	IT (Drafting Suggestions): 1. […] CASSINI shall undertake actions to support the commercialisation of the Union space industry **products** and services, […] IT (Comments): Adds "products and" to make explicit that CASSINI targets both hardware outputs and service offerings, aligning with the programme's market-uptake focus and with pre-filled suggestions
2. This component shall include the following eligible activities:	LU (Comments): We would simply like to highlight the importance of the references made in point (a) to early-stage growth, private investment during the growth phase, and the facilitation of exit opportunities for founders and investors, as well as the reference in point (b) to the creation of a Union industrial upscaling mechanism. SE (Comments): SE questions if it is appropriate for Member States to be bound to an initiative that otherwise lacks common governance or a formal legal basis.
(a) creation of Union Investment facilities for seed, early growth, and growth-stage private investment, and facilitating exits for founders and investors;	FR (Comments): Can the Commission link this item to Horizon Europe (EIC) and/or the Startup Scale Up initiave of the ECF ? SI

Commission proposal	Drafting Suggestions and Comments
	(Drafting Suggestions): creation of Union Investment facilities for seed, early growth, and growth-stage private investment, and facilitating exits for founders and investors SI (Comments): If there is support planned for SMEs and start-ups that should be reflected in the text
(b) creation of an Union industrial upscaling facility to enable investment into new manufacturing facilities and reinforce Union-based supply chains;	FR (Comments): Can the Commission link this item to Horizon Europe (EIC) and/or the Startup Scale Up initiave of the ECF ? RO (Drafting Suggestions): creation of an Union industrial upscaling facility to enable investment into new **and existing** manufacturing facilities and reinforce Union-based supply chains SE (Drafting Suggestions): creation of an Union industrial upscaling facility to enable **private** investment into new manufacturing facilities and reinforce Union-based supply chains; OR creation of an Union industrial upscaling facility to enable investment into new manufacturing facilities and reinforce Union-based supply chains**, while avoiding crowding out of private capital**; SE

Commission proposal	Drafting Suggestions and Comments
	(Comments): If this sub-article refers to private investment, that should be specified. If not, it should be clarified that the investment in this facility ought not to crowd out private investments. DE (Drafting Suggestions): (b) creation of an Union industrial upscaling facility to enable **improved financing terms for** investment into new manufacturing facilities and reinforce Union-based supply chains; DE (Comments): A new upscaling facility should provide clear benefits to improve conditions for investment into new manufacturing facilities and reinforce Union-based supply chains and specify mechanisms to achieve these goals; investment in these areas is already possible, even in the absence of Union support for industrial upscaling. IT (Drafting Suggestions): (b) creation **and expansion** of ~~an~~ Union industrial upscaling facili**ties** to enable investment into new manufacturing facilities **and other scaling assets** and **to** reinforce Union-based supply chains; IT (Comments): Broadens the facility's investment perimeter beyond "new manufacturing" to include expansion/modernisation and other scale-up assets, and to consider existing capacities—as flagged in the pre-filled tables

PUBLIC

Commission proposal	Drafting Suggestions and Comments
(c) support to the development of the Union of skills targeted to the space sector, including skills intelligence, space curricula development, upskilling, reskilling, mobility and exchange programmes;	FR (Comments): Can the Commission link this item to the other initiatives related of the ECF and to Erasmus+ ? LT (Drafting Suggestions): support to the development of the Union of skills targeted to the space sector, including skills intelligence, space curricula development, upskilling, reskilling, mobility and exchange programmes; **furthermore, this should include the support of innovative mechanisms and pilot measures designed to foster upskilling and reskilling in space section, facilitation of talent attraction to alleviate skills shortages, the development of curricula as well as the adjustment of skills to the evolving requirements of the labour market.** LT (Comments): Taking into account Article 21 of the Preamble, we propose to add that the ECF should also include support for innovative mechanisms and pilot measures for upskilling and reskilling, development of curricula, attraction of foreign talent and matching of skills with the labour market. RO (Comments): Also some initiatives to promote diversity, equity, and inclusion within the space sector workforce should be included
(d) strengthening the local space ecosystems bringing together different actors to promote space innovation, provide support, facilities and services to citizens and companies to foster entrepreneurship, notably through technology	AT (Drafting Suggestions):

Commission proposal	Drafting Suggestions and Comments
transfer, business incubation business acceleration services, matchmaking and investor networking and by enabling improved market access and international business networks;	(d) strengthening the local space ecosystems bringing together different actors to promote space innovation **notably through hackathons, challenges and mentoring~~,~~;** provide support, facilities and services to citizens and companies to foster entrepreneurship, notably through technology transfer, business incubation business acceleration services, matchmaking and investor networking and by enabling improved market access and international business networks; AT (Comments): Hackathons, mentoring and challenges should be mentioned as instruments. FR (Comments): Can the Commission link this item to Horizon Europe (EIC) and/or the Startup Scale Up initiave of the ECF and other horizontal disposition ? RO (Comments): Support for environmentally sustainable manufacturing and operational practices in the space industry could be added. EE (Drafting Suggestions): (d) strengthening **and creating synergies with the existing** local space ecosystems by bringing together different actors to promote space innovation, provide support, facilities and services to citizens and companies to foster entrepreneurship, notably through technology transfer, business incubation business acceleration services, matchmaking and investor networking and by enabling improved market access and international business networks; EE

Commission proposal	Drafting Suggestions and Comments
	(Comments): Estonia supports the objective of strengthening local space ecosystems and fostering innovation and entrepreneurship. However, we recommend that the article be adjusted to clarify that EU support under the ECF should focus on creating synergies with and enhancing existing networks, facilities, and support mechanisms, rather than establishing entirely new parallel structures. Leveraging and connecting current initiatives will help avoid fragmentation, ensure efficient use of resources, and maximize the impact of EU investments. The creation of new networks or facilities should be considered only where clear gaps or market failures are identified. IT (Drafting Suggestions): (d) […] business incubation **and** business acceleration services, […] IT (Comments): Editorial fix.
(e) schemes to accelerate commercial growth through the use of anchor customer contracts and schemes to onboard customers on both private and public sector markets, involving space components and infrastructures as well as products using space data and services.	NL (Drafting Suggestions): schemes to accelerate commercial growth through the use of anchor customer contracts and schemes to onboard customers on both private and public sector markets, involving space components and infrastructures as well as products using space data and services. **These must ensure that anchor tenancy and joint procurement instruments remain transparent, avoid market distortion, and provide real access for SMEs and start-ups.** NL (Comments):

Commission proposal	Drafting Suggestions and Comments
	• Article 66(e) How will the Commission ensure that anchor tenancy and joint procurement instruments remain transparent, avoid market distortion, and provide real access for SMEs and start-ups? DE (Drafting Suggestions): (e) schemes to accelerate commercial growth through the use of anchor customer contracts and schemes to onboard customers on both private and public sector markets, involving space components and infrastructures as well as products using space data and services **with the principle of parallel or multi-sourcing approaches to enhance competition and resilience.** DE (Comments): Creates duplicate structures to ESA funding mechanisms. It would also be necessary to take a very critical look at how this mechanism is to be implemented and who makes funding decisions. Experience with the ESA Marketplace has shown that such a tool can certainly be used to intervene in commercial markets and that a strong dynamic can result from the funding granted. It is very important to note here that individual players in a market are not selected, but that several players are always supported in parallel. EE (Comments): Estonia supports these tools for commercial growth, but stresses the need for open, fair, and cross-border access, especially for SMEs and companies from all Member States. IT

PUBLIC

Commission proposal	Drafting Suggestions and Comments
	(Drafting Suggestions): (e) schemes to accelerate **market readiness and** commercial growth through the use of anchor customer contracts and schemes to onboard customers on both private and public sector markets, […] IT (Comments): Adds "market readiness" to cover late-stage TRL/maturity and emphasises anchor-customer instruments to speed early revenues, reflecting focus on market uptake.
(f) any additional action necessary to support the Union's space economy and the establishment of a Single Market for space.	FI (Comments): 1f must be removed as it refers to proposed EU Space Act which is not mature enough. FR (Comments): Can the Commission provide more detail on the "additional action" mentionned ? (see (i) proposed here) PT (Drafting Suggestions): f) any additional action necessary to support the Union's space economy [and the establishment of a Single Market for space] PT (Comments): As the discussions on the existance of a Single Market in the area of space are still undergoing, the reference to it shoul be in [ ] RO

Commission proposal	Drafting Suggestions and Comments
	(Comments): Implementation of cybersecurity frameworks and data protection standards for space services could also be included
	AT (Drafting Suggestions): **3. The Commission, in its field of competence, shall seek to coordinate the actions of the Union on European level, in particular with the activities of the European Space Agency.** AT (Comments): In the eye of efficiency, it is important to avoid duplications e.g. through the ESA Business Incubation Centres. FR (Drafting Suggestions): **(g) boosting Union industrial competitiveness in global commercial markets, including through demonstrator missions advancing the degree of digitalisation of end-to-end space systems.** **(i) supporting standardisation and certification activities relevant for the Union space sector;** FR (Comments): Proposal to include this aspect in Art. 66 instead of Art. 67 devoted to R&I for the sake of commercialisation of competitive solutions

Commission proposal	Drafting Suggestions and Comments
Article 67	NL (Comments): • The proposal rightly stresses technological sovereignty and access to raw materials, but how will the Commission ensure "double sourcing" and diversification, so that the EU does not become dependent on a single provider or bottleneck in critical technologies? • Dual-use investments are important but must not come at the expense of civil innovation and commercial markets. The Netherlands insists on safeguards to preserve space for purely civil projects and open innovation ecosystems. • Access for SMEs and start-ups must be a guiding principle of Article 67 implementation.

PUBLIC

Technological sovereignty, research and innovation	AT (Drafting Suggestions): Technological sovereignty, research and innovation **and user uptake** AT (Comments): There is a strong focus on user uptake in this Article, which should be highlighted in the headline. FR (Drafting Suggestions): Technological sovereignty, research and innovation **of space activities** FR (Comments): How does this component of the FEC and Horizon Europe interact ? This should not be the chapter meant to be in Horizon Europe (which should mention also space sciences not present here) ? To separate it into two articles (one focused on technological sovereignty and one focused on space sciences) could be considered. IE (Comments): IE It is critical that the Commission and ESA work very closely together on technology harmonisation/ road mapping in order to avoid duplication and inefficient use of public funding. This is becoming an increasing cause of concern to MS. EE (Comments): Estonia supports strengthening EU technological sovereignty and reducing dependence on third countries, including for critical technologies and raw materials. The ECF should focus on developing and deploying strategic and

PUBLIC

Commission proposal	Drafting Suggestions and Comments
	dual-use technologies, with clear emphasis on cybersecurity and AI. Activities should avoid duplicating existing EU and ESA programmes and promote close cooperation with ESA. Funding should ensure geographic balance and flexibility, supporting also smaller Member States, SMEs, and individual projects outside large consortia. IT (Comments): Commission to provide visibility on secondary law and delivery by listing in work programmes: (i) the criteria/method for selecting critical technologies (drawing on the EU Observatory of Critical Technologies (OCT) roadmaps), (ii) the intended links with standardisation and the supply chain, and (iii) how downstream uptake is addressed (KPIs, calls, testbeds).
1. The technological sovereignty and innovation component shall enable the Union to build a competitive, autonomous, and innovative space industrial ecosystem, aiming to enhance the Union's technological sovereignty, non-dependence, and self-sufficiency in the space sector. It shall foster the development and uptake of cutting-edge space solutions. It shall prioritize the reduction of critical dependencies on non-Union technologies and focus on dual-use technologies that can benefit both civil and defence applications.	ES (Drafting Suggestions): 1. The technological sovereignty and innovation component shall enable the Union to build a competitive, autonomous, and innovative space ~~industrial~~ ecosystem, aiming to enhance the Union's technological sovereignty, non-dependence, and self-sufficiency in the space sector. It shall foster the development and uptake of cutting-edge space solutions. It shall prioritize the reduction of critical dependencies on non-Union technologies and focus on dual-use technologies that can benefit both civil and defence applications **and actively fostering the identification, qualification, and integration of Commercial Off-The-Shelf (COTS) components and systems to enhance the competitiveness, resilience, and cost-efficiency of space systems.** **2. In accordance with Article 15 paragraph 2, support provided through the activities referred to this component, will be provided through collaborative research and innovation activities set out in the Framework Programme for Research and Innovation, Horizon Europe;**

Commission proposal	Drafting Suggestions and Comments
	ES (Comments): (remove industrial) Inlcuding all entities such as Technological Centers, Universities, Research Institutes, Agencies, etc. (CDTI) (AEE) The inclusion of Commercial Off-The-Shelf (COTS) components and systems is essential to boost the competitiveness and resilience of European space systems. This can only be achieved through a coordinated, federated approach led by the EU, fostering collaboration across Member States and industry. Such an approach mirrors the open, synchronized coordination between NASA and the U.S. Department of Defense, which has proven effective in accelerating innovation while managing risks. Emulating this model is key to ensuring Europe's strategic autonomy and leadership in space The work programmes under this Regulation shall integrate in a specific dedicated part collaborative research and innovation activities and their dedicated budget. FR (Drafting Suggestions): 1. The technological sovereignty and innovation component shall enable the Union to build a competitive, autonomous, and innovative space industrial ecosystem, aiming to enhance the Union’s technological sovereignty, non-dependence, and self-sufficiency in the space sector. It shall foster the development and uptake of cutting-edge space solutions. It shall prioritize the reduction of critical dependencies on non-Union technologies and focus on dual-use technologies that can benefit both civil and defence applications. **Relevant activities shall be implemented by the Space Partnership, established under Regulation 2021/695.** FR

Commission proposal	Drafting Suggestions and Comments
	(Comments): At first view, this article seems to create many duplications with existing initiatives and does not seem to provide for an adequate governance structure, given the defence implications and the link with other similar programmes. What is the added value of this paragraph compared to the objectives in article 3 ? Shouldn't this paragraph not apply to the entire section ? If this article is deemed to create a separate component of the Space Programme, what would be the interplay with i) the other components of the Space Programme and ii) other reseach and innovation programmes, including in the defence sector ? How would the Commission ensure an adequate governance model for these initiatives and that it does not entail duplications with other programmes ? Consequently, we suggest to build upon the Space Partnership established under Horizon Europe since 2024 to ensure smooth transition and consultation of the research and industrial communities under the oversight of Member States and Commission. IE (Comments): IE: Technological sovereignty and European competitiveness in outer space is necessary, but need to be done so while safeguarding the peaceful uses of outer space, as required by the 1967 UN Resolution on the Exploration and Use of Outer Space. Any developments of dual-use technologies in outer space need safeguards to ensure that it does not ultimately lead to the militarization in outer space. We need to consider mitigation measures to ensure that any potential interference with defence technologies do not impact civil applications.

Commission proposal	Drafting Suggestions and Comments
	Equally, it may not be appropriate to only focus on dual-use technologies, as not all space items are dual-use and we may be limiting our ability to further invest in civilian technologies PT (Drafting Suggestions): 1. The technological sovereignty and innovation component shall enable the Union to build a competitive, autonomous, and innovative space industrial ecosystem, aiming to enhance the Union's technological sovereignty, non-dependence, and self-sufficiency in the space sector. It shall foster the development and uptake of cutting-edge space solutions. It shall prioritize the reduction of critical dependencies on non-Union technologies and **foster** ~~focus on~~ dual-use technologies that can benefit both civil and defence applications. PT (Comments): The focus of technology innovation should not be only dual-use technologies in this section. It should be broader and include dual use technologies, as well as ones with civil purposes alone. RO (Comments): Romania supports the emphasis on technological sovereignty and innovation but recommends the introduction of a clear mechanism for ensuring equitable participation of emerging space industries from all Member States, including criteria to promote and ensure this equitable participation. This will help prevent concentration of advanced technologies in only a few countries and promote balanced growth of the EU space sector. SE (Drafting Suggestions):

Commission proposal	Drafting Suggestions and Comments
	The technological sovereignty and innovation component shall enable the Union to build a competitive, autonomous, and innovative space industrial ecosystem, aiming to enhance the Union's technological sovereignty, **while safe-guarding an openness to the world** ~~non-dependence, and self-sufficiency~~ in the space sector. It shall foster the development and uptake of cutting-edge space solutions. It shall **focus on promoting productivity and innovation while** prioritize**ing** the reduction of critical dependencies on non-Union technologies and focus on dual-use technologies that can benefit both civil and defence applications. SE (Comments): A market-based policy and open, rules-based trade benefits EU member states, it is therefore important to safe-guard openness. The focus should be on promoting innovation, productivity and growth, in order to increase European competitiveness. SI (Drafting Suggestions): 1. The technological sovereignty**, research** and innovation component shall enable the Union to build a competitive, autonomous, and innovative space industrial ecosystem, aiming to enhance the Union's technological sovereignty, non-dependence, and self-sufficiency in the space sector. It shall foster the development and uptake of cutting-edge space solutions. It shall prioritize the reduction of critical dependencies on non-Union technologies and focus on dual-use technologies that can benefit both civil and defence applications. SI

Commission proposal	Drafting Suggestions and Comments
	(Comments): Research as an important component, that is mentioned in the title of this article, need - as a concequence - be mentioned also in the body of the first sentence of this paragraph. DE (Comments): As a general caveat, we require more information on the proposed component under draft Article 67. Providing space technology has been primarily the role of ESA, Member States and industry, while the EU focusses on the operation of space systems for its and the Member States' needs. That is why a general opening up of the Union towards the proposed component (draft Art. 67(1)) is not fully understood by DE. IT (Drafting Suggestions): 1. […] It shall foster the development and uptake of cutting-edge space **technologies** ~~solutions~~. […] IT (Comments): Aligns wording with the technology-centred focus of this component and the pre-filled text, without altering scope.
2. The component shall include the following eligible activities:	FR (Comments): Is there an expected subcommittee for this component and what is its interaction with the OCT and SPACE Partnership which already deal with technologies ? What will be the link between the OCT and the Observatory of Emerging Technologies expected to advise globally in the ECF ?

Commission proposal	Drafting Suggestions and Comments
(a) activities related to Union's technological sovereignty, such as research, development, and uptake of critical space technologies, including those directly responding to the EU Observatory of Critical Technologies, (OTC) and implementation of related OCT roadmaps that reduce Union dependencies and enhance competitiveness of the Union space ecosystem;	ES (Drafting Suggestions): (a) activities related to Union's technological sovereignty, such as research, development, and uptake of critical space technologies, including those directly responding to the EU Observatory of Critical Technologies, (~~OTC~~ **OCT**) and implementation of related OCT roadmaps that reduce Union dependencies and enhance competitiveness of the Union space ecosystem ES (Comments): Replace OCT= "Observatory of Critical Technologies. Why not include also the activities from the Joint Task Force? FR (Drafting Suggestions): (a) activities related to Union's technological sovereignty, such as research, development, and uptake of critical space technologies, including those directly responding to the EU Observatory of Critical Technologies~~,~~ (OTC) **and from the Joint Task Force (JTF) and CTB roadmaps ;** and implementation of related ~~**OCT**~~ roadmaps that reduce Union dependencies and enhance competitiveness of the Union space ecosystem; FR (Comments): What is the link and synergies between the research and devlopments activities mentionned and Horizon Europe ? How does the governance ensure coherence and coordination between the programmes and with the Member States ?

Commission proposal	Drafting Suggestions and Comments
	We do not yet fully understand how the OCT works and how it takes into account the needs and recommendations of member states, component manufacturers, and end users. The ESCC's CTB includes the following agencies: EC, ESA, national agencies, satellite manufacturers, and component manufacturers. This seems to be a more comprehensive forum for defining roadmaps. IT (Drafting Suggestions): (a) activities related to Union's technological sovereignty, such as research, development, and uptake of critical space technologies, including those directly responding to the EU Observatory of Critical Technologies, (OTC) **roadmaps**, and implementation of related ~~OCT roadmaps~~ **adoption strategy** that reduce Union dependencies and enhance competitiveness of the Union space ecosystem, **aiming to ensure the full supply chain from Union and MSs** IT (Comments): Many technologies now in use are already embedded in existing products and systems, creating high switching costs. Introducing EU-native, not-yet-available technologies requires targeted investments along the entire supply chain (from materials and components to integration, testing, and qualification) to cover non-recurring development (NRE) and early industrialisation. These emerging options may initially underperform established non-EU alternatives and be more expensive at first; without a clear adoption strategy (OCT roadmap uptake, staged procurement/testbeds, early standardisation/conformity assessment, and downstream integration paths), they risk limited uptake and continued dependence. The edit operationalises this transition by tying funding to OCT roadmaps + an

Commission proposal	Drafting Suggestions and Comments
	adoption strategy and by aiming at a full EU/MS supply chain, de-risking early deployment while preserving competitiveness.
(b) activities aiming at improving the timely availability of critical raw and advanced materials, components and technologies for the sector, including through the reduction of their delivery lead time, reservation of manufacturing slots or stockpiling of products, intermediate products or raw materials;	AT (Drafting Suggestions): (b) activities aiming at improving the timely availability of critical raw and advanced materials, components and technologies for the **space** sector, including through the reduction of their delivery lead time, reservation of manufacturing slots or stockpiling of products, intermediate products or raw materials; AT (Comments): For clarification. ES (Drafting Suggestions): (b) activities aiming at improving the timely availability of critical raw and advanced materials, components and technologies for the **space** sector, including through the reduction of their delivery lead time, reservation of manufacturing slots or stockpiling of products, intermediate products or raw materials; **(c) access to space innovation, including the upgrade, development and testing of new technologies and systems and services.** FR (Drafting Suggestions): ~~(b) activities aiming at improving the timely availability of critical raw and advanced materials, components and technologies for the sector, including through the reduction of their delivery lead time, reservation of~~

Commission proposal	Drafting Suggestions and Comments
	~~manufacturing slots or stockpiling of products, intermediate products or raw materials;~~ FR (Comments): What is the link and synergie between this paragraph and the Resilience section of the fund ? How are these actions managed with respect to the OCT and Member States ? IT (Drafting Suggestions): (b) activities aiming at improving the timely availability of critical **and strategic** raw and advanced materials, […]; IT (Comments): Explicitly includes strategic inputs alongside critical ones; no change of legal effect.
(c) the research and development of new Union Space capabilities and related enabling technologies fostering a new in-space economy, specifically through the maturation, demonstration and operationalisation of In-Space Operations and Services, and quantum sensing technologies;	ES (Drafting Suggestions): (c) the research and development of new Union Space capabilities and related enabling technologies fostering a new in-space economy, specifically through the maturation, demonstration and operationalisation of In-Space Operations and Services~~, and quantum sensing technologies~~; **thereby enhancing Europe's competitiveness while at the same time contributing to a safe and sustainable space infrastructure.** **(d) quantum sensing technologies;** ES (Comments):

Commission proposal	Drafting Suggestions and Comments
	In-Space Operations and Services ->This broader concept may serve the intention to foster the R&D in this area, but it is suggested to specify some key activities. For instance, in-space manufacturing and on-orbit servicing will be key capabilities for EU technical sovereignty in the near future. Additionally, Services such as infrared monitoring for missile detection and air surveillance from space are potential services that we suggest to be addressed specifically as R&D capabilities for supporting defence. (MD/MESPA) To achieve a secure and sustainable space infrastructure, these activities should not be addressed solely as R&D efforts, but rather as an integral component of the overall space programme. A comprehensive approach is needed to ensure that in-space operations and related capabilities are developed coherently across all programme elements, enabling Europe to reach this strategic objective effectively. quantum sensing technologies in another bullet FR (Drafting Suggestions): (c) the research and development of new Union Space capabilities and related enabling technologies fostering a new in-space economy, specifically through the maturation, demonstration and operationalisation of In-Space Operations and Services, **while duly taking into account the sovereign prerogatives of Member States in this domain**, and quantum sensing technologies~~;~~**. In particular, it should include the in-orbit validation of quantum inertial sensors through the realization of a Quantum Space Pathfinder Mission built on existing mission development phases under EU-programmes. In addition, innovative approaches should be explored by considering specific orbits such as very low Earth orbit (VLEO) and focusing on hybrid missions that are new in terms of platform,**

Commission proposal	Drafting Suggestions and Comments
	instrumentation, and approach to data processing on board and on the ground. FR (Comments): What is the link and synergies between the research and devlopments activities mentionned and Horizon Europe ? How does the governance ensure coherence and coordination between the programmes ? Could this already foresee activities (namely expert groups) on important missions already started like ISOS and quantum gravimetry ? Discussions related to In-Space Operations and Services furthermore need to truly take into account the maturity of such services and the state of the market. At this stage, EU investment on ISOS seems premature and does not seem to ensure that action in space remains the act of a State. In-orbit validation of quantum inertial sensor performance is necessary to prepare for future scientific missions, such as those dedicated to gravity or fundamental physics, which will rely on this technology. This last focus is driven by a dual disruptive potential (hybrid constellation…) : it pushes current technological boundaries while creating entirely new service opportunities for operators. LU (Comments): It is crucial that the implementation of R&I for strategic technologies such as quantum sensing ensures alignment with strong "capability or market pull" paradigm. Given the specific objective of maximizing the socio-economic benefits of space-based activities, the work programmes must articulate the strategic capabilities and user requirements that these fundamental

PUBLIC

Commission proposal	Drafting Suggestions and Comments
	technologies are intended to fulfill, thereby translating innovation efforts into industrial competitiveness and institutional strategic assets, reducing non-EU dependencies. PT (Drafting Suggestions): (c) the research and development of new Union Space capabilities and related enabling technologies fostering a new in-space economy, specifically through the maturation, demonstration and operationalisation of In-Space Operations and Services, and quantum sensing **space** technologies; PT (Comments): Clarfy that quantum sensing technologies refer to technologies applied in space. DE (Comments): The paragraph on the ISOS issue is very short. We would request that further content such as scope, governance, etc. should be clarified. Furthermore, reference to other institutions and their roles would be useful. Newly proposed activities with a clear dual-use character need to be agreed with the Member States, including military and security actors IT (Comments): When detailing ISOS/quantum sensing in work programmes, Commission to specify integration paths (interfaces, standards, user tech) to maximise uptake and avoid fragmentation

PUBLIC

Commission proposal	Drafting Suggestions and Comments
(d) boosting Union industrial competitiveness in global commercial markets, including through demonstrator missions advancing the degree of digitalisation of end-to-end space systems;	ES (Drafting Suggestions): (d) boosting Union industrial competitiveness in global commercial markets, including through **disruptive technologies, maturation of enabling technologies and building blocks and** demonstrator missions advancing the degree of digitalisation of end-to-end space systems; ES (Comments): New point (e) if previous proposal accepted This is the 7 year R&I programme, no one knows which technologies might appear which might be relevant for the competitiveness of the sector. FR (Drafting Suggestions): ~~(d) boosting Union industrial competitiveness in global commercial markets, including through demonstrator missions advancing the degree of digitalisation of end-to-end space systems;~~ FR (Comments): What would be the role of the already launched SPACE Partneship with respect to this objective ? Again, interaction and coherence with Horizon Europe is to be framed. Proposal to place it in previous article. IT (Comments): Commission to clarify the types/timelines of demonstrators (system/sub-system/in-orbit), expected flight heritage, and industry access modalities (incl. SMEs), as requested by delegations.

Commission proposal	Drafting Suggestions and Comments
(e) exploring and leveraging synergies with complementary domains such as defence and other relevant sectors for key areas such as Artificial Intelligence and cybersecurity;	ES (Drafting Suggestions): (e) exploring and leveraging synergies with complementary domains such as **security,** defence and other relevant sectors for key areas such as Artificial Intelligence and cybersecurity; ES (Comments): It should name Quantum tecnologies in general (not only sensing). FR (Drafting Suggestions): **(e) exploring and leveraging synergies with complementary domains such as defence and other relevant sectors for key areas such as Artificial Intelligence ~~and cybersecurity;~~** FR (Comments): How does the Commission intend to fullfill this mission and what will be the interplay with defence projects developed in other programmes ? How will the Commission ensure that there be no duplication ? While Cybersecurity and Artificial Intelligence are highly complementary domains, they engage two distinct professional and academic communities. It is therefore imperative that we clearly delineate them, both in terms of project scope and financial allocation, to ensure that each field receives the focused attention and resources required for its specific challenges and objectives. NL

Commission proposal	Drafting Suggestions and Comments
	(Comments): • Why is *"defence"* listed as a *"complementary domain/relevant sector"* in Article 67(2)(e), alongside enabling technologies such as AI and cybersecurity? Given that space is already recognised as a strategic domain for security and defence, this wording seems to understate the role of defence. Did the Commission intend to refer specifically to *"defence technologies"* rather than the broader defence domain? Additionally, we would like to add "defence *and security* technologies." IT (Drafting Suggestions): (e) exploring and leveraging synergies with complementary domains such as defence and other relevant sectors for key areas such as Artificial Intelligence and cybersecurity, **to be tailored also for space activities;** IT (Comments): Keeps cross-sector synergies while ensuring outputs are fit-for-space.
	FR (Drafting Suggestions): **(ee) exploring and leveraging synergies with complementary domains such as defence and other relevant sectors for key areas such as ~~Artificial Intelligence and~~ cybersecurity;**
(f) supporting standardisation and certification activities relevant for the Union space sector;	FR (Drafting Suggestions):

Commission proposal	Drafting Suggestions and Comments
	~~(f) supporting standardisation and certification activities relevant for the Union space sector;~~ FR (Comments): Transfer to Art. 66 : standardisation in the Space Act is linked with economy, not R&I PT (Drafting Suggestions): (f) supporting, standardisation and certification activities relevant for the Union space sector, **in line with the principle "as little as possible, as much as necessary"**; PT (Comments): We want to be cautious about overregulating the space sector in the EU. The objective should be to regulate as little as possible and as much as necessary. EE (Comments): Estonia supports the development of harmonized standards and certification processes for the Union space sector IT (Comments): In order to clear the ambiguity, Commission to clarify if "certification" refers to conformity-assessment linked to recognised standards..
(g) facilitating availability and access to testing and data processing facilities.	FR (Drafting Suggestions):

Commission proposal	Drafting Suggestions and Comments
	(g) facilitating availability and access to testing and data processing facilities, **covering both the space segment (onboard) and the ground segment.** FR (Comments): How does this also relate to the pilar 4 of Horizon Europe concerning R&T infrastructures ? This addition is driven by the fact that data processing solutions now rely on diverse computational models, including classic cloud computing, distributed onboard processing, and even space cloud systems, to manage all kind of data (EO, IOT…). IT (Drafting Suggestions): (g) facilitating availability and access to **production,** testing and data processing facilities. IT (Comments): Explicitly includes production facilities, recognising their role in scale-up and time-to-market.
(h) promotion of Copernicus user uptake for Copernicus core users with, market development and capacity building, including promotion of Copernicus data and services, downstream applications and their development at all levels to maximise socio-economic benefits, as well as the collection and analysis of Copernicus users' needs.	AT (Drafting Suggestions): (h) promotion of ~~Copernicus~~ user uptake for ~~Copernicus~~ **all space components'** core users with~~,~~ market development and capacity building, including promotion of ~~Copernicus~~ data and services, downstream

Commission proposal	Drafting Suggestions and Comments
	applications and their development at all levels to maximise socio-economic benefits, as well as the collection and analysis of ~~Copernicus~~ users' needs AT (Comments): We prefer a more general approach regarding user uptake. CZ (Drafting Suggestions): (h) promotion of ~~Copernicus~~ user uptake **for users of elements at Article 58**~~Copernicus core users~~ with~~,~~ market development and capacity building, including promotion of ~~Copernicus~~ data and services, downstream applications and their development at all levels to maximise socio-economic benefits, as well as the collection and analysis of ~~Copernicus~~ users' needs. CZ (Comments): We consider it essential to ensure the widest possible use of data and services provided by EU satellite systems and space-related initiatives. We therefore propose expansion to all other relevant systems and activities, in line with Article 58. We acknowledge that user uptake may differ depending on the specific nature of the satellite systems or the services provided. ES (Drafting Suggestions): (h) promotion of **EU space assets** ~~Copernicus user uptake~~ for ~~Copernicus~~ core users **uptake** with, market development and capacity building, including promotion of ~~Copernicus~~ **space** data and services, downstream applications and their development at all levels to maximise socio-economic benefits, as well as the collection and analysis of ~~Copernicus~~ users' needs. **(i) strengthen the position of leading European scientists and foster societal interest in space by supporting the space sciences and exploration activities and data exploitation.**

Commission proposal	Drafting Suggestions and Comments
	ES (Comments): Any of the subcomponents shall be promote, not only Copernicus Fostering sciences and exploration will also support the competitiveness of EU entities by capitalising the investments already done in EU space sciences infraestrutures and by fostering other interest such ISRU or commercial objects from technology transfer. FR (Drafting Suggestions): (h) ~~promotion of Copernicus user uptake for Copernicus core users with~~, market development and capacity building **for other target groups (e.g. broad public, schools, students, universities)**, including promotion of Copernicus data and services, downstream applications and their development at all levels to maximise socio-economic benefits, ~~as well as the collection and analysis of Copernicus users' needs~~ FR (Comments): Tasks related to Core Users and collection of needs shall be part of the corresponding component, as part of Article 60 since it is part of Copernicus activities, both for services and market uptake.. IE (Drafting Suggestions): Please add (i) below IE (Comments): Discussed and agreed at SPC-CC amongst delegates

Commission proposal	Drafting Suggestions and Comments
	PT (Drafting Suggestions): (h) promotion of **EU Space Components** ~~Copernicus~~ user uptake for ~~Copernicus core~~ users with, market development and capacity building, including promotion of **EU Space Components** ~~Copernicus~~ data and services, downstream applications and their development at all levels to maximise socio-economic benefits, as well as the collection and analysis of ~~Copernicus~~ users' needs. PT (Comments): We believe this article should be more general and refer to the promotion of all EU Space Components (Copernicus, Galileo/EGNOS, IRIS2, GOVSATCOM, EOGS). An hollistic view would be preferable than a targetted action to one component only. Copernicus specificity is proposed in a new element – below. SI (Drafting Suggestions): ~~(h) promotion of Copernicus user uptake for Copernicus core users with, market development and capacity building, including promotion of Copernicus data and services, downstream applications and their development at all levels to maximise socio-economic benefits, as well as the collection and analysis of Copernicus users' needs.~~ SI (Comments): This item would better be deleted here and placed under Aricle 60 (Earth observation) – preferably as one of the items under paragraph 5. IT (Drafting Suggestions):

Commission proposal	Drafting Suggestions and Comments
	(h) promotion of ~~Copernicus~~ core-user uptake for **the space components of the Union, where appropriate, including Copernicus,** with, market development and capacity building, including promotion of ~~Copernicus~~ data and services, downstream applications and their development at all levels to maximise socio-economic benefits, as well as the collection and analysis of ~~Copernicus~~ core-users' needs. IT (Comments): Keeps the Copernicus focus but opens uptake measures to other space components where appropriate, and codifies core-user needs capture,
	AT (Drafting Suggestions): (i) **establishment of a horizontal grant mechanism for Copernicus user uptake, enabling Member States and their competent public entities, individually or jointly, to design and implement needs driven activities identified at national or regional level, including those requiring cross border cooperation; such mechanism shall be complementary to market uptake measures, ensure that intellectual property remains with the beneficiaries, and shall be reserved to non commercial users, thereby guaranteeing bottom up participation and uniform Union wide coverage.** **3. The Member States, the Commission and the Agency may cooperate to widen the uptake of data, information and services provided by the section's components.** AT (Comments): The provision is necessary to close the "last- mile" to users: only Member States and their public institutions can identify and address their user's needs in a topic- specific and regionally differentiated manner. Existing EUSPA

Commission proposal	Drafting Suggestions and Comments
	led or market- oriented instruments do not cover these bottom- up needs. A horizontal, grant- based mechanism reserved for non- commercial users maximises the benefits of Copernicus for society and economy across the EU. For efficiency reasons, it would be good to coordinate national and European user uptake initiatives. BE (Drafting Suggestions): **(i) establishment of a horizontal grant mechanism for Copernicus user uptake, enabling Member States and their competent public entities, individually or jointly, to design and implement needs-driven activities identified at national or regional level, including those requiring cross-border cooperation; such mechanism shall be complementary to market uptake measures, ensure that intellectual property remains with the beneficiaries, and shall be reserved to non-commercial users, thereby guaranteeing bottom-up participation and uniform Union-wide coverage.** BE (Comments): In line with the suggested amendment to article 60 regarding user uptake. FR (Drafting Suggestions): **(i) schemes to support R&I through the use of anchor customer contracts, involving space components and infrastructures as well as products using space data and services.** **Article 67-bis : Space sciences**

Commission proposal	Drafting Suggestions and Comments
	1. The space sciences component shall enable the Union to maintain excellence of collaborative research in the field, aiming to enhance the Union's leadership in its future innovations. It shall foster the development of cutting-edge skills and technologies for instrumentation techniques and data analysis of scientific missions. **2. The component shall include the following eligible activities :** **a. Developping and maturing cutting-edge instrumentation techniques and technologies for astronomical observation** **b. Enhancing the discoveries and researches of scientific space missions by developping new algorithms and techniques to exploit their data.** FR (Comments): Support of R&I activities lead by Space Partnership Proposal to add space sciences in an article to cover the field which is highly subject to scientific cooperation and international recognition. IE (Drafting Suggestions): (i) establishment of a horizontal grant mechanism for Copernicus user uptake, enabling Member States and their competent public entities, individually or jointly, to design and implement needs-driven activities identified at national or regional level, including those requiring cross-border cooperation; such mechanism shall be complementary to market uptake measures, ensure that intellectual property remains with the beneficiaries, and shall be reserved to non-commercial users, thereby guaranteeing bottom-up participation and uniform Union-wide coverage IE

Commission proposal	Drafting Suggestions and Comments
	(Comments): Discussed and agreed at SPC-CC amongst delegates NL (Drafting Suggestions): **(i) establishment of a horizontal grant mechanism for Copernicus user uptake, enabling Member States and their competent public entities, individually or jointly, to design and implement needs-driven activities identified at national or regional level, including those requiring cross-border cooperation; such mechanism shall be complementary to market uptake measures, ensure that intellectual property remains with the beneficiaries, and shall be reserved to non-commercial users, thereby guaranteeing bottom-up participation and uniform Union-wide coverage.** PT (Drafting Suggestions): **(i) establishment of a horizontal grant mechanism for Copernicus user uptake, enabling Member States and their competent public entities, individually or jointly, to design and implement needs-driven activities identified at national or regional level, including those requiring cross-border cooperation; such mechanism shall be complementary to market uptake measures, ensure that intellectual property remains with the beneficiaries, and shall be reserved to non-commercial users, thereby guaranteeing bottom-up participation and uniform Union-wide coverage.** PT (Comments): Taking into account the complexity of Earth Observation uptake, a program dedicated to Copernicus core users should be included. This horizontal grant could eventually be broaden to include the use of other space components.

Commission proposal	Drafting Suggestions and Comments
	RO (Drafting Suggestions): **(i) support for technology and knowledge sharing and diffusion, capacity-building, assistance in standardization and certification processes** RO (Comments): To enhance access of all MS to the Union space ecosystem and value chain tehnologies, similar to the *widening* component of HE. DE (Comments): It is important to ensure that there is a suitable grant mechanism for Copernicus user uptake. Such a mechanism should enable Member States and their competent public entities, individually or jointly, to design and implement needs driven activities identified at national or regional level, including those requiring cross border cooperation; such mechanism shall be complementary to market uptake measures, ensure that intellectual property remains with the beneficiaries, and shall be reserved to non-commercial users, thereby guaranteeing bottom-up participation and uniform Union wide coverage. IT (Drafting Suggestions): (i) establishment of a horizontal grant mechanism for user uptake, enabling Member States and their competent public entities, individually or jointly, to design and implement needs-driven activities identified at national or regional level, including those requiring cross-border cooperation; such mechanism shall be complementary to market uptake measures, ensure that

Commission proposal	Drafting Suggestions and Comments
	intellectual property remains with the beneficiaries, and shall be reserved to non-commercial users, thereby guaranteeing bottom-up participation and uniform Union-wide coverage. IT (Comments): Provision to promote user uptake
Article 68	

PUBLIC

Commission proposal	Drafting Suggestions and Comments
Access to services	ES (Comments): The wording should leave the door open for third countries and/or organisations to join the services/programmes, if so stipulated. FR (Drafting Suggestions): **Access to services of third countries and international organisations** FR (Comments): This article specifically addresses access by third countries and international organizations to the services of certain components. NL (Comments): • How will the Commission ensure that access to services by third countries does not undermine EU security and strategic autonomy? We call for transparent criteria, with Member State involvement, to decide which partners are eligible. IT (Comments): Commission to clarify the treatment of third-country-controlled companies seeking access to governmental services, ensuring coherence with eligibility safeguards and Member States' role in the evaluation and decision.
1. Third countries and international organisations may have access to Secure Connectivity services and EOGS subject to an agreement concluded in	AT (Drafting Suggestions):

Commission proposal	Drafting Suggestions and Comments
accordance with Article 218 TFEU and pursuant to Article 11(3), laying down the terms and conditions for access to those services, and on the condition that they comply with Article 78.	1. Third countries and international organisations may have access to Secure Connectivity services and EOGS subject to an agreement concluded in accordance with Article 218 TFEU and pursuant to Article 11(~~3~~**4**), laying down the terms and conditions for access to those services, and on the condition that they comply with Article 78. AT (Comments): Editorial change. FR (Drafting Suggestions): 1. Third countries and international organisations may have access to Secure Connectivity services and EOGS subject to an agreement concluded in accordance with Article 218 TFEU and pursuant to Article 11~~(3),~~ laying down the terms and conditions for access to those services, and on the condition that they comply with Article 78. FR (Comments): It seems to us that the whole of Article 11 applies. IT (Drafting Suggestions): 1. […] **Before entering into such agreements, the Commission shall consult the committee referred to in Article 83(1)(g) and take utmost account of Member States' views.** IT (Comments): Ensures a strong Member States' role upfront on access to governmental services, in line with the discussion asking for clearer decision-making and

Commission proposal	Drafting Suggestions and Comments
	less "may" in operational clauses. It also anticipates security sensitivities flagged by several delegations.
2. Third countries and international organisations not having their headquarters in the Member States may have access to secure sensitive SST services subject to an agreement concluded, provided that they conclude an agreement, in accordance with Article 218 TFEU, laying down the terms and conditions for access to those services and comply with the security requirements referred to in Article 77.	AT (Drafting Suggestions): 2. Third countries and international organisations not having their headquarters in the Member States may have access to secure sensitive SST services subject to an agreement concluded, provided that they conclude an agreement, in accordance with Article 218 TFEU, laying down the terms and conditions for access to those services and comply with the security requirements referred to in Article 77 **and Article 78**. AT (Comments): What is meant by "secure sensitive SST services"? This term needs to be defined in the ECF Regulation. Article 78 should be mentioned here as well. ES (Drafting Suggestions): 2. Third countries and international organisations not having their headquarters in the Member States may have access to secure sensitive SST services subject to an agreement concluded, ~~provided that they conclude an agreement,~~ in accordance with Article 218 TFEU, laying down the terms and conditions for access to those services and comply with the security requirements referred to in Article 77. ES (Comments): "secure sensitive services" shall be defined.

Commission proposal	Drafting Suggestions and Comments
	FR (Comments): Some clarifications are needed : Can the Commission define what "secure sensitive SST services" are? These services are not defined anywhere. Is there a link with the "SST governmental service" referred to in Article 62.9(c)? What is the rational to limit the international organisation with regard to the location of their headquarters? Does that means that international organisation located in the territory of Member States may have access to SST services without agreement? RO (Comments): A correlation with 62(11) is needed. IT (Drafting Suggestions): 2. […] **with the scope of security-sensitive SST services defined pursuant to Article 62(8).**" IT (Comments): Links the undefined category of "security-sensitive SST services" to the technical/legal delineation under Article 62(8), avoiding ambiguity in access conditions. This addresses explicit MS requests to specify which SST services are considered sensitive
3. The access of third countries and international organisations to the Public Regulated Service (PRS) provided by Galileo shall be governed by	

Commission proposal	Drafting Suggestions and Comments
Article 3(5) of Decision No 1104/2011/EU of the European Parliament and of the Council.	
4. By derogation to paragraph 2, no agreement concluded in accordance with Article 218 TFEU shall be required to access SST services relating to collision avoidance and re-entry.	FR (Comments): See comment made in point 2. Does this mean that SST services relating to collision avoidance and re-entry are not part of secure sensitive SST services? Clarification on what are these secure sensitive services is need, especially regarding the "SST governmental services" ? Does it imply that third countries and international organizations will be considered as a user equivalent to a space operator ? IT (Comments): Commission to clarify if collision avoidance and reentry services are "security sensitive SSA services"
	IT (Drafting Suggestions): **5. Union and Member States will have priority access to the Union space services**

PUBLIC

Commission proposal	Drafting Suggestions and Comments
Article 69	AT (Comments): Will be discussed by the CSC. DE (Comments): This is to be discussed and commented upon conjointly with experts on security matters (possibly CSC), also due to the decision to examine this draft Article solely within the Council Security Committee, and not in the AHWP-MFF(ECF) (see DK presidency flash note for October, Overview table re Wednesday 1/10).
	DE (Comments): DE is very concerned as regards the current implementation practice under Art. 24 space regulation (and the equivalent IRIS2 provision), excluding certain companies. We see a need to address this issue in detail and find a workable solution, which in the future would not be open to the (mis)perception (by some) as 'arbitrary' exclusion of certain companies. As a general principle, the Member States' competence for national security (Article 4.2 TEU) needs to be fully respected.

PUBLIC

Commission proposal	Drafting Suggestions and Comments
Eligibility and participation conditions for the preservation of the security, integrity and resilience of operational space systems of the Union	EE (Comments): Estonia emphasizes that eligibility and participation conditions must be transparent, fair, and ensure equal opportunities for all Member States, including smaller and new entrants. The waiver mechanisms should be clearly defined and subject to regular reporting and committee oversight. The Commission should monitor and report on the geographic and organizational distribution of beneficiaries to avoid concentration of participation and ensure broad access. Administrative requirements should be proportionate and not create unnecessary barriers for SMEs and smaller Member States.
1. The Commission shall apply the eligibility and participation conditions set out in paragraph 2 to the procurement, grants or prizes under this Title if it deems that this is necessary and appropriate to preserve the security, integrity and resilience of the operational Union systems, taking into account the objective to promote the Union's strategic autonomy, in particular in terms of technology across key technologies and value chains, while preserving an open economy.	BE (Drafting Suggestions): 1. The Commission shall apply the eligibility and participation conditions set out in paragraph 2 to the procurement, grants or prizes under this Title if ~~it~~**the Commission and Council** deem~~s~~ that this is necessary and appropriate to preserve the security, integrity and resilience of the operational Union systems, taking into account the objective to promote the Union's strategic autonomy, in particular in terms of technology across key technologies and value chains, while preserving an open economy. BE (Comments): Belgium wonders what is the legal basis for the COM's exclusive competence to assess the necessity and appropriateness of imposing eligibility conditions in view of security requirements? How is this exclusivity, insofar as it applies to space, justified under Articles 4(3) and 189(2) TFEU, given that it impacts the space competence of Member States (at least indirect economic impact due to access by certain “historic” industrial operators)? LU

Commission proposal	Drafting Suggestions and Comments
	(Drafting Suggestions): 1. The Commission shall apply the eligibility and participation conditions set out in paragraph ~~2~~ **3** to the procurement, grants or prizes under this Title if it deems that this is necessary and appropriate to preserve the security, integrity and resilience of the operational Union systems, taking into account the objective to promote the Union's strategic autonomy, in particular in terms of technology across key technologies and value chains, while preserving an open economy. RO (Comments): The provision should include a reference to space sector, otherwise the provision is too general SI (Drafting Suggestions): 1. The Commission shall apply the eligibility and participation conditions set out in paragraph ~~2~~**3** to the procurement, grants or prizes under this Title if it deems that this is necessary and appropriate to preserve the security, integrity and resilience of the operational Union systems, taking into account the objective to promote the Union's strategic autonomy, in particular in terms of technology across key technologies and value chains, while preserving an open economy. SI (Comments): We found the inconsistency here, as the eligibility and participation conditions are set in paragraph 3 and not in paragraph 2. DE (Drafting Suggestions):

Commission proposal	Drafting Suggestions and Comments
	1. The Commission shall apply the eligibility and participation conditions set out in paragraph **3** to the procurement, grants or prizes under this Title if it deems that this is necessary and appropriate to preserve the security, integrity and resilience of the operational Union systems, taking into account the objective to promote the Union's strategic autonomy, in particular in terms of technology across key technologies and value chains, while preserving an open economy. IT (Comments): Editorial fix: the cross-reference in paragraph 1 appears to be incorrect (should point to paragraph 3, not 2). Please correct.
2. Before applying the eligibility and participation conditions in accordance with paragraph 1 the Commission shall inform the Committee referred to in Article 83, paragraph 1, point (g) and shall take utmost account of the Member States' views on the scope of application of and the justification for those eligibility and participation conditions.	IE (Comments): Can this be strengthened to give MS a say in the application of the eligibility and participation conditions"?
3. The eligibility and participation conditions shall be as follows:	IE (Comments): Eligibility criteria a) and b) are reasonable – an additional assurance that all IP will remain in EU would be welcome
(a) the eligible legal entity is established in a Member State and its executive management structures are established in that Member State;	

Commission proposal	Drafting Suggestions and Comments
(b) the eligible legal entity commits to carry out all relevant activities in one or more Member States; and	
(c) the eligible legal entity is not to be subject to control by a third country or by a third country entity.	RO (Comments): Please outline the elements used to interpret **control**, particularly in relation to how the links between undertakings are intended to be understood.
4. The Commission may set out, by means of implementing acts, the criteria determining which ability to exercise a decisive influence over a legal entity, directly, or indirectly through one or more intermediate legal entities may have an impact on the security, integrity and resilience of the security, integrity and resilience of the operational Union systems, taking into account the objective to promote the Union's strategic autonomy, in particular in terms of technology across key technologies and value chains.	FR (Drafting Suggestions): The Commission may set out, by means of implementing acts in examination procedure according to article 83(3), the criteria determining which ability to exercise a decisive influence over a legal entity, directly, or indirectly through one or more intermediate legal entities may have an impact on the security, integrity and resilience of the security, integrity and resilience of the operational Union systems, taking into account the objective to promote the Union's strategic autonomy, in particular in terms of technology across key technologies and value chains. NL (Drafting Suggestions): The Commission may set out, by means of implementing acts, the criteria determining which ability to exercise a decisive influence over a legal entity, directly, or indirectly through one or more intermediate legal entities may have an impact on the security, integrity and resilience of the security, integrity and resilience of the operational Union systems, taking into account the objective to promote the Union's strategic autonomy, in particular in terms of technology across key technologies and value chains. **These**

PUBLIC

Commission proposal	Drafting Suggestions and Comments
	implementing acts shall be adopted in accordance with the advisory procedure referred to in Article 83, paragraph 2. DE (Comments): As a general principle, we are very critical of the application of implementing acts in areas of relevance to ~~(~~Member States'~~)~~ national security.
5. The Commission may waive the conditions of paragraph 3, points (a) and (b) for a particular legal entity upon evaluation based on the following cumulative criteria:	
(a) for specific technologies, goods or services needed for the activities referred to in paragraph 1 no substitutes are readily available in the Member States;	
(b) the legal entity is established in a country which is a member of the EEA or EFTA and which has concluded an international agreement with the Union as referred to in Article 11, its executive management structures are established in that country and the activities linked to the procurement, grant or prize are carried out in that country or in one or more such countries; and	
(c) sufficient measures are implemented to ensure the protection of EUCI under Article 78 and the integrity, security and resilience of the Programme's components, their operation and their services.	

Commission proposal	Drafting Suggestions and Comments
6. By way of derogation from point (b) of the first subparagraph of this paragraph, the Commission may waive the conditions under points (a) or (b) of the first subparagraph of paragraph 2 for a legal entity established in a third country which is not a member of the EEA or EFTA	ES (Comments): Paragraph 6 currently mixes references that are difficult to parse; clarification avoids internal contradictions FR (Comments): Could the Commission specify under which conditions it could waive the conditions under points (a) or (b) as mentioned ? LU (Drafting Suggestions): 6. By way of derogation from point (b) of **paragraph 5** ~~the first subparagraph of this paragraph~~, the Commission may waive the conditions under points (a) or (b) of ~~the first subparagraph of~~ paragraph ~~2~~ **3** for a legal entity established in a third country which is not a member of the EEA or EFTA SI (Drafting Suggestions): 6. By way of derogation **from "point (b) of the first subparagraph of this paragraph"**, the Commission may waive the conditions under **points (a) or (b) of the first subparagraph of paragraph 2** for a legal entity established in a third country which is not a member of the EEA or EFTA SI (Comments): We found inconsistencies in this paragraph indicated by red coloured text (there is no subparagraph to this paragraph and no relared point (b) in it, besides, there are no point (a) or (b) to the first subparagraph of paragraph 2).

Commission proposal	Drafting Suggestions and Comments
7. The Commission may waive the condition under point (c) of paragraph 3 if the legal entity established in a Member State provides the following guarantees:	
(a) control over the legal entity is not exercised in a manner that restrains or restricts its ability to:	
(1) carry out the procurement, grant or prize; and	
(2) deliver results, in particular through reporting obligations;	
(b) the controlling third country or third country entity commits to refrain from exercising any controlling rights over or imposing reporting obligations on the legal entity in relation to the procurement, grant or prize; and	IE (Comments): IE: are concerned about the strength of the language here – there does not seem to be strong enough of a safeguard to guarantee that the third country or third country entity refrains from interfering or imposing reporting obligations on the legal entity.
(c) the legal entity complies with Article 69.	
8. The competent authorities of the Member State in which the legal entity is established shall assess whether the legal entity complies with the criteria set out in point (c) of paragraph 5 for waivers relative to condition (3)(b) and guarantees referred to in paragraph 7. The Commission shall comply with that assessment.	

PUBLIC

Commission proposal	Drafting Suggestions and Comments
9. The Commission shall provide the following to the Programme committee referred to in Article 83, paragraph 1, point g:	
(a) the scope of application of eligibility and participation conditions referred to in paragraph 1 of this Article;	SI (Drafting Suggestions): (a) the scope of application of eligibility and participation conditions referred to in paragraph ~~1~~**2** of this Article; SI (Comments): We found inconsistency under this item as eligibility and participation conditions are reffered to under paragraph 2 and not under paragraph 1. We advice further check of the subject text to assure proper wording.
(b) details and justifications on the waivers granted in accordance with this Article; and;	
(c) the evaluation that formed the basis for a waiver, subject to paragraphs 3 and 4 of this Article, without divulging commercially sensitive information.	LU (Drafting Suggestions): (c) the evaluation that formed the basis for a waiver, subject to paragraphs ~~3~~ **5** and ~~4~~ **7**of this Article, without divulging commercially sensitive information.
10. The conditions set out in paragraph 3, the criteria set out in paragraphs 4, 5 and 6 and the guarantees set out in paragraph 7 shall be included in the documents relating to the procurement, grant or prize, as applicable, and, in	

Commission proposal	Drafting Suggestions and Comments
the case of procurement, they shall apply to the full life cycle of the resulting contract.	
11. This Article is without prejudice to Decision No 1104/2011/EU and Commission Delegated Decision of 15.9.2015 (43), Regulation (EU) 2019/452, Decision 2013/488/EU and Decision (EU, Euratom) 2015/444 and to the security vetting carried out by Member States with regard to legal entities involved in activities requiring access to EUCI subject to the applicable national laws and regulations.	
12. If contracts resulting from the application of this Article are classified, eligibility and participation conditions applied by the Commission in accordance with paragraph 1 shall be without prejudice to the competence of national security authorities.	
13. This Article shall not interfere with, amend or contradict any existing Facility Security Clearance and Personnel Security Clearance procedure within a Member State.	
Article 70	

PUBLIC

Commission proposal	Drafting Suggestions and Comments
Ownership of Union space assets and access to results	AT (Drafting Suggestions): Ownership of Union space assets**,** ~~and~~ access to results **and needs of the Programme** AT (Comments): As paragraph 5 otherwise does not fit under this article, the headline should be adapted. DE (Comments): We appreciate the provisions under draft subsection 2 of draft Article 70. Can COM please provide specific and detailed written information on the overall IPR regime as intended hereunder, including a draft estimate of how IPRs will roughly be divided between the Union and other stakeholders (in percentage) on the basis thereof? In the context of space, DE supports an approach where the rights are vested with industry in order to facilitate the largest possible valorization of the IPRs developed under the programme / draft space policy window.
1. Except as provided under paragraph 2, the Union shall be the owner of all tangible and intangible assets created, developed or purchased under direct or indirect management in the implementation of activities supported under this section. To that effect, the Commission shall ensure that relevant contracts, agreements and other arrangements relating to the activities which may result in the creation or development of such assets contain provisions ensuring the Union's ownership.	

PUBLIC

Commission proposal	Drafting Suggestions and Comments
2. Paragraph 1 shall not apply to the tangible and intangible assets created or developed under direct or indirect management in the implementation of the activities supported under this section:	
(a) where Union support is provided in the form of grants, prizes or pre-commercial procurement, or	
(b) the activities are not fully financed by the Union, except as otherwise specified and with the exclusion of IRIS², or	ES (Comments): Difficult to understand. Clarification and addition of an individual statement for it (c) required RO (Comments): It would be helpful to clarify how "fully financed" is determined and under which circumstances exceptions may apply, in order to avoid ambiguities that could affect Member States' access to result.
(c) the activities relate to PRS receivers developed by Member States.	
3. In the conditions set in paragraph 2, Union institutions, bodies, offices or agencies shall not acquire ownership but enjoy royalty-free access rights to results for own use and the right to grant, or to require the recipients to grant, non-exclusive licences to third parties to exploit the results under fair and reasonable conditions without any right to sublicense.	AT (Comments): Is it sufficient to state this in the ECF Regulation or is a special agreement with the respective entity/Member State needed? FR (Comments):

PUBLIC

Commission proposal	Drafting Suggestions and Comments
	It is unclear what should happen in case of the involvement of EU in a joint procurment for a launch service for a Member State or an International Organisation according to Article 65. Therefor, how does this paragraph applies regarding the involvement of EU in the joint procurement of launch service for a Member State or an International Organisation? IT (Drafting Suggestions): 3. In the conditions set in paragraph 2, Union institutions, bodies, offices or agencies shall not acquire ownership but enjoy royalty-free access rights to results for own use and the right to grant, or to require the recipients to grant, non-exclusive licences to **Member States and** third parties to exploit the results under fair and reasonable conditions without any right to sublicense. IT (Comments): Adds Member States to the licensing pathway so that national authorities can lawfully exploit results where Union ownership is not acquired, while keeping Union ownership and fair-and-reasonable terms intact. This improves reuse and speeds operational uptake.
4. The Union shall be entitled to conclude the relevant agreements in order to acquire ownership of assets developed by third parties where such assets are necessary to the fulfilment of the objectives laid down in Article 3.	FR (Drafting Suggestions): 4. The Union shall be entitled to conclude the relevant agreements in order to acquire ownership of assets developed by third parties **in the frame of the implementation of the components referred to in Article 58** where such assets are necessary to the fulfilment of the objectives laid down in Article 3.

Commission proposal	Drafting Suggestions and Comments
5. The Commission shall ensure that the Union has the following rights:	FR (Comments): How this article is applicable since some licences granted by the Member States regarding the use of their frequencies are concluded with the EC and provide for an exclusive rights of use (see the licence for Galileo). Should all the licences be reviewed in order to allow the Union to have access to the frequencies
(a) the right of use of the frequencies required for the transmission of the signals generated by the governmental infrastructure of IRIS², the PNT components and the EO components in accordance with the applicable laws and regulations and the relevant licensing agreements, enabled by the relevant filings for the frequencies provided by the Member States, which remain under the responsibility of the Member States;	FR (Drafting Suggestions): (a) the right of use of the frequencies required for the transmission of the signals generated by the governmental infrastructure of IRIS², the PNT components and the EO components in accordance with the applicable laws and regulations and the relevant licensing agreements, enabled by the relevant filings for the frequencies provided by the Member States~~, which remain under the responsibility of the Member States~~; FR (Comments): According to some licences, the Commission shall compensate and hold harmless the administrations in case of claim regarding the use of the frequencies granted by the licence SE (Comments): There is a concern that the national right to use frequencies in SE, according to internationally agreed regulations, are not guaranteed through the current formulation. We would like to ensure that this is the case."

PUBLIC

Commission proposal	Drafting Suggestions and Comments
(b) the right to prioritise the provision of the IRIS² governmental services over commercial services, in accordance with the terms and conditions to be established in the contracts referred to in Article 61 and by taking into consideration the needs of government-authorised users.	
Article 71	
Warranty and liability	IT (Comments): Clarify how the limitation of liability for Union/EUSPA and for SST-participating Member States interfaces with the future obligations on operators under the EU Space Act (e.g., on collision-avoidance and traffic rules). The relationship between limited institutional liability and operators' compliance duties should be explicit
1. Except if otherwise specified the services, data and information provided by the components and activities under this section shall be without any express or implied warranty as regards their quality, accuracy, availability, reliability, speed and suitability for any purpose. The Union, including the Commission and the Agency (EUSPA), shall not be liable.	CZ (Drafting Suggestions): ~~1. Except if otherwise specified the services, data and information provided by the components and activities under this section shall be without any express or implied warranty as regards their quality, accuracy, availability, reliability, speed and suitability for any purpose. The Union, including the Commission and the Agency (EUSPA), shall not be liable.~~ **The owner of the systems shall declare that the data and services provided by the satellite systems referred to in this Regulation comply with the declared service parameters. In the event that the data or**

Commission proposal	Drafting Suggestions and Comments
	services do not meet the declared parameters, the owner of the systems or an entity designated by the owner shall, where technically feasible, promptly inform the users of this fact. CZ (Comments): Users must be informed without delay of any disruption or deviation from the declared service parameters, in order to be able to take this information into account when using the Union satellite systems and their services. FR (Comments): The delegation will emphasize the need for the PNT services to acknowledge their daily involvement in safeguarding lives, and that the possibility of a personal accident results directly from a fault or error of the programme. The current wording must not deprive European citizens of an effective criminal recourse in the event of a major accident, for example in the aviation sector. SE (Comments): SE seeks clarification on whether Article 71 should be interpreted strictly, thereby excluding any responsibility by the Commission and EUSPA for the space programme's functionality. This raises concerns regarding the programme's suitability for civil preparedness. SE considers the situation problematic until a formal assurance of responsibility is provided. Additionally, could existing Service Level Agreements (SLA) and Service Level Targets (SLT), such as those for PRS, be regarded as overriding Article 71? SI (Comments): More insight into the meaning (and consequences) of this article would be appreciated

Commission proposal	Drafting Suggestions and Comments
	DE (Drafting Suggestions): Except if otherwise specified the services, data and information provided by the components and activities under this section shall be without any express or implied warranty as regards their quality, accuracy, availability, reliability, speed and suitability for any purpose. ~~The Union, including the Commission and the Agency (EUSPA), shall not be liable.~~ DE (Comments): The sentence generally and categorically excluding COM and EUSPA liabiliy seems unbalanced – please provide detailed and specific information as to why COM sees this as necessary and appropriate, given this sentence was not included in the current space programme regulation Art. 10(1).
2. For SST, Member States participating in the SST sub-component shall not be held liable for: damage resulting from the lack of or interruption in the provision of SST services, delay in the provision of SST services; inaccuracy of the information provided through the SST services or action undertaken in response to the provision of SST services.	AT (Drafting Suggestions): 2. For SST, Member States participating in the SST sub-component shall not be held liable**.** ~~for: damage resulting from the lack of or interruption in the provision of SST services, delay in the provision of SST services; inaccuracy of the information provided through the SST services or action undertaken in response to the provision of SST services.~~ AT (Comments): We are in favour of a broader scope and not to mention specific and therefore exclusive situations. An alternative could be to mention examples.

Commission proposal	Drafting Suggestions and Comments
Article 72	SE (Comments): SE suggests Article 72 to be clarified. It is not currently evident that the subcontracting requirement applies specifically to support for development activities as outlined in the purpose articles (Articles 3(1) and 3(2)), which SE believes should be made explicit.
Complementary procurement rules	IE (Comments): IE Supportive of this approach but the procurement should include provision for industry days and weighting factor for greater involvement of SMES etc. rather than merely investigating after the fact
1. While protecting the Union's autonomy, the contracting authority may request that the tenderer subcontracts part of the contract by competitive tendering at the appropriate levels of subcontracting to companies other than those which belong to the tenderer's group. For contracts above EUR 10 million, the contracting authority shall aim to ensure that at least 30 % of the value of the contract is subcontracted by competitive tendering at various levels of subcontracting to companies outside the group of the prime tenderer, in particular in order to enable the cross-border participation of SMEs in the space ecosystem. The tenderer shall provide reasons for not fulfilling a request made to sub-contract or for deviating from the 30% target. The contracting authority may include specific requirements in the award procedure documentation to ensure that prime contractors follow the principles of the procurement set in this regulation during the execution of the contract, notably as regards the involvement of SMEs and new entrants, competition, constant benchmarking with the best market conditions.	AT (Comments): The term "SME" should be defined in the ECF Regulation, e.g. through a reference to the COMMISSION RECOMMENDATION of 6 May 2003 concerning the definition of micro, small and medium-sized enterprises (2003/361/EC). BE (Comments): The tenderer shall provide reasons for not fulfilling a request made to sub-contract or for deviating from the 30% target.--> Is the term 'reason' sufficiently strong to ensure that tenders will include SMEs? CZ (Drafting Suggestions):

Commission proposal	Drafting Suggestions and Comments
	1. While protecting the Union's autonomy, the contracting authority may request that the tenderer subcontracts part of the contract by competitive tendering at the appropriate levels of subcontracting to companies other than those which belong to the tenderer's group. For contracts above EUR 10 million, the contracting authority shall aim to ensure that at least 30 % of the value of the contract is subcontracted by competitive tendering at various levels of subcontracting to companies outside the group of the prime tenderer, in particular in order to enable the cross-border participation of SMEs in the space ecosystem. The tenderer shall provide reasons for not fulfilling a request made to sub-contract or for deviating from the 30% target. The contracting authority may include specific requirements in the award procedure documentation to ensure that prime contractors follow the principles of the procurement set in this regulation during the execution of the contract, notably as regards the involvement of SMEs and new entrants, competition, constant benchmarking with the best market conditions. **The contracting authority shall, where possible, select at least two suppliers of the same technology established in different Member States of the European Union. The selection of suppliers shall also take into account the objective of ensuring a broad geographical distribution of suppliers across the Member States of the Union.** CZ (Comments): This provision aims to promote a more balanced geographical distribution of contracts across the Union and to ensure that, where feasible, at least two suppliers of the same technology are selected. Such an approach would enhance the resilience of the supply chain, strengthen the competitiveness of the European industrial base, and reduce dependence on single points of difficulties. ES

Commission proposal	Drafting Suggestions and Comments
	(Drafting Suggestions): 1. While protecting the Union's autonomy, the contracting authority may request that the tenderer subcontracts part of the contract by competitive tendering at the appropriate levels of subcontracting to companies other than those which belong to the tenderer's group. For contracts above EUR 10 million, the contracting authority shall aim to ensure that at least 30 % of the value of the contract is subcontracted by competitive tendering at various levels of subcontracting to companies outside the group of the prime tenderer, in particular in order to enable the cross-border participation of SMEs **MID CAPS and non-LSI,** in the space ecosystem. The tenderer shall provide reasons for not fulfilling a request made to sub-contract or for deviating from the 30% target. The contracting authority may include specific requirements in the award procedure documentation to ensure that prime contractors follow the principles of the procurement set in this regulation during the execution of the contract, notably as regards the involvement of SMEs and new entrants, competition, constant benchmarking with the best market conditions. ES (Comments): In order to foster and maintain EU industry competitiveness Given the predominance of SMEs in Spain, including within the Defence Technological and Industrial Base (DTIB), which consists largely of smaller companies compared to the EU average, lowering the €10 million threshold could better reflect national industrial realities and support broader participation. LT (Comments):

Commission proposal	Drafting Suggestions and Comments
	We welcome the intention to ensure the participation of SMEs and new entrants. We would also welcome the attention to more balanced geografical distribution. RO (Drafting Suggestions): While protecting the Union's autonomy, the contracting authority may request that the tenderer subcontracts part of the contract by competitive tendering at the appropriate levels of subcontracting to companies other than those which belong to the tenderer's group. For contracts above EUR 10 million, the contracting authority shall aim to ensure that at least 30 % of the value of the contract is subcontracted by competitive tendering at various levels of subcontracting to companies outside the group of the prime tenderer, in particular in order to enable the cross-border participation of SMEs in the space ecosystem. The tenderer shall provide reasons for not fulfilling a request made to sub-contract or for deviating from the 30% target. The contracting authority ~~may~~ **shall** include specific requirements in the award procedure documentation to ensure that prime contractors follow the principles of the procurement set in this regulation during the execution of the contract, notably as regards the involvement of SMEs and new entrants, **especially from Member States with emerging space sectors**, competition, constant benchmarking with the best market conditions. RO (Comments): The monitoring and sanctioning mechanisms to ensure compliance with the 30% subcontracting target for companies outside the main contractor's group have not been specified. For Member States with developing industrial sectors, guarantees are needed to ensure that this target is not merely formal. There is a risk that subcontracting may be minimal or nonexistent, and we emphasize that this mechanism could provide real opportunities for companies outside the

PUBLIC

Commission proposal	Drafting Suggestions and Comments
	main contractor's group, particularly benefiting Member States with emerging industrial sectors. The contracting authority shall encourage and facilitate cross-border partnerships and consortia involving SMEs from different Member States, to enhance knowledge transfer and integration within the EU space ecosystem. Specific measures shall be implemented to facilitate the participation of SMEs and new entrants, including capacity-building programmes, access to financing, and simplified administrative procedures. SE (Drafting Suggestions): While protecting the Union's **open** **strategic** autonomy, the contracting authority may request that the tenderer **foster** ~~subcontracts part of the contract by competitive tendering at the appropriate levels of subcontracting to companies other than those which belong to the tenderer's group. For contracts above EUR 10 million, the contracting authority shall aim to ensure that at least 30 % of the value of the contract is subcontracted by competitive tendering at various levels of~~ subcontracting to companies outside the group of the prime tenderer, in particular in order to enable the cross-border participation of SMEs in the space ecosystem. ~~The tenderer shall provide reasons for not fulfilling a request made to sub-contract or for deviating from the 30% target. The contracting authority may include specific requirements in the award procedure documentation to ensure that prime contractors follow the principles of the procurement set in this regulation during the execution of the contract, notably as regards the involvement of SMEs and new entrants, competition, constant benchmarking with the best market conditions.~~ SE

Commission proposal	Drafting Suggestions and Comments
	(Comments): Procurements should be designed in such a manner that no barriers arise to the participation of SMEs and so on, rather than including SME participation as part of the evaluation criteria. DE (Drafting Suggestions): 1. While protecting the Union's autonomy, the contracting authority **shall in principle apply open competitive tendering at all levels of the contract.** ~~may request that the tenderer subcontracts part of the contract by competitive tendering at the appropriate levels of subcontracting to companies other than those which belong to the tenderer's group.~~ For contracts above EUR 10 million, the contracting authority shall aim to ensure that at least 30 % of the value of the contract is subcontracted by competitive tendering ~~at various levels of subcontracting to companies outside the group of the prime tenderer, in particular~~ **to SME**s in order to enable the cross-border participation of SMEs in the space ecosystem. **Including the minimum participation of SME, in principle 30% of the value of the contract shall be subcontracted by competitive tendering at various levels to companies outside the group of the prime tenderer**. The tenderer shall provide reasons for not fulfilling a request made to sub-contract or for deviating from the ~~30%~~ **forementioned** targets. The contracting authority may include specific requirements in the award procedure documentation to ensure that prime contractors follow the principles of the procurement set in this regulation during the execution of the contract, notably as regards the involvement of SMEs and new entrants, competition, constant benchmarking with the best market conditions DE (Comments):

Commission proposal	Drafting Suggestions and Comments
	Germany underlines that the baseline of any public procurements on all levels – system- and subsystem – should be open competition. Any restricted competition or direct negotiation has to be justified. Germany is convinced that the European ecosystem has enough players to ensure competition also on system level. Germany strongly recommends a much more precise formulation to guarantee access for SMEs in EU procurements. We would like to underline that companies outside the prime group could still benefit major companies. Only a minimum threshold for SME participation saveguards their participation, which is needed for innovation and competition. Saying this, Germany the proposal to procure in principle 30% outside the primes group, including the minumum of 10% SME. EE (Drafting Suggestions): "…For contracts above EUR 10 million, the contracting authority **shall ensure** that at least 30 % of the value of the contract is subcontracted by competitive tendering at various levels of subcontracting to companies outside the group of the prime tenderer, in particular in order to enable the cross-border participation of SMEs in the space ecosystem…" EE (Comments): Estonia supports the objective of Article 72 to increase SME and cross-border participation in large contracts. However, we are concerned that the current 30% subcontracting target may not, in practice, ensure fair opportunities for SMEs from all Member States, particularly smaller or peripheral countries. We recommend strengthening the wording to require the contracting authority to actively promote and monitor the achievement of this target. Consideration could be given to financial incentives for prime

Commission proposal	Drafting Suggestions and Comments
	contractors who meet or exceed the target. Clear monitoring and reporting mechanisms should be established to ensure transparency and effectiveness.. IT (Drafting Suggestions): **1. […], including where procurement is performed under indirect management pursuant to Article 74.** IT (Comments): Ensures the 30% competitive subcontracting target and SME participation are effectively applied and monitored throughout the supply chain, including under indirect management, reflecting practical safeguards requested by Member States. PL (Drafting Suggestions): 1. **The foster broad geographical participation across the Union by encouraging the involvement of new entrants, SMEs, and start-ups, and ensuring the components' benefits are widely distributed.** While protecting the Union's autonomy, the contracting authority ~~may~~ **shall** request that the tenderer subcontracts part of the contract by competitive tendering at the appropriate levels of subcontracting to companies other than those which belong to the tenderer's group. For contracts above EUR 10 million, the contracting authority shall aim to ensure that at least 30 % of the value of the contract is subcontracted by competitive tendering at various levels of subcontracting to companies outside the group of the prime tenderer, in particular in order to enable the cross-border participation of SMEs in the space ecosystem. The tenderer shall provide reasons for not fulfilling a request made to sub-contract or for deviating from the 30% target. The contracting authority may include specific requirements in the award procedure documentation to ensure that prime contractors follow the principles of the

Commission proposal	Drafting Suggestions and Comments
	procurement set in this regulation during the execution of the contract, notably as regards the involvement of SMEs and new entrants, competition, constant benchmarking with the best market conditions. PL (Comments): In line with the provisions of the current EU Space Programme Regulation (Regulation (EU) 2021/696, Article 17 on Subcontracting), we propose the introduction of mandatory support mechanisms, including those related to subcontracting. Accordingly, we recommend replacing the term "*may*" with "*shall*" in Article 72.1 of the draft ECF Regulation to reflect this mandatory nature. Furthermore, we suggest enriching the introductory sentence of paragraph 1 in this Article by incorporating wording similar to that found in Regulation (EU) 2021/696 (Article 17) or Article 45 of the ECF. For example: "*To foster broad geographical participation across the Union by encouraging the involvement of new entrants, SMEs, and start-ups, and ensuring the components' benefits are widely distributed, while safeguarding the Union's autonomy* (…)." This approach is essential to prevent a disproportionate allocation of resources that could deepen existing disparities and hinder the Union's ability to develop technological independence. Moreover, promoting inclusive participation and broad dissemination of benefits will contribute to strengthening the overall resilience of the European Union in the face of crises and external challenges. Such amendments would help align the draft regulation with existing legal frameworks while reinforcing key objectives of inclusivity, strategic autonomy, and crisis preparedness. We have doubts as to whether the mechanism set out in Article 72 — requiring that 30% of the contract value for contracts above EUR 10 million be

Commission proposal	Drafting Suggestions and Comments
	subcontracted to entities outside the prime contractor's group — is effective in practice. According to this provision, it is possible to deviate from this requirement, for instance in cases where suitable subcontractors with the necessary competences are not available, or where specific security requirements apply. Does the European Commission have data on the percentage of contracts above EUR 10 million for which such derogations have been applied, or could it obtain such data from the contracting authorities? If the mechanism proves to be ineffective in fostering the participation of SMEs and new entrants, it might be necessary to consider introducing modifications or additional measures to ensure that the intended objectives are achieved.
	AT (Drafting Suggestions): **1 bis. The Commission shall inform the committee referred to in Article 83 (1) (g) on the fulfillment of the objective referred to in paragraph 1.** AT (Comments): Member States shall be informed about the fulfilment of the subcontracting condition for large contracts.
2. The procurements relating to governmental services, service continuity or the fulfilment of the objectives referred to in Article 3(2), point (d).3, notably as regards security, shall be deemed to satisfy the condition of urgency established in point 11.1.c) of Annex I of the Financial Regulation.	AT (Drafting Suggestions): 2. The procurements relating to governmental services, service continuity or the fulfilment of the objectives referred to in Article 3(2), point (d)-(3), notably as regards security, shall be deemed to satisfy the condition of urgency established in point 11.1.c) of Annex I of the Financial Regulation. AT (Comments):

Commission proposal	Drafting Suggestions and Comments
	The term "governmental services" needs to be defined or specified in the ECF Regulation.
Article 73	
Complementary grant rules	NL (Comments): • How will the Commission ensure that simplified access rules genuinely benefit SMEs and start-ups?
1. [The Union may cover up to 100 % of the eligible costs, without prejudice to the co-financing principle.]	
2. By way of derogation from Article 184(6) of the Financial Regulation when applying flat rates, the authorising officer responsible may authorise or impose funding of the beneficiary's indirect costs up to a maximum of 25 % of total eligible direct costs for the action.	DE (Comments): Could the Comission please explain why this derogation from Article 184(6) of the Financial Regulation is considered necessary?
3. By way of derogation from Article 207 of the Financial Regulation, the maximum amount of financial support that can be paid to a third party shall not exceed EUR 200 000.	RO (Comments): Could you please provide the rationale to establish the EUR 200,000 threshold? DE (Comments):

PUBLIC

Commission proposal	Drafting Suggestions and Comments
	What is the commissions reasoning regarding the amount of € 200 000 ?
4. The SST partnership shall be considered as the predefined beneficiary of the SST grant.	
Article 74	
Complementary indirect management rules	AT (Comments): As the reference to Article 131 of Regulation 2024/2509 regarding financial framework partnerships does not seem detailed and specific enough, we prefer the text of Articles 31 and 32 of the Space Regulation. In any case, it is important to involve Member States via examination procedure. When will negotiations with ESA regarding the tripartite agreement start? NL (Comments): • The Netherlands underlines the importance of preserving ESA's role as Europe's technical space agency; indirect management under the ECF must build on this proven model.
1. A tripartite agreement in accordance with Article 131 of Regulation (EU, Euratom) 2024/2509 shall be concluded with both the Agency established in accordance with Regulation (EU) [XXX] [future EUSPA founding Regulation] and the European Space Agency, subject to which [EUSPA] and	FR (Comments):

PUBLIC

Commission proposal	Drafting Suggestions and Comments
the European Space Agency may be entrusted with budget implementation tasks.	The delegation may point out that there is still no mention of the tripartite agreement between the Commission, EUSPA, and ESA. The delegation may therefore request clarifications regarding the content of this agreement and the timeline for its implementation. NL (Comments): • Article 74(1)The article refers to a future EUSPA founding regulation and a tripartite agreement. Could the Commission clarify what exactly is envisaged here? How will the Commission guarantee cost control, performance monitoring and continuity of cooperation? Why is the long-term Financial Framework Partnership Agreement (FFPA) with ESA and EUSPA no longer explicitly reaffirmed under the ECF? PT (Drafting Suggestions): 1. A tripartite agreement in accordance with Article 131 of Regulation (EU, Euratom) 2024/2509 shall be concluded with both the Agency established in accordance with Regulation (EU) [XXX] [future EUSPA founding Regulation] and the European Space Agency, subject to which [EUSPA] and the European Space Agency may be entrusted with budget implementation tasks**. Procurements and implementation activities carried in indirect management should comply with the same level of openess and transparency as if carried out by the EC.** PT (Comments): In MFF21-28, there has been a recurrent dicussion on the lack of transparency in procurements carried out by ESA under the FFPA (be them as part of the Union Space Programme or Horizon Europe). Information on all contracts,

Commission proposal	Drafting Suggestions and Comments
	subcontracts, geographic return and other statitistics should be public and updated regularly, since funding comes from EU taxpayers money. ESA should use the the Funding and Tenders Portal or any other EU portal used for the ECF instead of using esa-star for EU procurements, since this has led to the underparticipation of entities from non-ESA EU Member states due to lack of information. IT (Drafting Suggestions): 1. […] **Entrustment agreements shall ensure the application of procurement principles equivalent to Article 72, including competitive subcontracting and SME participation requirements.** IT (Comments): Guarantees homogeneous rules and transparency across direct and indirect management, preserving the 30% competitive subcontracting objective and SME access even when ESA/EUSPA run procurements. Commission to confirm that the new tripartite agreement will allow contribution agreements or equivalent instruments to detail entrusted activities, mirroring the current FFPA practice.
2. Whenever a Tender Evaluation Board is established by the Agency or ESA for a procurement performed under the tripartite agreement, experts from the Commission and, where relevant, from the other entrusted entity can reserve the right to participate as members in the Tender Evaluation Board meetings, have access to all deliverables and attend review meetings. Such participation shall not affect the technical independence of the Tender Evaluation Board	IE (Comments): IE welcome this provision as a positive step forward, particularly for ESA. IE welcome the provision to "preserve the right to participate as members of the TEB.." as opposed to acting as observers – positive step forward, particularly for ESA
	AT

Commission proposal	Drafting Suggestions and Comments
	(Drafting Suggestions): **2 bis. The Commission shall, by means of implementing acts, decide on the tripartite agreement referrred to in paragraph 1. Those implementing acts shall be adopted in accordance with the examination procedure referred in Article 83 (3). The European Parliament and the Council shall be fully informed about the tripartite agreement well in advance of its conclusion and about its implementation.**
3. By way of derogation from Article 62(1) of the Financial Regulation and subject to the Commission's assessment of the protection of the Union's interests, tasks entrusted under indirect management to the Agency, or its successors, may be further entrusted by the Agency to bodies referred to in Article 62(1), point (c), of Regulation (EU, Euratom) 2024/2509 under the conditions of indirect management applying to the Commission.	AT (Comments): Does this paragraph include the Copernicus entrusted entities? FR (Comments): Could the Commission further explain what is entailed by "the conditions of indirect management applying to the Commission"? DE (Drafting Suggestions): ~~3. By way of derogation from Article 62(1) of the Financial Regulation and subject to the Commission's assessment of the protection of the Union's interests, tasks entrusted under indirect management to the Agency, or its successors, may be further entrusted by the Agency to bodies referred to in Article 62(1), point (c), of Regulation (EU, Euratom) 2024/2509 under the conditions of indirect management applying to the Commission.~~ DE (Comments): (1) For space, we would like to emphasise the importance of indirect management, which is mentioned in draft Article 12(2). The possibility of directly transferring funds for the implementation of EU space activities to

Commission proposal	Drafting Suggestions and Comments
	the European Space Agency (ESA) should be widely applied. This makes it possible to fully utilise ESA's potential as a system developer for the EU and to reduce the administrative burden. How does the derogation from the EU Financial Regulation provided for in draft Art. 74 para. 3 fit in with the overarching objective of administrative simplification? (2) Furthermore, we request that regarding indirect management in the interest of simplification and streamlining COM insert a provision that the procurement rules of ESA as the entity entrusted with budget implementation tasks shall apply to the extent allowable under the Financial Regulation.
	AT (Drafting Suggestions): **3 bis. The Commission shall inform the committee referred to in Article 83 (1) (g) on the tasks entrusted to other bodies referred to in paragraph 3.** AT (Comments): Or use the examination procedure if an implementing act is necessary.
4. Whenever procurement or grant activities are implemented via indirect management by entrusted entities, communications activities, dissemination activities and any infrastructure, equipment, vehicles, supplies or major result funded by the procurement or grant must acknowledge the Union support and display the European flag (emblem) and funding statement (translated into local languages, where appropriate) in accordance with the Commission' standard communication rules.	

Commission proposal	Drafting Suggestions and Comments
Article 75	

PUBLIC

Roles	BE (Comments): The role of Member States is very vaguely defined, despite being formulated as an obligation ("shall"). It should be noted that in the corresponding article of the current EU Regulation on the Union Space Program (Art. 27), the provision of services, infrastructure, or equipment is optional ("may"). How are the terms and conditions for this provision defined? EL (Drafting Suggestions): The Commission shall prepare, by 2027, a separate Regulation setting out the detailed framework for the Union's space programmes, including clear governance arrangements, institutional roles (Commission, EUSPA, ESA, Member States), and a predictable multi-annual funding roadmap. EL (Comments): Ensures continuity with existing Regulation (EU) while providing the flexibility and legal clarity needed under the ECF. PL (Comments): **General Note:** This section is of critical importance as it effectively establishes the governance framework for all space components. • In the current EU Space Programme Regulation (EU) 2021/696, the chapter on governance was among the most sensitive elements during the sectoral negotiations of the Multiannual Financial Framework (MFF) 2021–2027. It is expected to remain a key point of discussion in the current legislative process — particularly in light of Article 75(2), which foresees the adoption of an additional legal act concerning

Commission proposal	Drafting Suggestions and Comments
	the tasks and competences of the EU Agency for the Space Programme (EUSPA). • EUSPA's existing responsibilities are defined in Regulation (EU) 2021/696 as well as in the Financial Framework Partnership Agreement (FFPA) — the tripartite arrangement between the European Commission, EUSPA, and ESA. However, the new tasks foreseen for EUSPA under both the proposed ECF Regulation and the parallel EU Space Act (EUSA) will require a dedicated legal basis. A draft of this new legal act is tentatively expected in the fourth quarter of 2025. • Regarding the EU SST component, the current absence of any explicit role for EUSPA could be interpreted as an indication that the Commission does not, at this stage, envisage a stronger role for the Agency in the governance or operational coordination of this area. This raises questions about the future direction of institutional responsibilities and the level of oversight intended in the SST domain.
1. The Member States shall take all the necessary measures to ensure the smooth functioning of the actions supported under this section and may contribute with their technical competence, know-how and assistance, in particular in the field of safety, security, and frequency allocation. This contribution shall include, but not be limited to, making available to the Union data, information, services and infrastructure in their possession or located on their territory, that are necessary to the good functioning of the actions. The Member States shall be responsible, at local level, for the accreditation of the security of sites that are located within their territory and form part of the security accreditation area for the components, notably Member States participating in the SST Partnership shall perform security accreditation on the basis of the general security requirements referred to in Article 77.	BE (Drafting Suggestions): 1. The Member States shall take all the necessary measures to ensure the smooth functioning of the actions supported under this section and may contribute with their technical competence, know-how and assistance, in particular in the field of safety, security, and frequency allocation. This contribution shall include, but not be limited to, making available to the Union**, where appropriate and possible,** data, information, services and infrastructure in their possession or located on their territory, that are necessary to the good functioning of the actions. The Member States shall be responsible, at local level, for the accreditation of the security of sites that are located within their territory and form part of the security accreditation area for the components **and report, to this end, to the Security Accreditation Board**.~~,~~

Commission proposal	Drafting Suggestions and Comments
	~~notably~~ Member States participating in the SST Partnership shall perform security accreditation on the basis of the general security requirements referred to in Article 77**, paragraph 3**. BE (Comments): This paragraph is coming from the current EU Space Regulation (2021/696) but key elements are missing. We propose in this sense to retain the wording "where appropriate and possible" coming from Article 27 paragraph 1 of the Regulation 2021/696, whose paragraph here is inspired by. The wording "report to this end to the SAB" is also based on Article 42 paragraph 5 of the EU Regulation 2021/696, whose paragraph is inspired by ES (Comments): Regarding frequency allocation it should be noted that spectrum is a scarce valuable resource FR (Drafting Suggestions): 1. The Member States shall take all the necessary measures to ensure the smooth functioning of the actions supported under this section and may contribute with their technical competence, know-how and assistance, in particular in the field of safety, security, and frequency allocation. This contribution ~~shall~~ **may** include, but not be limited to, making available to the Union**, where appropriate and possible,** data, information, services and infrastructure in their possession or located on their territory, that are necessary to the good functioning of the actions. The Member States shall be

Commission proposal	Drafting Suggestions and Comments
	responsible, at local level, for the accreditation of the security of sites that are located within their territory and form part of the security accreditation area for the components **and report, to this end, to the Security Accreditation Board.**~~, notably~~ Member States participating in the SST Partnership shall perform security accreditation on the basis of the general security requirements referred to in Article 77**, paragraph 3**. FR (Comments): This paragraph is coming from the current EU Space Regulation (2021/696) but key elements are missing. We propose in this sense to retain the wording "where appropriate and possible" coming from Article 27 paragraph 1 of the Regulation 2021/696, whose paragraph here is inspired by. The first sentence refers to a possible contribution ("may") and the second refers to an obligation in the contribution ("Such contribution shall"). Proposition made to harmonise the wording. The wording "report to this end to the SAB" is also based on Article 42 paragraph 5 of the EU Regulation 2021/696, whose paragraph is inspired by IE (Comments): IE This will be onerous on smaller MSs, can we have clarification on whether Cion will provide guidance, assistance, support etc NL (Comments): • We note that Article 75 does not explicitly refer to ESA's role or entrusted activities, unlike the current Space Programme Regulation.

Commission proposal	Drafting Suggestions and Comments
	Could the Commission clarify how ESA's technical role will be safeguarded under the ECF? Again, what mechanism will secure long-term cooperation and cost control in absence of an FFPA. SE (Comments): SE notes that the term "actions" remains unclear and may create uncertainty regarding the responsibilities of Member States. SE would like to raise a concern regarding the wording on accreditation, which appears to be at odds with the mandate of the Security Accreditation Board (SAB) as established under the current space regulation (EU 2021/696). SE would therefore like to underline the importance of ensuring a clear and collective role for Member States in the accreditation process within the SAB framework. DE (Drafting Suggestions): 1. The Member States **may participate in the Space Section of the ECF. Member states doing so** ~~shall take all the necessary measures to ensure the smooth functioning of the actions supported under this section and~~ may contribute with their technical competence, know-how and assistance~~, in particular in the field of safety, security, and frequency allocation~~. This contribution **may** ~~shall~~ include, ~~but not be limited to,~~ making available to the Union data, information, services and infrastructure in their possession or located on their territory~~, that are necessary to the good functioning of the actions~~. The Member States **shall take ~~all the necessary~~ measures to ensure the smooth functioning of the actions supported under this section and** shall be responsible, at local level, for the accreditation of the security of sites that are located within their territory and form part of the

Commission proposal	Drafting Suggestions and Comments
	security accreditation area for the components.~~,~~ N~~n~~otably, Member States participating in the SST Partnership shall perform security accreditation on the basis of the general security requirements referred to in Article 77. DE (Comments): 1. We request that this draft subsection be realigned with the current space programme regulation Art. 27. The provision should not start with what Member States must do; instead please start with what Member States may do, then moving on to their potential responsibilities. 2. Please provide a written answer: Is COM already securing access to MS sensors, data and possibly hardware here? This could play a role in navigation for the RFI monitoring service. The same applies to EU-SST. PL (Drafting Suggestions): 1. The Member States shall, **where appropriate and in accordance with national law,** take all the necessary measures to ensure the smooth functioning of the actions supported under this section and may contribute with their technical competence, know-how and assistance, in particular in the field of safety, security, and frequency allocation. This contribution shall include, but not be limited to, making available to the Union data, information, services and infrastructure in their possession or located on their territory, that are necessary to the good functioning of the actions. The Member States shall be responsible, at local level, for the accreditation of the security of sites that are located within their territory and form part of the security accreditation area for the components, notably Member States participating in the SST Partnership shall perform security accreditation on the basis of the general security requirements referred to in Article 77.

Commission proposal	Drafting Suggestions and Comments
	PL (Comments): In paragraph 1, the first sentence provides that Member States *may* contribute their technical competence, expertise, and assistance, particularly in areas such as safety, security, and frequency allocation. However, the subsequent sentence uses the term *shall include*, requiring Member States to make available to the Union data, information, services, and infrastructure in their possession or located on their territory that are necessary for the proper functioning of operations. This apparent discrepancy in wording creates ambiguity regarding the scope of Member States' obligations. The phrasing could be interpreted as imposing an extensive requirement for Member States to provide access to their assets, which may raise concerns about the extent of their commitments under this provision. To enhance clarity and legal certainty, we suggest aligning the language to consistently reflect either a mandatory or voluntary contribution, for example: "*Member States shall, where appropriate and in accordance with national law, make available to the Union relevant data, information, services, and infrastructure necessary for the proper functioning of operations, complemented by their technical competence, expertise, and assistance*." This formulation would better balance the need for cooperation with respect for Member States' sovereignty and capacities.
2. The Commission shall have overall responsibility for the implementation of the components referred to in this Section, including in the field of security, without prejudice to Member States' prerogatives in the area of national security and supervise their implementation.	BE (Drafting Suggestions): 2. The Commission shall have overall responsibility for the implementation of the components referred to in this Section, including in the field of security, without prejudice to Member States' prerogatives in the area of national

Commission proposal	Drafting Suggestions and Comments
	security and supervise their implementation**, without prejudice to other policies of the Union**. BE (Comments): Same logic as in the previous comment. We propose to retain the wording coming from Article 28 paragraph 1 of the Regulation 2021/696. ES (Comments): Which is the implication of the overall responsibility? FR (Drafting Suggestions): 2. The Commission shall have overall responsibility for the implementation of the components referred to in this Section, including in the field of security, without prejudice to Member States' prerogatives in the area of national security and supervise their implementation**, without prejudice to other policies of the Union**. FR (Comments): Same logic as in the previous comment. We propose to retain the wording coming from Article 28 paragraph 1 of the Regulation 2021/696, whose paragraph is inspired by PT (Drafting Suggestions): The Commission shall have overall responsibility for the implementation of the components referred to in this Section, including in the field of security, without prejudice to Member States' prerogatives in the area of national security**,** and supervise their implementation.

Commission proposal	Drafting Suggestions and Comments
	RO (Comments): Although it is stated that national security prerogatives are respected, there is no clear framework on how to handle situations where national interests conflict with Union objectives. It should be developed a clear procedural framework for managing these elements between national security and European coordination. DE (Drafting Suggestions): 2. The Commission shall have overall responsibility for the implementation of the components referred to in this Section, including in the field of security, ~~without prejudice to Member States' prerogatives in the area of national security~~ and supervise their implementation. **This is** without prejudice to Member States' prerogatives in the area of national security. **EUSPA may be entrusted with tasks based on the needs of the activities under this section, provided that those tasks do not duplicate activities performed by another entrusted entity and that they aim to improve the efficiency of the implementation of the space section's activities.** DE (Comments): The MS' prerogatives in the area of national security have to relate to the COM's responsibility in its entirety, not only part thereof.
3. The Commission shall	

Commission proposal	Drafting Suggestions and Comments
(a) manage any of the components or subcomponents not entrusted to another entity;	
(b) determine the priorities and long-term evolution of those components, in line with the user requirements, and shall supervise their implementation.	
(c) determine and coordinate the international dimension of the components, to ensure coherence with the Union policies for external action and a consistent approach thereof.	
	AT (Drafting Suggestions): **(d) ensure a clear division of tasks and responsibilities between the various entities involved in the programme and coordinate the activities of those entities;** **(e) ensure that the uptake and use of the data and services provided by the Programme's components is promoted and maximised in the public and private sectors;** **(f) ensure the coherence of activities performed in the context of the Programme with activities carried out in the space domain at Union, national or international level.** AT (Comments): These are important points to add.
4. Where necessary to further define and specify the governance, security and provision of services under this chapter, the Commission may, by means of implementing acts, complement the catalogue of services provided and shall determine the technical and operational requirements needed for the	AT (Drafting Suggestions): 4. Where necessary to further define and specify the governance, security and provision of services under this chapter, the Commission may,

PUBLIC

Commission proposal	Drafting Suggestions and Comments
implementation of and evolution of the components under this chapter and of the services they provide after having consulted users and other stakeholders. When determining those technical and operational requirements, the Commission shall avoid reducing the general security level and shall meet backwards compatibility requirements. Those implementing acts shall be adopted in accordance with Article 83, paragraph 2.	by means of implementing acts, complement the catalogue of services provided and shall determine the technical and operational requirements needed for the implementation of and evolution of the components under this chapter and of the services they provide after having consulted **member states,** users and other stakeholders. When determining those technical and operational requirements, the Commission shall avoid reducing the general security level and shall meet backwards compatibility requirements. Those implementing acts shall be adopted in accordance with **the examination procedure referred to in** Article 83, paragraph ~~2~~**3**. AT (Comments): We prefer less implementing acts and more details in the basic act. BE (Drafting Suggestions): Where necessary to further define and specify the governance, security and provision of services under this chapter, the Commission may, by means of implementing acts, complement the catalogue of services provided and shall determine the technical and operational requirements needed for the implementation of and evolution of the components under this chapter and of the services they provide after having consulted users and other stakeholders. When determining those technical and operational requirements, the Commission shall avoid reducing the general security level and shall **imperatively** meet backwards compatibility requirements. Those implementing acts shall be adopted in accordance with Article 83, paragraph **3**. BE (Comments):

Commission proposal	Drafting Suggestions and Comments
	Same logic than previous comments : we propose to retain the wording agreed in the Space Regulation. “Imperatively” is used in Article 28 paragraph 5 of the Regulation 2021/696. The implementing acts should be adopted in an examination procedure. CZ (Drafting Suggestions): 4. Where necessary to further define and specify the governance, security and provision of services under this chapter, the Commission may, by means of implementing acts, complement the catalogue of services provided and shall determine the technical and operational requirements needed for the implementation of and evolution of the components under this chapter and of the services they provide after having consulted users and other stakeholders. When determining those technical and operational requirements, the Commission shall avoid reducing the general security level and shall meet backwards compatibility requirements. Those implementing acts shall be adopted in accordance with Article 83, paragraph ~~2~~**3**. CZ (Comments): Where a decision-making procedure through implementing acts is necessary, we request an examination procedure rather than an advisory procedure. The reason for this is that these acts relate to a program with significant impact (see Article 2(b)(i) of Regulation No. 182/2011). FR (Drafting Suggestions): Where necessary to further define and specify the governance, security and provision of services under this chapter, the Commission may, by means of implementing acts, complement the catalogue of services provided and shall

Commission proposal	Drafting Suggestions and Comments
	determine the technical and operational requirements needed for the implementation of and evolution of the components under this chapter and of the services they provide after having consulted users and other stakeholders. When determining those technical and operational requirements, the Commission shall avoid reducing the general security level and shall **imperatively** meet backwards compatibility requirements. Those implementing acts shall be adopted in accordance with Article 83, paragraph **3**. FR (Comments): Same logic than previous comments : we propose to retain the wording agreed in the Space Regulation. "Imperatively" is used in Article 28 paragraph 5 of the Regulation 2021/696, whose paragraph is inspired by. The implementing acts should be adopted in an examination procedure. RO (Drafting Suggestions): …Those implementing acts shall be adopted in accordance with the examination procedure referred to in Article 83, paragraph ~~2~~ **3**. RO (Comments): The examination procedure offers a transparent and inclusive process, ensuring accountability and thorough evaluation by Member States and other institutions. While the provision grants the Commission the power to define and specify governance, security, and service requirements via implementing acts, it is

Commission proposal	Drafting Suggestions and Comments
	essential that such acts undergo a transparent and robust decision-making process.
5. Where necessary, the Commission shall, by means of implementing acts, adopt measures required to determine the location of the ground-based infrastructure following an open and transparent process, ensuring sound financial management and the protection of security and public order of the Union and its Member States. Those implementing acts shall be adopted in accordance with Article 83, paragraph 2.	AT (Drafting Suggestions): 5. Where necessary, the Commission shall, by means of implementing acts, adopt measures required to determine the location of the ground-based infrastructure following an open and transparent process, ensuring sound financial management and the protection of security and public order of the Union and its Member States. Those implementing acts shall be adopted in accordance with **the examination procedure referred to in** Article 83, paragraph ~~2~~**3**. AT (Comments): We prefer less implementing acts and more details in the basic act. BE (Drafting Suggestions): 5. Where necessary, the Commission shall, by means of implementing acts, adopt measures required to determine the location of the ground-based infrastructure **in accordance with the security requirements and** following an open and transparent process, ensuring sound financial management ~~and the protection of security and public order of the Union and its Member States~~. Those implementing acts shall be adopted in accordance with Article 83, paragraph **3**. BE (Comments):

Commission proposal	Drafting Suggestions and Comments
	Same logic than previous comments : we propose to retain the wording agreed in the Space Regulation. “In accordance with security requirements” is coming from the Regulation 2021/696 Article 47 (c). Moreover, in which sense is Commission in charge of security and public order here ? The implementing acts should be adopted in an examination procedure. FR (Drafting Suggestions): 5. Where necessary, the Commission shall, by means of implementing acts, adopt measures required to determine the location of the ground-based infrastructure **in accordance with the security requirements and** following an open and transparent process, ensuring sound financial management ~~and the protection of security and public order of the Union and its Member States~~. Those implementing acts shall be adopted in accordance with Article 83, paragraph **3**. FR (Comments): Same logic than previous comments : we propose to retain the wording agreed in the Space Regulation. “In accordance with security requirements” is coming from the Regulation 2021/696 Article 47 (c), whose paragraph is inspired by. Moreover, in which sense is Commission in charge of security and public order here ? The implementing acts should be adopted in an examination procedure. RO

Commission proposal	Drafting Suggestions and Comments
	(Comments): Member States are responsible for the security accreditation of ground sites; however, there are currently no uniform rules or mandatory minimum standards in place. A common set of mandatory minimum standards for the protection of critical ground infrastructure across the EU should be established, with the adoption of implementing acts following the examination procedure.
6. The Agency shall have its own tasks and may be entrusted by the Commission with other tasks in accordance with Regulation (EU) [XXX] [*EUSPA founding Reg*].	AT (Comments): When will the proposal for the EUSPA Regulation be published? Where will it be discussed? CZ (Drafting Suggestions): 6. The Agency shall have its own tasks and may be entrusted by the Commission with other tasks in accordance with Regulation (EU) [XXX] [*EUSPA founding Reg*]. **<u>These tasks shall include in particular;</u>** **a) direct responsibilities and assigned tasks in accordance with Regulation (EU) 2021/696 (Space Regulation) and Regulation (EU) 2023/588 (Secure Connectivity Regulation);** **b) security accreditation which shall be extended to all components in accordance with Article 58;** **c) user uptake activities which shall be extended to IRIS², EOGS and SSA-related activities;** **d) awareness rising and capacity building, i.a.-human resources activities in relation to components of Article 58;**

Commission proposal	Drafting Suggestions and Comments
	e) operation of dedicated EOGS space segment and ground segment; **d) operation of LEO-PNT space segment and ground segment** CZ (Comments): We propose to place all the tasks foreseen for the Agency in square brackets in order to enable their transfer to the forthcoming EUSPA Regulation. This would allow this Article to retain only a reference to that new Regulation, ensuring coherence and avoiding duplication between legislative acts and also cover the whole picture of governance with all the players. Regarding the operation of the space and ground segments of EOGS and LEO-PNT: EUSPA has practical experience in ensuring the operation of both space and related infrastructures (Galileo), which should be fully exploited. This would lead to higher efficiency and cost savings. FR (Comments): This is miroring Article on the role of ESA. All delegated tasks of EUSPA should be reflected here to ensure funding and clear division of tasks between the entrusted entities. SE (Comments): SE requests greater transparency regarding the Commission's intentions for the future role of EUSPA. DE (Comments): DE cannot agree, pending a clearer picture, to such a broad power of COM to entrust tasks to EUSPA, in part (but not solely) due to the cross-reference to

Commission proposal	Drafting Suggestions and Comments
	a document, the proposed contents of which are unknown to us (i.e. the planned proposal of an EUSPA regulation). PL (Comments): Paragraph 6 indicates that the Agency (EUSPA) will have its own defined tasks and may be entrusted with additional responsibilities pursuant to a forthcoming separate legal act, which is not yet established. However, this brief description provides limited insight into the exact scope of the Agency's powers and duties, making it difficult to fully assess its future role. In light of this, we believe it would be beneficial to include more detailed information or clarifications within this provision. For instance, we envisage a strengthened, more clearly defined coordinating role for EUSPA within the EU SST component. Such an enhanced role would better facilitate cooperation among the Member States involved, including greater involvement in decision-making processes related to this component.
7. Provided that the interests of the Union are protected, ESA may be entrusted with the following tasks:	AT (Comments): Does ESA have comments on these taks? Are there consultations with ESA ongoing? LT (Drafting Suggestions): **(e) as regards space commercialization and space economy: attracting private investment capital, accelerating commercial growth and business networks, and driving market expansion and industrial upscaling.** LT (Comments):

Commission proposal	Drafting Suggestions and Comments
	ESA's role in commercialization should be strongly emphasized - particularly in attracting private investment capital, accelerating commercial growth and business networks, and driving market expansion and industrial upscaling. Thus we suggest to amend by paragraph (e). RO (Comments): ESA should also support Member States with lower technological capacities, through targeted programs to develop technological and industrial capabilities in less advanced Member States, fostering a more balanced European space ecosystem. DE (Drafting Suggestions): 7. Provided that the interests of the Union are protected, ESA ~~may~~ **will** be entrusted with the following tasks: DE (Comments): 1. In the current space programme regulation, singular is used ("Provided that the interest of the Union…") – could you please specify in writing all the interests that COM sees as falling thereunder? 2. In the current space programme regulation, an obligatory verb is used ("shall"). Please replace "may" with "will" or "shall". PL (Drafting Suggestions): 7. Provided that the interests of the Union are protected, ESA ~~may~~ **shall** be entrusted with the following tasks: PL (Comments):

Commission proposal	Drafting Suggestions and Comments
	We propose replacing the term *"may"* with *"shall"* in reference to entrusting the European Space Agency (ESA) with the tasks set out in this paragraph. This adjustment would align the wording with that of Article 30 of the current Regulation (EU) 2021/696, which governs the implementation of the 2021–2027 Multiannual Financial Framework (MFF). At the same time, and in line with the current regulation, it would be possible to retain flexibility by allowing ESA to carry out additional or specific tasks on a non-mandatory basis, where appropriate. To reflect this distinction more clearly, we suggest dividing the paragraph into two parts: 1. Tasks that *shall* be entrusted to ESA; and 2. Tasks that *may* be entrusted to ESA - a distinction already partially addressed in paragraph 4 of this article. Such a revision would enhance legal clarity and ensure consistency with the existing regulatory framework, while also allowing for the necessary operational flexibility.
(a) as regards PNT: major systems evolution and design and development of parts of the ground segment, and of satellites, including testing and validation;	FR (Drafting Suggestions): (a) as regards PNT: major systems evolution ~~and design~~ and development of parts of the ground segment, and of satellites, including testing and validation; **continuous design authority for systems developped by ESA** FR (Comments): Design authority is a role that ESA will need to ensure for whole life cycle of the programme, even in interaction with EUSPA PT (Comments):

Commission proposal	Drafting Suggestions and Comments
	This element should ideally be funded by the ECF and not by FP10 (Horizon Europe) budget. Indirectly managed actions to ESA for EGNSS upstream R&D consumed a significant part of HE Cluster 4 – Space budget. It is of outmost importance to ensure that FP10 has enough budget for bottom up space innovation and that the budget is not consumed primarely for EU Space Components evolution R&D. PNT is a critical tecnology, without this budget it will not be possible to maintain a European PNT programme. DE (Drafting Suggestions): as regards PNT: ~~major~~ systems evolution and design and development of parts of the ground segment, and of satellites, including testing and validation; DE (Comments): Question for COM: Why only "parts of the ground segment"? In navigation, the ground and space segments are highly interconnected. We would be grateful for a written explanation in response. The suggested deletion of “major” is in line with the tasks as previously defined under the space programme regulation. It is not clear why a different approach should be taken.
(b) as regards Copernicus: i) coordination and implementation of the space component and its evolution; ii) design, development and construction of the Copernicus space infrastructure, including the operations of that infrastructure	BE (Drafting Suggestions): as regards Copernicus: i) coordination and implementation of the space component and its evolution; ii) design, development and construction of the

Commission proposal	Drafting Suggestions and Comments
and related procurement, except when those operations are done by other entities; iii) where appropriate, provision of access to third-party data;	Copernicus space infrastructure **and parts of associated ground segment**, including the operations of that infrastructure and related procurement, except when those operations are done by other entities; iii) where appropriate, provision of access to third-party data ES (Drafting Suggestions): (b) as regards Copernicus: i) coordination and implementation of the space **infraestructure** ~~component~~ and its evolution; ii) design, development and construction of the Copernicus space infrastructure, including the operations of that infrastructure and related procurement, except when those operations are done by other entities; iii) where appropriate, provision of access to third-party data; ES (Comments): Component has other meaning in this Regulation. Another word should be chosen for coherence with the rest of the text. FR (Drafting Suggestions): (b) as regards Copernicus: i) coordination and implementation of the space component and its evolution; ii) design, development and construction of the Copernicus space infrastructure **and parts of associated ground segment**, including the operations of that infrastructure and related procurement, except when those operations are done by other entities; iii) where appropriate, provision of access to third-party data DE (Drafting Suggestions):

Commission proposal	Drafting Suggestions and Comments
	(b) as regards Copernicus: i) coordination and implementation of the space component and its evolution; ii) design, development and construction of the Copernicus space infrastructure **and parts of associated ground segment**, including the operations of that infrastructure and related procurement, except when those operations are done by other entities; iii) where appropriate, provision of access to third-party data; DE (Comments): See above
(c) as regards EOGS: design and development of new Earth-observation space missions and parts of associated ground segment;	AT (Comments): What does "space missions" refer to? – In comparison to the term "space component"/ "space infrastructure" in paragraph (7) (b). IE (Comments): IE: As part of the design phase of EOGS being carried out by ESA there should be some consideration of the integration of re-usable parts of Copernicus for security services or other third party space assets whose data could be useful in an EOGS context DE (Drafting Suggestions): (c) as regards EOGS: ~~design and development of new Earth-observation space missions and parts of associated ground segment;~~ **i) coordination and implementation of the space component and its evolution; ii) design, development and construction of the EOGS space infrastructure and parts of associated ground segment, including the operations of that infrastructure and related procurement, except when those operations**

Commission proposal	Drafting Suggestions and Comments
	are done by other entities; iii) where appropriate, provision of access to third-party data; DE (Comments): See above.
(d) as regards : (i) IRIS²: the supervision of the development, of the validation and of the related deployment activities relating to the definition, design, development, validation and deployment phases for the governmental services and of the development and evolution necessary for the provision of governmental services, ensuring coordination between the tasks and budget entrusted to ESA and possible contribution by ESA, excluding pooling and sharing related actions referred to in Article 47, paragraph 2, point a; (ii) the provision of its technical expertise, including during the implementation of the components;	
4. On the basis of an assessment by the Commission, ESA may be entrusted with other tasks based on the needs of the activities under this section, provided that those tasks do not duplicate activities performed by another entrusted entity and that they aim to improve the efficiency of the implementation of the space window's activities.	ES (Comments): Renumber this item as "8." (second sequence of numbering). FR (Drafting Suggestions): 8. On the basis of an assessment by the Commission, ESA may be entrusted with other tasks based on the needs of the activities under this section, provided that those tasks do not duplicate activities performed by another entrusted entity and that they aim to improve the efficiency of the implementation of the space window's activities.

PUBLIC

Commission proposal	Drafting Suggestions and Comments
5. Provided that the interests of the Union are protected, the Commission may also entrust, in full or in part, tasks to implement the components supported under this section to relevant entities, such as the European Organisation for the Exploitation of Meteorological Satellites, the European Environment Agency, the European Border and Coast Guard Agency, the European Maritime Safety Agency, the European Union Satellite Centre, the European Centre for Medium-Range Weather Forecasts, and [*Mercator International Centre for the Ocean*].	BE (Comments): This could be linked to the associated services described in Articles 60(2) and 60(5). ES (Comments): Renumber this item as "9." (second sequence of numbering). FR (Drafting Suggestions): 9. Provided that the interests of the Union are protected, the Commission may also entrust, in full or in part, tasks to implement the components supported under this section to relevant entities, such as the European Organisation for the Exploitation of Meteorological Satellites, the European Environment Agency, the European Border and Coast Guard Agency, the European Maritime Safety Agency, the European Union Satellite Centre, the European Centre for Medium-Range Weather Forecasts, and [*Mercator International Centre for the Ocean*] **or other relevant entities from Member States**.. FR (Comments): This could be linked to the associated services described in Articles 60(2) and 60(5). It is relevant to mention these entrusted entities (including Mercator), and to include a reference to the entities of the Member States in order to be complete. DE (Drafting Suggestions): 5. Provided that the interests of the Union are protected, the Commission may also entrust, in full or in part, tasks to implement the

PUBLIC

Commission proposal	Drafting Suggestions and Comments
	components supported under this section, **notably Copernicus**, to relevant entities, such as the European Organisation for the Exploitation of Meteorological Satellites, the European Environment Agency, the European Border and Coast Guard Agency, the European Maritime Safety Agency, the European Union Satellite Centre, the European Centre for Medium-Range Weather Forecasts, and [Mercator International Centre for the Ocean].
Article 76	
Competent authorities	IE (Comments): IE: Who does Cion envisage as being on the competent authority - a mix of technical experts and/or security/trade compliance experts? LT (Comments): General note: it is crucial to avoid any overlaps while creating new governance structures. It is essential to maintain consitency (for example, the requirement to establish NCA is already foreseen in EUSA proposal).
1. Where necessary for security sensitive components, such as Positioning Navigation and Timing, Earth Observation, and Secure Connectivity, each participant to that component appointed to supervise the access to services shall designate a competent authority for each component. The competent authority shall ensure that:	FR (Drafting Suggestions): 1. Where necessary **and required** for ~~security sensitive~~ **certain** components, such as **PRS in** Positioning Navigation and Timing, **EOGS in** Earth Observation, and Secure Connectivity, each participant to ~~that~~ **these** component**s** ~~appointed to supervise the access to services~~ shall designate a competent authority for each component **to supervise the access to services**. The competent authority shall ensure that:

Commission proposal	Drafting Suggestions and Comments
	FR (Comments): We do not understand what is meant by the notion of "security-sensitive components" here. The only existing reference to this concept is in CFSP Decision 2021/698, but this decision has no connection with the requirement to designate competent authorities to supervise access to services for certain components. In order to avoid any confusion with the terms agreed in Decision 2021/698, which have a very specific meaning, we recommend reviewing the wording. Furthermore, not all sub-components require the appointment of a competent authority. It is therefore necessary to be more precise: in the PNT component, only the PRS sub-component requires a CPA; in the EO component, only the EOGS sub-component requires a competent authority. Finally, the paragraph mixes up the concepts and roles of participants and competent authorities. Programme participants are not "appointed" to supervise access to services. The participants in the programme are de facto the EU institutions, the Member States and, where an agreement provides for it, third parties. Each participant is then responsible for appointing a competent authority, which will supervise access to services.
(a) the use of the relevant services is in compliance with the general security requirements referred to in Article 77;	FR (Drafting Suggestions): (a) the use of the relevant services is in compliance with the general security requirements referred to in Article 77**, paragraph 3**;
(b) the access rights to the relevant services are determined and managed;	

Commission proposal	Drafting Suggestions and Comments
(c) user equipment necessary for the use of the relevant services and associated electronic communication connections and information are used and managed in accordance with the general security requirements referred to in Article 77;	
(d) a central point of contact is established to assist as necessary in the reporting of security risks and threats, in particular the detection of potentially harmful electromagnetic interference affecting the services developed under the space policy window.	
2. By derogation to paragraph 1, the actions, tasks and functioning of PRS Competent Authorities are referred to in Article 5 of Decision No 1104/2011/EU.	
Article 77	
Principles of governance and security	DE (Comments): This is to be discussed and commented upon conjointly with experts on security matters (possibly CSC), also due to the COM's decision to examine part of this draft Article within the Council Security Committee rather than the AHWP-MFF(ECF) (see DK presidency flash note for October, Overview table re Wednesday 1/10).

PUBLIC

PUBLIC

Commission proposal	Drafting Suggestions and Comments
1. The principles of governance for the specific activities and components under this section shall be based on the following:	
(a) clear distribution of tasks and responsibilities between the entities involved in the implementation, building on their respective competences and avoiding any overlaps or duplications in tasks and responsibilities and thus ensuring clear accountability;	
(b) relevance of the governance structure to the specific needs of each component and measure as appropriate;	
(c) strong control of the activities and components, including strict adherence to cost, schedule and performance by all the entities, within their respective role and tasks;	
(d) transparent and cost-efficient management;	
(e) service continuity and necessary infrastructure continuity, including protection from relevant threats;	FR (Comments): Consider moving to number 1 objective for existing components. Cf. EGNOS 5 day outage in OCT25 with no public communication by EC.
(f) systematic and structured consideration of the needs of users of the data, information and services provided by the [components], as well as of related scientific and technological evolutions;	

Commission proposal	Drafting Suggestions and Comments
(g) constant efforts to control and reduce risks.	
2. The principles of security or the specific activities and components under this section shall be based on the following:	ES (Drafting Suggestions): 2. The principles of security o~~r~~ **f** the specific activities and components under this section shall be based on the following:
(a) to take account of the experience of the Member States in the field of security and draw inspiration from their best practices;	
(b) to ensure the protection of the ground infrastructures which form an integral part of the space policy window and which are located on their territory the Member States shall take measures which are at least equivalent to those necessary for the protection of European critical infrastructures within the meaning of Council Directive 2008/114/EC;	ES (Drafting Suggestions): (b) to ensure the protection of the ground infrastructures which form an integral part of the space policy window and which are located on the~~ir~~ territory **of** the Member States shall take measures which are at least equivalent to those necessary for the protection of European critical infrastructures within the meaning of Council Directive 2008/114/EC RO (Comments): CD 2008/114/EC was repealed by Directive (EU) 2022/2557
	AT (Drafting Suggestions): **(b bis) to ensure the protection of infrastructure, both ground and space, and of the provision of services, particularly against physical or cyber-attacks, including interference with data streams;**

Commission proposal	Drafting Suggestions and Comments
	AT (Comments): The overall protection of ground AND space infrastructure is essential.
(c) to use the security rules of the Council and of the Commission, which provide, inter alia, for a separation between operational functions and those associated with accreditation;	AT (Comments): Will be discussed by the CSC.
(d) to consider the Commission as Originator of all classified information created by entrusted entities as referred to in Article 68, paragraph 1;	AT (Comments): Will be discussed by the CSC. BE (Comments): What justifies the Commission being designated as the originator of all classified information? What are the 'entrusted entities' referred to in connection with Article 68 (third-party access to services)? If this is not a referencing error, what classified information produced by a third country would be involved? Do you for instance consider that Norway should abandon its originatorship rights (e.g. right to declassification) when sending a classified request for information to EOGS? FR (Comments): What justifies the Commission being designated as the originator of all classified information? What are the 'entrusted entities' referred to in connection with Article 68 (third-party access to services)? If this is not a

PUBLIC

Commission proposal	Drafting Suggestions and Comments
	referencing error, what classified information produced by a third country would be involved? Do you for instance consider that Norway should abandon its originatorship rights (e.g. right to declassification) when sending a classified request for information to EOGS? SI (Drafting Suggestions): (d) to consider the Commission as Originator of all classified information created by entrusted entities as referred to in **"Article 68, paragraph 1"**; SI (Comments): Ariticle 68, paragraph 1 is (by our opinion) not explanatory about the entrusted entities. We advice further check of the subject text.
(e) to ensure that the Security Accreditation Board established by Regulation (EU) [XXX] [*EUSPA founding Reg*] performs its tasks without prejudice to the responsibilities of the Commission or to those entrusted entities, and without prejudice to the competences of the Member States as regards security accreditation;	BE (Drafting Suggestions): (e) to ensure that the Security Accreditation Board**, which shall be the security accreditation authority for all of the Space policy window components defined in Article 58 paragraph 1 points (a), (b), (d), (e), and for the governmental infrastructure and related governmental services of the IRIS² sub-component and GOVSATCOM subcomponent defined in Article 58 paragraph 1 (c),** established by Regulation (EU) [XXX] [*EUSPA founding Reg*] ~~**shall**~~ perform~~s~~ its tasks without prejudice to the responsibilities of the Commission or to those entrusted entities, and without prejudice to the competences of the Member States as regards security accreditation; BE

Commission proposal	Drafting Suggestions and Comments
	(Comments): Same logic than previous comments : we propose to retain the wording agreed in the Space Regulation. "The Security Accreditation Board shall perform its tasks…" is coming from Article 38 paragraph 1 of the Regulation 2021/696, whose paragraph is inspired by. The inclusion of the SAB as accreditation authority is in line with the SAB role as defined in Article 36 of the current Regulation 2021/696 and Article 32 of USC regulation 2023/588. The SAB is the only instance in which Member States are responsible for taking security accreditation decisions independently of the Programme and, to this end, have the capacity to audit the Programme independently. In this sense, the role and responsibilities of the SAB cannot be weakened in this draft regulation. FR (Drafting Suggestions): (e) to ensure that the Security Accreditation Board**, which shall be the security accreditation authority for all of the Space policy window components defined in Article 58 paragraph 1 points (a), (b), (d), (e), and for the governmental infrastructure and related governmental services of the IRIS² sub-component and GOVSATCOM subcomponent defined in Article 58 paragraph 1 (c),** established by Regulation (EU) [XXX] [*EUSPA founding Reg*] **shall** perform~~s~~ its tasks without prejudice to the responsibilities of the Commission or to those entrusted entities, and without prejudice to the competences of the Member States as regards security accreditation; FR (Comments):

Commission proposal	Drafting Suggestions and Comments
	Same logic than previous comments : we propose to retain the wording agreed in the Space Regulation. "The Security Accreditation Board shall perform its tasks…" is coming from Article 38 paragraph 1 of the Regulation 2021/696, whose paragraph is inspired by. The inclusion of the SAB as accreditation authority is in line with the SAB role as defined in Article 36 of the current Regulation 2021/696 and Article 32 of USC regulation 2023/588. The SAB is the only instance in which Member States are responsible for taking security accreditation decisions independently of the Programme and, to this end, have the capacity to audit the Programme independently. In this sense, the role and responsibilities of the SAB cannot be weakened in this draft regulation. RO (Comments): Correlation with EUSPA founding Reg
(f) The security accreditation decisions, as well as the residual risks identified, shall be communicated by the Commission to the Council for information. The Commission may adopt any adequate measures in accordance with this Regulation;	BE (Drafting Suggestions): **(f)** ~~The security accreditation decisions, as well as the residual risks identified, shall be communicated by the Commission to the Council for information. The Commission may adopt any adequate measures in accordance with this Regulation;~~ **The Commission shall keep the European Parliament and the Council informed, without delay, of the impact of the adoption of the decisions on security accreditation on the proper conduct of the Programme's components. If the Commission considers that a decision taken by the Security Accreditation Board could have a significant effect on the proper conduct of those components, for example in terms of costs,**

Commission proposal	Drafting Suggestions and Comments
	schedule or performance, it shall immediately inform the European Parliament and the Council. BE (Comments): The wording proposed at the end of the paragraph could be interpreted as allowing the Commission not to implement security accreditation decisions taken by Member States in the SAB. In order to clarify the meaning and remove any ambiguity, we request to go back to the wording of Article 41.3 of the Regulation 2021/696. This article is also referred to within article 36 of Union Secure Connectivity Regulation (2023/588) whose proposed paragraph is inspired by. FR (Drafting Suggestions): **(f)** ~~The security accreditation decisions, as well as the residual risks identified, shall be communicated by the Commission to the Council for information. The Commission may adopt any adequate measures in accordance with this Regulation;~~ **The Commission shall keep the European Parliament and the Council informed, without delay, of the impact of the adoption of the decisions on security accreditation on the proper conduct of the Programme's components. If the Commission considers that a decision taken by the Security Accreditation Board could have a significant effect on the proper conduct of those components, for example in terms of costs, schedule or performance, it shall immediately inform the European Parliament and the Council.** FR (Comments): The wording proposed at the end of the paragraph could be interpreted as allowing the Commission not to implement security accreditation decisions

Commission proposal	Drafting Suggestions and Comments
	taken by Member States in the SAB. In order to clarify the meaning and remove any ambiguity, we request to go back to the wording of Article 41.3 of the Regulation 2021/696. This article is also referred to within article 36 of Union Secure Connectivity Regulation (2023/588) whose proposed paragraph is inspired by.
(g) to establish a structure to coordinate the operations of the governmental services of the different components with designated national competent authorities or national entities for relevant component	AT (Comments): The term “governmental services” needs to be defined in the ECF Regulation. BE (Comments): Can the Commission provide more information on the strcture and the associated estimated expenses ? FR (Comments): Can the Commission provide more information on the strcture and the associated estimated expenses ?
	AT (Drafting Suggestions): **(d bis) to ensure that the Agency and entities involved in the Programme take all the necessary measures, including in light of the issues identified in the risk and theat analysis referred to in paragraph (3), to ensure the security of the Programme** AT (Comments):

Commission proposal	Drafting Suggestions and Comments
	We need to make sure that all entities involved take care of security precautions.
3. The Commission shall ensure that a risk and threat analysis is performed for each new component and maintained for the existing components. Based on that analysis, it shall determine, by means of implementing acts, for each component, the general security requirements. Those implementing acts shall be adopted in accordance with the examination procedure referred to in Article 83, paragraph 3.	AT (Drafting Suggestions): 3. The Commission shall **be responsible for the operational security and shall** ensure that a risk and threat analysis is performed for each new component and maintained for the existing components. Based on that analysis, it shall determine, by means of implementing acts, for each component, the general security requirements. Those implementing acts shall be adopted in accordance with the examination procedure referred to in Article 83, paragraph 3. AT (Comments): This is an important addition! For better comparability, the risk and threat analysis should be standardised by the Commission. BE (Drafting Suggestions): 3. The Commission shall ensure that a risk and threat analysis is performed for each new component and maintained for the existing components. Based on that analysis, it shall determine, by means of implementing acts, for each component, the general security requirements. **In doing so, the Commission shall take account of the impact of those requirements on the smooth functioning of that component, in particular in terms of cost, risk management and schedule, and shall ensure that the general level of security is not reduced and that the functioning of the existing equipment based on that component is not undermined and shall take into account**

Commission proposal	Drafting Suggestions and Comments
	cybersecurity risks. Those implementing acts shall be adopted in accordance with the examination procedure referred to in Article 83, paragraph 3. BE (Comments): Same logic than previous comments : we propose to retain the wording agreed in the Space Regulation. The proposal comes from Article 34(2) of Regulation 2021/696. FR (Drafting Suggestions): 3. The Commission shall ensure that a risk and threat analysis is performed for each new component and maintained for the existing components. Based on that analysis, it shall determine, by means of implementing acts, for each component, the general security requirements. **In doing so, the Commission shall take account of the impact of those requirements on the smooth functioning of that component, in particular in terms of cost, risk management and schedule, and shall ensure that the general level of security is not reduced and that the functioning of the existing equipment based on that component is not undermined and shall take into account** **cybersecurity risks**. Those implementing acts shall be adopted in accordance with the examination procedure referred to in Article 83, paragraph 3. FR (Comments): Same logic than previous comments : we propose to retain the wording agreed in the Space Regulation. The proposal comes from Article 34(2) of Regulation 2021/696, whose paragraph is inspired by.

Commission proposal	Drafting Suggestions and Comments
4. Whenever the security of the Union or its Member States may be affected by the operation of the systems, the procedures set out in Decision (CFSP) 2021/698 shall apply where relevant.	BE (Drafting Suggestions): Whenever the security of the Union or its Member States may be affected by the operation of the systems, the procedures set out in Decision (CFSP) 2021/698 shall apply ~~where relevant~~. BE (Comments): Article 35 of current EU Space regulation does not include the words "where relevant". FR (Drafting Suggestions): Whenever the security of the Union or its Member States may be affected by the operation of the systems, the procedures set out in Decision (CFSP) 2021/698 shall apply ~~where relevant~~. FR (Comments): Article 35 of current EU Space regulation whose paragraph is inspired by does not include the words "where relevant".
	BE (Drafting Suggestions): **Article 77a** **General principles of security accreditation** 1. **Security accreditation activities for all of the Space policy window components shall be conducted in accordance with the following principles:**

Commission proposal	Drafting Suggestions and Comments
	(a) security accreditation activities and decisions shall be undertaken in a context of collective responsibility for the security of the Union and of the Member States; **(b) efforts shall be made for decisions within the Security Accreditation Board to be reached by consensus;** **(c) security accreditation activities shall be carried out using a risk assessment and management approach, considering risks to the security of the component concerned as well as the impact on cost or schedule of any measure to mitigate the risks, taking into account the objective not to lower the general level of security of that component;** **(d) decisions of the Security Accreditation Board on security accreditation shall be prepared and taken by professionals who are duly qualified in the field of accrediting complex systems, have an appropriate level of security clearance and who act objectively;** **(e) efforts shall be made to consult all relevant parties with an interest in security issues for the component concerned;** **(f) security accreditation activities shall be carried out by all relevant stakeholders of the component concerned in accordance with a security accreditation strategy, without prejudice to the role of the Commission;** **(g) decisions of the Security Accreditation Board on security accreditation shall, following the process defined in the relevant security accreditation strategy defined by that Board, be based on local decisions on security accreditation taken by the respective national security accreditation authorities of the Member States;** **(h) a permanent, transparent and fully understandable monitoring process shall ensure that the security risks for the component concerned are known, that security measures are defined to reduce such risks to an acceptable level, in view of the security needs of the Union and of its Member States, and for the smooth running of the component and that those measures are applied in accordance with the concept of defence in depth. The effectiveness of such measures shall be continuously evaluated. The process relating to security risk assessment and management shall be**

Commission proposal	Drafting Suggestions and Comments
	conducted as an iterative process jointly by the stakeholders of the component concerned; **(i) the Security Accreditation Board shall take decisions on security accreditation in a strictly independent manner, including with regard to the Commission and the other bodies responsible for the implementation of the component concerned and for the provision of related services, and with regard to the Executive Director and the Administrative Board of the Agency.** **(j) security accreditation activities shall be carried out with due regard for the need for adequate coordination between the Commission and the authorities responsible for implementing security rules;** **(k) the security accreditation of EGNOS performed by the Security Accreditation Board shall be without prejudice to the accreditation activities performed, for aviation, by the European Aviation Safety Agency** **For the purposes of the component Secure Connectivity, the term 'component' shall be read as 'governmental infrastructure'.** BE (Comments): Article 77 sets out the programme governance principles and security governance principles. However, the security accreditation governance principles have been omitted. Yet, the need to refere to the security accreditation procedure can be found in the Regulation, for example in Article 61.1(e)(2). The security accreditation principles must be then reinstated, also in line with Article 77.2(e) which specifies that the SAB is security accreditationa authority for all space components.

Commission proposal	Drafting Suggestions and Comments
	We therefore propose reinstating the article 37 on general security accreditation principles as stated in the Regulation 2021/696. Furthermore, the definition of the terms in the article on security accreditation principles needs to be clarified with regard to the Secure Connectivity component in order to clearly understand which assets are subject to the accreditation process. FR (Drafting Suggestions): **Article 77a** **General principles of security accreditation** **2. Security accreditation activities for all of the Space policy window components shall be conducted in accordance with the following principles:** **(a) security accreditation activities and decisions shall be undertaken in a context of collective responsibility for the security of the Union and of the Member States;** **(b) efforts shall be made for decisions within the Security Accreditation Board to be reached by consensus;** **(c) security accreditation activities shall be carried out using a risk assessment and management approach, considering risks to the security of the component concerned as well as the impact on cost or schedule of any measure to mitigate the risks, taking into account the objective not to lower the general level of security of that component;** **(d) decisions of the Security Accreditation Board on security accreditation shall be prepared and taken by professionals who are duly qualified in the field of accrediting complex systems, have an appropriate level of security clearance and who act objectively;**

Commission proposal	Drafting Suggestions and Comments
	(e) efforts shall be made to consult all relevant parties with an interest in security issues for the component concerned; (f) security accreditation activities shall be carried out by all relevant stakeholders of the component concerned in accordance with a security accreditation strategy, without prejudice to the role of the Commission; (g) decisions of the Security Accreditation Board on security accreditation shall, following the process defined in the relevant security accreditation strategy defined by that Board, be based on local decisions on security accreditation taken by the respective national security accreditation authorities of the Member States; (h) a permanent, transparent and fully understandable monitoring process shall ensure that the security risks for the component concerned are known, that security measures are defined to reduce such risks to an acceptable level, in view of the security needs of the Union and of its Member States, and for the smooth running of the component and that those measures are applied in accordance with the concept of defence in depth. The effectiveness of such measures shall be continuously evaluated. The process relating to security risk assessment and management shall be conducted as an iterative process jointly by the stakeholders of the component concerned; (i) the Security Accreditation Board shall take decisions on security accreditation in a strictly independent manner, including with regard to the Commission and the other bodies responsible for the implementation of the component concerned and for the provision of related services, and with regard to the Executive Director and the Administrative Board of the Agency ; (j) security accreditation activities shall be carried out with due regard for the need for adequate coordination between the Commission and the authorities responsible for implementing security rules; (k) the security accreditation of EGNOS performed by the Security Accreditation Board shall be without prejudice to the accreditation

Commission proposal	Drafting Suggestions and Comments
	activities performed, for aviation, by the European Aviation Safety Agency. **For the purposes of the component Secure Connectivity, the term 'component' shall be read as 'governmental infrastructure'.** FR (Comments): Article 77 sets out the programme governance principles and security governance principles. However, the security accreditation governance principles have been omitted. Yet, he need to refere to the security accreditation procedure can be found in the Regulation, for example in Article 61.1(e)(2). The security accreditation principles must be then reinstated, also in line with Article 77.2(e) which specifies that the SAB is security accreditationa authority for all space components. We therefore propose reinstating the article 37 on general security accreditation principles as stated in the Regulation 2021/696. Furthermore, the definition of the terms in the article on security accreditation principles needs to be clarified with regard to the Secure Connectivity component in order to clearly understand which assets are subject to the accreditation process.

PUBLIC

Commission proposal	Drafting Suggestions and Comments
Article 78	AT (Comments): Will be discussed by the CSC. DE (Comments): This is to be discussed and commented upon conjointly with experts on security matters (possibly CSC), also due to the COM's decision to examine this draft Article solely within the Council Security Committee, and not in the AHWP-MFF(ECF) (see DK presidency flash note for October, Overview table re Wednesday 1/10).
Complementary rules on the protection of classified information	IT (Comments): Ensure full consistency with EUCI handling and national security authorities' competences (vetting, FSC/PSC processes) and with the governance provisions in Article 77, avoiding overlaps in the origin and handling of classified information
1. The exchange of classified information related to the components supported under this sections hall be subject to the existence of an international agreement between the Union and a third country or international organisation on the exchange of classified information or, where applicable, an arrangement entered into by the competent Union institution or body and the relevant authorities of a third country or international organisation on the exchange of classified information, and to the conditions laid down therein.	ES (Drafting Suggestions): 1. The exchange of classified information related to the components supported under this sections **s**hall be subject to the existence of an international agreement between the Union and a third country or international organisation on the exchange of classified information or, where applicable, an arrangement entered into by the competent Union institution or body and the relevant authorities of a third country or international organisation on the exchange of classified information, and to the conditions laid down therein.

Commission proposal	Drafting Suggestions and Comments
	ES (Comments): shall be subject to SI (Drafting Suggestions): The exchange of classified information related to the components supported under this sections **s**hall be subject to the existence of an international agreement between the Union and a third country or international organisation on the exchange of classified information or, where applicable, an arrangement entered into by the competent Union institution or body and the relevant authorities of a third country or international organisation on the exchange of classified information, and to the conditions laid down therein. SI (Comments): Missing letter, as indicated.
2. Natural persons resident in and legal persons established in third countries may deal with EUCI regarding the space policy window's only where they are subject, in those third countries, to security regulations ensuring a degree of protection at least equivalent to that provided by the Commission's rules on security set out in Decision (EU, Euratom) 2015/444 and by the security rules of the Council set out in the Annexes to Decision 2013/488/EU. The equivalence of the security regulations applied in a third country or international organisation shall be defined in a security of information agreement, including, if relevant, industrial security matters, concluded between the Union and that third country or international organisation in accordance with the procedure provided for in Article 218 TFEU and taking into account Article 13 of Decision 2013/488/EU.	

PUBLIC

Commission proposal	Drafting Suggestions and Comments
3. Without prejudice to Article 13 of Decision 2013/488/EU and to the rules governing the field of industrial security as set out in Decision (EU, Euratom) 2015/444, a natural person or legal person, third country or international organisation may be given access to EUCI where deemed necessary on a case-by-case basis, according to the nature and content of such information, the recipient's need-to-know and the degree of advantage to the Union.	
	EL (Comments): To ensure effective governance and implementation, the ECF should treat space as a high-level strategic window with a 'light' regulatory footprint, complemented by a detailed, stand-alone Space legal document covering programme structures, funding, and agency roles. This dual approach will secure flexibility, legal certainty, and continuity for flagship EU space initiatives. RO (Drafting Suggestions): **4. Any further disclosure, subcontracting, or sharing of EUCI by third-country entities shall be strictly prohibited unless explicitly authorized under the original agreement or arrangement** RO (Comments): The Union/MS shall reserve the right to suspend or revoke access to EUCI for any third-country entity or individual in case of non-compliance, breach of security protocols, or significant changes in the political or security environment and a coordinated incident response protocol shall be ensured

PUBLIC

Commission proposal	Drafting Suggestions and Comments
	between the Union institutions, Member States' security authorities, and relevant oversight bodies. DE (Drafting Suggestions): Request for COM to propose provisions based on Article 102 current space programme regulation, however with inclusion of the RSB, to ensure that the important goals of increased competitveness and efficiency are effectively put into place and independent recommendations provided to COM on possible improvements thereon. DE (Comments): In the interest of a transparent and efficient governance, we request provisions devoted to the planning, assessment, evaluation and control of the proposed space section, with sufficient Member State involvement. Specifically, a stringent mid-term evaluation and submission thereof to the RSB is necessary, see also Art. 102 of the current space programme regulation.

PUBLIC