

ABSTRACT

The Artemis Program exemplifies how the rapidly developing commercialization of space, particularly the moon, contributes to the development of emerging norms on the issue of benefit-sharing as a crucial legal discourse. Although the 1967 Outer Space Treaty and the 1979 Moon Agreement appear to guarantee equitable benefit-sharing among states, the absence of a centralized authority making it impossible to guarantee and realize a specific mechanism. This research contributes by addressing why such centralized authority does not exist in the international space legal framework. The study focuses on conducting comparative analysis of the current framework to assess internal coherence, alongside comparison with the law of the sea regime, particularly the International Seabed Authority as comparative benchmark. This doctrinal research employs three approaches: statute, conceptual, and comparative. The research specification is descriptive analysis with data obtained from secondary data including applicable international agreements, books, and journals, which then analyzed through a qualitative data analysis method. The results show that the existing international space legal framework does not provide an adequate normative basis for the establishment of a centralized authority, and that benefit-sharing duties under the 1967 Outer Space Treaty and the 1979 Moon Agreement are best classified as obligations of means.

[Keywords: Benefit-Sharing, Space Law, Artemis Program]