

## **B. ABM Treaty 1972**

Calls for multilateralizing the ABM Treaty have primarily been aimed at encouraging the US and Russia to extend to satellites of third countries the arrangements concerning the immunity of certain space objects already agreed between them bilaterally.<sup>45</sup>

Other proposals have aimed at extending some of the limitations found in the ABM Treaty to "other technologically advanced States".<sup>46</sup>

To date, neither the US nor Russia have formally supported the idea of multilateralization of the ABM Treaty.

Nevertheless, the proposals could be incorporated into future outer space arms control agreements.

## **C. Registration Convention 1975**

In general, the proposals to reinforce the registration Convention are centered on the provisions of Article IV. Perceived shortcomings of this provision include the fact that not a single State has registered a single satellite as having military applications. In most cases, notifications have been submitted to the UN registry two to six months after launch.

Various proposals have been advanced to resolve these perceived shortcomings.<sup>47</sup>

In order to enhance knowledge of spacecraft, and in particular to clarify responsibilities in the event of an incident, it has been suggested that the register should also include the following information or demand the following actions: the orbital characteristics of each satellite; details of its maneuverability; announcing manoeuvres of spacecraft in advance; information on energy sources available on board; certain other functional characteristics (mass, size, expected life of the space vehicle); to reduce the time taken to notify the Secretary General of information; to establish a fixed interval between the time of the launch and the time of notification; the possibility of informing the United Nations Secretary-General of launch forecasts; and to update information regularly.

All of these proposals reflect the positions of delegations which sustain the viability of the Registration Convention as an instrument via which some outer space activities of military value may be governed. It should be noted that that this view is not shared unanimously.<sup>48</sup> Several delegations are of the opinion that the Registration Convention is neither an arms control

---

<sup>45</sup> See, "Statement submitted by Australia to the Conference on Disarmament", CD/PV 279; "Prevention of an Arms Race in Outer Space", CD/375, 14 April 1983; "Statement submitted by the Federal Republic of Germany to the Conference on Disarmament", CD/PV 345, 6 March 1986.

<sup>46</sup> See, "Statement submitted by Pakistan to the Conference on Disarmament", CD/PV 367, 3 July 1986.

<sup>47</sup> Argentina, "Proposals for the Strengthening of the Regime Established by the Convention on Registration of Objects Launched into Outer Space", CD/OS/WP.42, 18 July 1990. "Prevention of an Arms Race in Outer Space: Confidence Building Measures and Transparency," Working paper submitted by France to the Conference on Disarmament, CD/1092, 1 August 1991, at 3. Australia and Canada, CD/PV 468.

<sup>48</sup> Statement submitted by Japan to the Conference on Disarmament", Conference on Disarmament, CD/PV 419, 7 July 1987, at 12. United States, CD/905.