

34. Various other possible measures relating to the security of satellites were mentioned, such as multilateralizing the immunity provided for in certain bilateral agreements to satellites that serve as national technical means of verification, a "rules-of-the-road" agreement, the reaffirmation and development of the principle of non-interference with peaceful space activities and the elaboration of a code of conduct in outer space to prevent the risks and fears that could arise from certain manoeuvres of space objects.

35. One delegation noted that international legal instruments already existed to ensure the immunity of satellites. This delegation stated that these instruments prohibit the use of force and the threat of the use of force against satellites except in cases of self-defence. This delegation noted, however, that these instruments are not intended to compromise the inherent right of sovereign States to take adequate measures to protect themselves in the event of the threat or use of force.

36. Many delegations noted that general provisions on the prohibition of the use or threat of use of force have unfortunately not proved to be adequately binding in the past. This has necessitated the growing need for negotiation of specific disarmament agreements, for example, those relating to chemical and biological weapons, inhumane weapons, etc.

37. One delegation recalled its proposal for the conclusion of a multilateral agreement to supplement the 1972 ABM Treaty (CD/708).

38. Some delegations highlighted the contribution that confidence-building measures could make to the objective of preventing an arms race in outer space and stressed in that regard the importance of transparency in the activities of States and of accurate information on how outer space was being used. It was pointed out that to date not a single one of the space launches registered had been described as having military purposes, although well over half of space objects performed military functions. The view was expressed by another delegation that there was a need for expert examination of the parameters on which information should be provided and it was suggested that a group of experts be set up for that purpose. Some other delegations believed that the strengthening of the Registration Convention would be a valuable confidence-building measure, and they discussed various ways and means of improving the system of notification established thereunder with a view to assuring the availability of timely and adequate information on the nature and purposes of space activities. A proposal was submitted (CD/OS/WP.25), suggesting that an understanding be reached among States parties to the Convention that in discharging their reporting responsibilities they would provide timely, accurate information on the functions of a satellite, including whether it fulfilled a civilian or military mission or both. This same proposal included the suggestion that States which have launched space objects, but are not party to the Convention should join the Convention or agree to submit the same information under the terms of General Assembly resolution 1721 (XVI). A number of delegations also noted that the proposed course of action submitted in CD/OS/WP.25 would enhance confidence through the provision of more specific information regarding objects launched into space as well as through increased adherence and better compliance with an existing legal instrument. It was believed that although the Convention had not been negotiated as an agreement in the field of arms limitation and disarmament, it offered possibilities that could be used to advantage in this field. Another