



General Assembly

Seventy-eighth session

First Committee

27th meeting

Tuesday, 31 October 2023, 10 a.m.
New York

Official Records

Chair: Mr. Paulauskas (Lithuania)

The meeting was called to order at 10 a.m.

Agenda items 90 to 106 (continued)

Action on all draft resolutions and decisions submitted under disarmament and international security agenda items

The Chair: The Committee will continue to take action on all draft resolutions and draft decisions submitted under agenda items 90 to 106. We will be guided by the same procedure agreed at our meeting on 27 October (see A/C.1/78/PV.25). We will begin by taking action on the draft resolutions and draft decisions under cluster 3, “Outer space (disarmament aspects)”, as contained in informal paper A/C.1/78/INF/1/Rev.5. Thereafter, the Committee will consider the proposals contained in informal paper A/C.1/78/INF/2/Rev.2, which has been circulated to delegations electronically.

First, I shall give the floor to delegations wishing to make either a general statement or to introduce new or revised drafts under cluster 3, “Outer space (disarmament aspects)”. Delegations are reminded that statements are limited to five minutes. Microphones will be automatically cut once the time limit is reached.

I call on the representative of the United Kingdom to introduce draft resolution A/C.1/78/L.15/Rev.1.

Mr. Liddle (United Kingdom): I take the floor on behalf of the United Kingdom to introduce draft resolution A/C.1/78/L.15/Rev.1, “Reducing space threats through norms, rules and principles of responsible behaviours”. The initiative has received the overwhelming support of the General Assembly since

the first resolution of that title was adopted in 2020 under the agenda item “Prevention of an arms race in outer space” (resolution 75/35). It was motivated by the increasingly urgent need to find a way of breaking the long-standing impasse on the prevention of an arms race in outer space (PAROS) by looking at the problem with fresh eyes, taking into account the significant developments in the outer space domain in recent years.

The responsible behaviours initiative focuses on the full range of threats to, from and in space, and all the factors that could drive an arms race in outer space. It recognizes that PAROS measures could be expressed in legally binding instruments or in political commitments, and that the two are mutually reinforcing. It posits that measures to regulate the observable actions of States are more likely to achieve the goals of PAROS than unverifiable measures to ban certain capabilities. Our approach has been inclusive, providing a platform for spacefaring and aspiring spacefaring nations, as well as those that increasingly rely on space services for their security and prosperity.

We all have a stake in protecting space systems and working together to achieve a secure and sustainable space environment. While that is and will remain a State-led process, we also want all perspectives — including those of international organizations, industry and academia — to be represented and taken into account. While the Open-ended Working Group on reducing space threats through norms, rules and principles of responsible behaviours (OEWG), established by resolution 76/231, could not reach consensus on a set of substantive recommendations, most participating

This record contains the text of speeches delivered in English and of the translation of speeches delivered in other languages. Corrections should be submitted to the original languages only. They should be incorporated in a copy of the record and sent under the signature of a member of the delegation concerned to the Chief of the Verbatim Reporting Service, room AB-0928 (verbatimrecords@un.org). Corrected records will be reissued electronically on the Official Document System of the United Nations (<http://documents.un.org>).



delegations, including those that had not supported the resolution that created it, indicated that its work had brought fresh thinking to PAROS. In the closing session of the OEWG, we heard many calls to continue those discussions and to take forward the elaboration of norms, rules and principles in the area areas of concern that had been identified.

We were hugely encouraged by the statement of support from 39 countries from across different regions. Those calls were echoed by the Secretary-General in his Our Common Agenda policy brief, in which he recommended that States

“develop, with the widest possible acceptance, international norms, rules and principles to address threats to space systems and, on that basis, launch negotiations on a treaty to ensure peace, security and the prevention of an arms race in outer space” (A/77/CRP.1/Add.6, p. 18).

The purpose of the present draft resolution is to respond to those calls. The second OEWG would elaborate further the concept of norms, rules and principles of responsible behaviours and make recommendations on the development of such norms, rules and principles in five specific areas that were the particular focus of discussions and proposals in the 2022-2023 OEWG. The mandate of the new group would also include consideration of how such norms, rules and principles could be monitored and verified.

Over the past two months, we have consulted widely and openly on the draft resolution, refining and improving the text in discussion with Member States. Thanks to comments we have received, it articulates more clearly the relationship between legally binding instruments and political commitments and the contribution of norms, rules and principles of responsible behaviours to PAROS. I thank all those delegations that have given us their advice and encouragement through that process.

My delegation shares the view, which has been widely expressed by others, that having two proposals for OEWGs on matters concerning the prevention of an arms race in outer space represents an unacceptable burden on the resources of Member States and of the Secretariat alike. We have engaged constructively and with an open mind with proposals to consolidate discussions on PAROS into a single process, while respecting the broad support for the responsible

behaviours approach and for the open and inclusive modalities that characterized the first OEWG.

That flexibility was, however, not reciprocated. The decision on the way forward therefore now rests in the hands of the Committee. The delegation of the United Kingdom is grateful for the continued support and cooperation of United Nations Member States in our common endeavour to prevent an arms race in outer space.

Mr. Shen Jian (China) (*spoke in Chinese*): The Chinese delegation has co-sponsored draft resolutions A/C.1/78/L.3, A/C.1/78/L.53, A/C.1/78/L.54 and A/C.1/78/L.55, and wishes to avail itself of this opportunity to elaborate China's position in greater detail.

The first special session on disarmament in 1978 put forward the clear goal of the prevention of an arms race in outer space (PAROS) through negotiations. China believes that the fundamental solution to the issue of outer space security is to negotiate an international legally binding instrument. China supports the United Nations, especially the Conference on Disarmament, in Geneva, in acting as the main platform to strive for a negotiated international legal instrument in the area of outer space arms control at an early date. Draft resolutions A/C.1/78/L.3, A/C.1/78/L.53, A/C.1/78/L.54 and A/C.1/78/L.55 are aimed at advancing the aforementioned objectives in a substantive way.

Draft resolution A/C.1/78/L.55 proposes the establishment of an open-ended working group (OEWG) on PAROS to continue to hold extensive deliberations on substantial elements of an international legally binding instrument on PAROS to build on the work of the Group of Governmental Experts in a more open manner, to assist in negotiations on the relevant international legally binding instrument, and to preserve peace and security in outer space. China notes concerns raised by a number of countries regarding a parallel process within the United Nations framework on PAROS. We commend the efforts made by the main sponsors of draft resolution A/C.1/78/L.3 and the parties concerned to narrow their differences. We hope that all parties can uphold true multilateralism, balance different proposals and work in synergy to converge rather than diverge international efforts to push for a negotiated legal instrument on arms control in outer space.

We regret that a few countries requested recorded voted on certain paragraphs of draft resolutions

A/C.1/78/L.53 and A/C.1/78/L.55. As the chronicle of world history has evolved into the chapter of the twenty-first century, human beings have broken down barriers in geography, ethnicity and culture, and are now living in the same global village to partake of the benefits of outer space and coexist in a community of shared interests, responsibilities and future — a community whose well-being and security are interrelated.

PAROS and the maintenance of sustained peace and security in outer space bear on the well-being of the entire human community. The 1967 Treaty on Principles Governing the Activities of States in the Exploration and Use of Outer Space, including the Moon and Other Celestial Bodies recognized the common interest of all humankind in the progress of the exploration and use of outer space for peaceful purposes. In the introduction to his policy brief “For All Humanity — The Future of Outer Space Governance”, Secretary-General António Guterres stressed that we have a “common interest in preserving the domain of outer space, a province of humankind that benefits us all”.

To practice in outer space the concept of a community with a shared future for humankind is to preserve an outer space featuring peace, security, openness and cooperation, and to ensure that humankind as a whole can share the dividends of outer space, security and development. That is highly consistent with the aforementioned spirit and speaks fully to our shared aspiration to maintain common security in outer space. It has been supported and endorsed by the vast majority of Member States. We must also point out that the language of a United Nations document needs to be the crystallization of the wisdom of the broader membership. It is not the property or the prerogative of any single country. It must not be tainted by ideology. It is the embodiment of true multilateralism.

In the light of all that, China calls on all members to vote in favour of draft resolutions A/C.1/78/L.3, A/C.1/78/L.53, A/C.1/78/L.54 and A/C.1/78/L.55 and the relevant paragraphs therein.

The Chair: I give the floor to the representative of the Russian Federation to introduce draft resolutions A/C.1/78/L.53, A/C.1/78/L.54 and A/C.1/78/L.55.

Mr. Belousov (Russian Federation) (*spoke in Russian*): In the current conditions, in which the development and well-being of States are increasingly dependent on space technologies, preserving space free of any kind of weapon, preventing its transformation

into an arena of armed confrontation and maintaining it as a safe environment for peaceful exploration is becoming one of the key priorities of the international community. In that regard, consolidated steps developed on a truly collective basis are required now more than ever to counter the weaponization of outer space, the use of force potential in and from space and the erection of unilateral barriers on the path to the non-discriminatory participation of all countries in space activities and access to the benefits provided by space technologies.

That task can and must be solved by developing a multilateral legally binding agreement or agreements to prevent an arms race in outer space. Such an agreement should contain reliable guarantees against the placement of weapons in outer space and the use of force or threat of force against space property and the infrastructure supporting it. Moreover, such an agreement, to which all space-significant States must become parties, is intended to eliminate the existing gaps in the current international space law and, at the same time, not undermine it but rather harmoniously complement it. We believe that this approach has been and remains a reliable basis for international regulation of space activities.

The work on preparing the agreement on the prevention of an arms race in outer space (PAROS) must be transparent, inclusive, consistent and constructive. That is precisely what draft resolution A/C.1/78/L.55, “Further practical measures for the prevention of an arms race in outer space”, is aimed at. It provides for the creation of a specialized open-ended working group of the United Nations that would operate on the basis of consensus. The activities of the format proposed by Russia also presuppose a broad discussion of other possible instruments and mechanisms that could facilitate the solution of PAROS tasks and serve as a significant addition to future legally binding agreements. In that regard, we emphasize the importance of the Russian draft resolutions A/C.1/78/L.54, “Transparency and confidence-building measures in outer space activities”, and A/C.1/78/L.53, “No first placement of weapons in outer space”.

The statements of our opponents representing the collective West, about the impossibility of developing an effective legally binding document capable of protecting outer space from uncontrolled militarization, are perplexing. After all, it is the Western countries that have been avoiding the launch of negotiations on

such an agreement for the past 15 years under various pretexts and have even blocked them. Moreover, their arguments in favour of such negotiations remain untenable. That position is primarily due to the fact that the plans of the United States and its allies to use outer space to conduct military operations contradict the preparation of such an agreement or agreements. Those same plans also determine the emergence of the concept of responsible behaviour in space. It has become clear that this concept is being used as a screen to cover up the true intentions of the Western States in space, as is eloquently evidenced by their national and group doctrinal guidelines.

Moreover, the concept of responsible behaviour is already being used for propaganda purposes. Everything that is being done by Western countries in near-Earth space is unconditionally recognized as legal and responsible. At the same time, in essence, any activity of other cosmically significant States is condemned and branded as irresponsible. It is obvious that such actions run counter to the statements of Western States about their readiness to develop, on a collective basis, measures to ensure the safety of space activities.

Mrs. Romero López (Cuba) (*spoke in Spanish*): The delegation of Cuba supports and has sponsored draft resolutions A/C.1/78/L.3, "Prevention of an arms race in outer space"; A/C.1/78/L.53, "No first placement of weapons in outer space"; A/C.1/78/L.54, "Transparency and confidence-building measures in outer space activities"; and A/C.1/78/L.55, "Further practical measures for the prevention of an arms race in outer space".

We support the legitimate right of all States to enjoy access to outer space for its exclusively peaceful use as a common heritage of humankind and without discrimination. We reiterate the urgent need to strengthen the legal regime applicable to outer space. In that regard, we support negotiations and the early adoption of a multilateral legally binding treaty for the prevention of an arms race in outer space, including the prohibition of placement of weapons therein. The Group of Governmental Experts established pursuant to resolution 77/250 is working to advance that instrument. We hope that the format for discussing that extremely important instrument for disarmament and international security can be expanded through the establishment of an open-ended working group that would allow for the participation of all States, as proposed in draft resolution A/C.1/78/L.55.

At the same time, we support voluntary transparency and confidence-building measures and activities related to outer space, although they do not substitute for the adoption of a legally binding instrument in that area. We support and promote the policy of no first placement of weapons of any kind in outer space.

We urge Member States to vote in favour of draft resolutions A/C.1/78/L.3, A/C.1/78/L.53, A/C.1/78/L.54 and A/C.1/78/L.55 and their various relevant paragraphs on which separate, recorded votes have been requested.

The Chair: I now call on those representatives wishing to deliver explanations of vote or position before the voting.

Mr. Ghorbanpour (Islamic Republic of Iran): I have taken the floor to explain the position of my delegation on draft resolution A/C.1/78/L.15/Rev.1, "Reducing space threats through norms, rules and principles of responsible behaviours".

Some years back, the possibility of an arms race in outer space was only a potential risk. It has now become a real and serious threat to our ability to cope with the threat of the militarization of outer space. Discussions on the development of a legally binding instrument specifically related to the prevention of an arms race in outer space are especially necessary. The 1967 Treaty on Principles Governing the Activities of States in the Exploration and Use of Outer Space, including the Moon and Other Celestial Bodies is not enough to make outer space a safer place, simply because it does not mention or address other types of weapons and military activities.

It is our principled position that, on the one hand, outer space is humankind's common heritage that should be protected against any attempt to weaponize or realize an arms race in that area. On the other hand, the development of certain tangible measures to promote and facilitate international cooperation through the transfer of technical knowledge, technology and the required equipment is improving. Besides transparency and confidence-building measures, which are complementary to each other, the monopoly of a few countries or the imposition of any restriction on the transfer of space-related science, expertise, technology and services to developing countries should be rejected.

The proposal to establish another open-ended working group (OEWG) with the same defects and ill-defined modality as the previous one, at a time when the

political stance of Member States remains unchanged, raises concerns regarding its constructive nature. That proposal, in the context of the recently established Group of Governmental Experts, may potentially undermine the Group's efficacy by suggesting that its success is not imperative, given the possible establishment of another OEWG in the future. Moreover, such a move could have far-reaching implications not only for the working agenda of the Conference on Disarmament, particularly in matters related to the prevention of an arms race in outer space, but also for the establishment of a negotiating committee for the development of a legally binding instrument, as proposed by China and Russia in the draft treaty on the prevention of the placement of weapons in outer space and of the threat or use of force against outer space objects.

Having said that, Iran will vote against draft resolution A/C.1/78/L.15/Rev.1 and calls upon the delegations of developing countries to do so. From our point of view, it not only fails to reflect the aforementioned principles, but also tries to set preconditions for enjoying outer space and satellite technology for peaceful purposes. Any pretext to prevent developing countries from becoming spacefaring nations is rejected. We are of the view that the adoption of such a draft could lead us to a divisive situation in which United Nations Member States would be forced to split into groups of so-called responsible versus irresponsible States. That situation is completely unacceptable. Furthermore, the draft resolution overlaps with the agendas of the Committee on the Peaceful Uses of Outer Space and the First Committee, which should be avoided.

Last but not least, if there is a genuine intention to contribute to a safe and secure space, we should start from the negotiation of a legally binding instrument.

Mr. Turner (United States of America): The United States has the honour to deliver this explanation of vote on behalf of the United States, France and the United Kingdom on draft resolution A/C.1/78/L.55, "Further practical measures for the prevention of an arms race in outer space". We will vote no and we urge all delegations to do likewise.

The United States, the United Kingdom and France have consistently engaged constructively and pragmatically with other United Nations Member States in order to strengthen the safety, stability, security and sustainability of outer space activities and to prevent an arms race in outer space. The safety and security of the

outer space environment are an issue that will impact all countries, and we have a shared responsibility to work together to address dangerous and destabilizing behaviours that may potentially lead to conflict.

We believe that our common goal of achieving progress and preventing an arms race in outer space in all its aspects can be best and most quickly achieved by reducing the threats or perceived threats to space activities. That is why we have led efforts at the United Nations to create pragmatic and effective initiatives to discuss current security threats in outer space and approaches to mitigating them, including draft resolution A/C.1/78/L.15/Rev.1 this year, which would establish an open-ended working group on reducing space threats through norms, rules and principles of responsible behaviours to build upon the progress made during the last working group.

Conversely, we have repeatedly seen Russia, the principal author of draft resolution A/C.1/78/L.55, impeding productive discussion on those issues that a vast majority of States were visibly interested in pursuing at the last Open-ended Working Group (OEWG) on reducing space threats through norms, rules and principles of responsible behaviours, even those that initially expressed reservations. Russia made no serious attempts to negotiate the content of the report, and Russia's obstructionism prevented the OEWG from reaching consensus, even on a simple procedural report. Despite Russia's spoiling tactics, the vast majority of States at the OEWG noted that the forum had proven itself and supported the continuation of that process.

While Russia did all it could to prevent States from discussing responsible behaviours at the United Nations, it continues to advance spurious justifications for its own irresponsible conduct, such as the destructive direct-descent anti-satellite missile test that created more than 1,000 pieces of debris, or the use of threatening rhetoric against satellites of other countries. Russia seeks to lock us into the same stagnant debate that has not made progress since 1978.

If we are serious about addressing issues related to preventing an arms race in outer space, then we cannot be focused solely on rushing to negotiate a legally binding instrument on no solid ground or on proposals that seek only to limit the deployment of space capabilities, which is what the open-ended working group to be established under draft resolution

A/C.1/78/L.55 would seek to do. That OEWG would be duplicative and limited in scope and would not foster unity or consensus among United Nations Member States. It would seek only to drag Member States into a never-ending process, instead of making concrete, step-by-step progress.

Instead, we should respond to the recommendation from the Secretary-General's report from the seventy-sixth session, which calls for a broad approach, stating

"I continue to believe that a combination of binding and non-binding norms is needed, building on existing frameworks and drawing in the full range of actors now involved in space exploration and use." (A/77/80, para. 41)

That is what the OEWG to be established by A/C.1/78/L.15/Rev.1 would seek to do.

There are real threats to our space systems and to all countries' ability to use outer space for peaceful purposes, but draft resolution A/C.1/78/L.55, on further practical measures, is not the answer.

Mr. Sanchez De Lerin Garcia-Ovies (Spain) (*spoke in Spanish*): I have the honour to speak on behalf of the States members of the European Union (EU).

The EU candidate countries Albania, Bosnia and Herzegovina, the Republic of Moldova, Montenegro, North Macedonia and Ukraine, and the European Free Trade Association countries Iceland and Norway, members of the European Economic Area, as well as Canada, Monaco and San Marino, align themselves with this statement.

I am taking the floor to explain our vote on draft resolutions A/C.1/78/L.55, "Further practical measures on the prevention of an arms race in outer space", and A/C.1/78/L.53, "No first placement of weapons in outer space". We will vote against those two draft resolutions and call on other Member States to do the same.

We need further practical measures for the prevention of an arms race in outer space, in accordance with the spirit of the Treaty on Principles Governing the Activities of States in the Exploration and Use of Outer Space, including the Moon and Other Celestial Bodies and the final document of the 1978 first special session on disarmament (resolution S/10/2). Such measures can be a combination of legally binding and non-legally binding instruments.

In draft resolution A/C.1/78/L.55, definitional ambiguity regarding the question of what constitutes a weapon in space will affect all objects placed in space or that could be used to affect objects in outer space, which could be considered a weapon if used in an aggressive manner. Thus, it could diminish the overall sense of security, instead of bringing it to a higher level

Furthermore, the open-ended working group (OEWG) proposed under draft resolution A/C.1/78/L.55 has two main pitfalls. First, it disregards previous and existing processes and simply repeats the mandate of the upcoming Group of Governmental Experts, which has not even started its work. It also ignores the successful discussions held at the OEWG on space threats and categorically refuses to take on board the benefits of the behaviour-based approach, despite the wide support of Member States. Secondly, as it does not build on past and existing work strands, it fails to propose a realistic scope of work. Against that background, it is evident that the proposed OEWG is aimed only at disrupting multilateral efforts to improve space security. It spurs division and risks while stretching the resources of Member States in competing processes.

The responsible behaviours initiative, by contrast, has from the outset acknowledged that the prevention of an arms race in outer space can be addressed through a combination of legally binding and non-legally binding measures. It proposes to take into account the work to be done at the Group of Governmental Experts and presents us with a clear mandate building on the progress made in the first OEWG, responding to a clear demand expressed by a large number of Member States in Geneva in September.

We do not face a dilemma with two equally legitimate proposals. There is one serious, anticipated and widely supported initiative, and one disruptive move aimed only at slowing any meaningful progress.

With regard to draft resolution A/C.1/78/L.53, "No first placement of weapons in outer space", our position has been known for many years. The no first placement initiative does not address the difficult issue of defining what a weapon in outer space is, which continues to make the draft resolution ineffective and does not address threats from the use of space systems to interfere with other space systems. Ambiguities could lead to misinterpretations, misunderstandings and miscalculations, and could consequently increase the risk of conflict in space.

Furthermore, we remain concerned about the continued development and testing of anti-satellite weapons and the repeated threats by the Russian Federation to target commercial satellites. We underline the importance of addressing such dangerous and highly destabilizing developments, which the draft resolution does not do sufficiently. The EU therefore welcomes the national commitments made by an increasing number of Member States not to conduct destructive direct-ascent anti-satellite missile tests.

As mentioned earlier, we support the continuation of discussions on norms, rules and principles of responsible behaviours because we believe that it is only through that process that we can build common understandings on key concepts and objectives and, eventually building on that, to consider the negotiation of legally-binding instruments so as to avoid the duplication of efforts and redundancy of action.

Ms. Della-Porta (Australia): I take the floor to explain Australia's voting position on draft resolution A/C.1/78/L.53, "No first placement of weapons in outer space", and draft resolution A/C.1/78/L.55, "Further practical measures for the prevention of an arms race in outer space".

Australia is committed to working with all nations to ensure the security of the space domain and the prevention of an arms race in outer space. In doing so, we must respond to the reality of the space environment as it now exists and the threats we are seeing in relation to space systems.

Australia will vote against draft resolution A/C.1/78/L.53 because, among other concerns, the approach that it advocates fails to adequately define what constitutes a weapon in outer space. It also fails to recognize the dual-use nature of many space objects, which can have both a legitimate reason to be in space and yet can also be used as a weapon. Further, it does nothing to tackle the threats to space systems that we now see — for example, threats to space systems that emanate from Earth-based systems. As such, the approach advocated in draft resolution A/C.1/78/L.53 will not be effective in reducing threats to space systems or in achieving our shared goals in the prevention of an arms race in outer space (PAROS), and Australia is unable to support it.

Australia will also vote against draft resolution A/C.1/78/L.55 because we do not support the creation of a new forum that would run in parallel to the

Open-ended Working Group (OEWG) on reducing space threats through norms, rules and principles of responsible behaviours. The OEWG proposed in draft resolution A/C.1/78/L.55 has a narrow scope that limits the potential measures we can progress in support of the PAROS agenda. Further, it pre-empts the outcomes and recommendations of the Group of Governmental Experts on further practical measures for the prevention of an arms race in outer space, which has not even commenced its work yet. It would also impose an unreasonable resource burden on States and the United Nations Office for Disarmament Affairs. Quite simply, we cannot support the creation of a new forum when the OEWG on responsible behaviours has proven to be widely supported, has a broad mandate and offers real prospects for making progress on our critical goals of reducing space threats and preventing an arms race in outer space.

Mr. Sivamohan (Malaysia): I take the floor to explain Malaysia's vote on draft resolution A/C.1/78/L.15/Rev.1, "Reducing space threats through norms, rules and principles of responsible behaviours", and draft resolution A/C.1/78/L.55, "Further practical measures for the prevention of an arms race in outer space". Those draft resolutions each seek to mandate the establishment of an open-ended working group (OEWG) concerning the prevention of an arms race in outer space, after the conclusion of the work of the Group of Governmental Experts on further practical measures for the prevention of an arms race in outer space, established pursuant to resolution 77/250.

Malaysia appreciates the informal consultations convened by the respective main sponsors — the United Kingdom, for draft resolution A/C.1/78/L.15/Rev.1, and the Russian Federation, for draft resolution A/C.1/78/L.55. We have taken careful note of the rationales put forward for each of the proposed OEWGs. In that connection, we understand that the OEWG envisaged in draft resolution A/C.1/78/L.15/Rev.1 would facilitate deliberations on rules, norms and principles of responsible behaviours in outer space, encompassing both political commitments and legally binding standards. We also understand that the OEWG envisioned in draft resolution A/C.1/78/L.55 would focus more specifically on, inter alia, recommendations on substantial elements of an international legally binding instrument on the prevention of an arms race in outer space.

My delegation will vote in favour of both draft resolutions, including the separate paragraphs therein. Malaysia nonetheless reiterates the importance of avoiding parallel multilateral processes on key First Committee agenda items in a manner that may either duplicate Member States' efforts or result in divergent pathways that are difficult to reconcile. The practical constraints on smaller delegations, especially from developing countries, also warrant particular attention in considering appropriate mechanisms for regular institutional dialogue. We therefore hope that the main sponsors of the two draft resolutions will continue to engage in dialogue with each other with a view to maximizing the utility of scarce resources as well as the substantive value and contributions of the platforms that they have proposed.

It is vital that the global community advance multilateral discourse and initiatives on the prevention of an arms race in outer space through a transparent and inclusive process, allowing Member States of differing levels of capacity, expertise and resources to participate effectively. That is critical to ensuring that outer space is, both in principle and in practice, a common heritage of humankind which all States can avail themselves of.

Mr. Belousov (Russian Federation) (*spoke in Russian*): We would like to clarify the position of the Russian Federation regarding draft resolution A/C.1/78/L.15/Rev.1, "Reducing space threats through norms, rules and principles of responsible behaviours".

Russia, as the author of a number of landmark initiatives aimed at preventing an arms race in outer space (PAROS), welcomes any ideas that could contribute to keeping outer space free of weapons of any kind and preventing space from becoming yet another area of tension and armed confrontation. We are ready to discuss them and work on them with all interested States. Our fundamental position has remained unchanged for several decades now — achieving that goal will be possible only through the development of a multilateral legally binding agreement that would be comprehensive and aimed at preventing an arms race in outer space.

With regard to the British initiative, we can only reaffirm that we see a number of fundamental distortions and flaws in it. The connection between the responsible behaviours initiative and the prevention of an arms race in outer space remains unclear. The past two sessions of the relevant Open-ended Working Group have only

confirmed those concerns. The main emphasis is on something completely different, namely, on various aspects of increasing the sustainability and safety of space operations and combating space debris. We again recall that the Committee on the Peaceful Uses of Outer Space (COPUOS) has long and successfully been considering those issues. Russia proceeds from the fact that the entire spectrum of issues related to ensuring safety in the implementation of space activities, with the exception of the issue of preventing an arms race in outer space, falls under the purview of COPUOS. We consider it unacceptable to duplicate the consideration of those issues at other venues.

With regard to the agreement on transparency and confidence-building measures in outer space activities, which could include the United Kingdom initiative, we are convinced that they should be aimed at a complete ban on the placement of weapons in outer space and on the use of force or threat of force against space objects or with their help, and also complement, but in no way replace, the agreements on the prevention of an arms race in outer space .

Some fragmentary, non-inclusive rules for regulating space activities that do not take into account the approaches of all United Nations Member States and are aimed at ensuring the dominance of a small group of States in space, rather than at solving the key task of PAROS, would not contribute to maintaining international peace and security and would lead to an escalation of tensions in space, the further disunity of the world community and the limitation of equal access to space for its exploration and use for peaceful purposes.

In that context, we consider the initiative of the United Kingdom, set out in resolution 76/231 and reiterated in document A/C.1/78/L.15/Rev.1, as an attempt to refocus the efforts of United Nations Member States from the goals of PAROS to secondary and non-core topics and to enshrine rules for regulating space activities that are beneficial to Western States to the detriment of other countries. We see in that approach the desire of Western countries to solidify space as an arena of confrontation and an environment for possible military actions and, in essence, to legitimize the possibility of using force and conducting combat operations in space. Therefore, we will vote against the draft resolution.

We call on United Nations Member States to focus on the adoption of national and international commitments

that weapons of any kind will not be placed in outer space, including in orbit around the Earth and on celestial bodies. The use of force or threat of force against space objects and with their use should also be prohibited. Only such comprehensive legally binding measures will guarantee the solution of the PAROS task and keep space free for peaceful exploration.

Ms. Nam (New Zealand): I take the floor to explain New Zealand's votes on two draft resolutions in this cluster.

New Zealand will continue to vote against the text contained in draft resolution A/C.1/78/L.53, "No first placement of weapons in outer space". As a space-launching State, New Zealand advocates for a space environment that is peaceful, sustainable, safe and secure. In line with that, New Zealand strongly supports efforts towards preventing an arms race in outer space. Although the potential weaponization of space is an important element of that issue, New Zealand continues to hold concerns about the approach in the draft resolution that seeks to regulate only the first placement of weapons in outer space. That approach risks providing tacit approval for second and subsequent placement of weapons. The approach also does not address the risk of Earth-to-space threats to space objects. We are also concerned that, given the physical realities of the space environment and the dual-use nature of many space-capabilities, important questions around definitions and verification have yet to be addressed.

Last year, New Zealand voted against resolution 77/250, "Further practical measures for the prevention of an arms race in outer space". That was in the interest of providing room for existing conversations on the prevention of an arms race in outer space (PAROS) to bear fruit before establishing a group of governmental experts on the same topic. That text, this year in the form of draft resolution A/C.1/78/L.55, now proposes to establish a four-year open-ended working group before the work of the Group of Governmental Experts on further practical measures for the prevention of an arms race in outer space has even begun. That initiative risks crowding and confusing the space security conversation, and in particular will create capacity challenges for smaller States and those States with emerging space capabilities to effectively engage.

Additionally, although we do support the open-ended working group format as allowing for broad

participation, we are concerned about an approach that cannot provide any outcome until the end of 2028. A number of United Nations resolutions, as well as the statements of many States that have been delivered here today, highlight the urgent need to address the risk of conflict in outer space. New Zealand believes that other initiatives, with more ambitious timelines, are better able to achieve timely progress on PAROS.

For those reasons that New Zealand will vote against the fifth preambular paragraph and operative paragraphs 7 to 11 of draft resolution A/C.1/78/L.55 and the draft resolution as a whole.

Mr. Fetz (Canada): Canada would like to associate itself with the explanation of vote delivered on behalf of the European Union on draft resolutions A/C.1/78/L.53 and A/C.1/78/L.55. We will vote against those two draft resolutions.

The Chair: The Committee will now proceed to take action on draft resolution A/C.1/78/L.3.

I give the floor to the Secretary of the Committee.

Ms. Elliott (Secretary of the Committee): On 11 October, draft resolution A/C.1/78/L.3 was submitted by the representatives of Egypt and Sri Lanka. The sponsors of the draft resolution are contained in document A/C.1/78/L.3. The additional sponsors of the draft resolution are Belarus and Burundi.

The Chair: The sponsors of the draft resolution have expressed the wish that the Committee adopt it without a vote. If I hear no objection, I shall take it that the Committee wishes to act accordingly.

Draft resolution A/C.1/78/L.3 was adopted.

The Chair: The Committee will now proceed to take action on draft resolution A/C.1/78/L.15/Rev.1, "Reducing space threats through norms, rules and principles of responsible behaviours".

I now give the floor to the Secretary of the Committee.

Ms. Elliott (Secretary of the Committee): Draft resolution A/C.1/78/L.15/Rev.1 was submitted by the representative of the United Kingdom on 3 October. Subsequently revised, the draft resolution was submitted on 24 October. The sponsors of the draft resolution are contained in document A/C.1/78/L.15/Rev.1.

The present oral statement is made in the context of rule 153 of the rules of procedure of the General

Assembly. The present statement has also been distributed to Member States.

Under the terms of operative paragraphs 4, 5 and 6 of the draft resolution, the General Assembly would decide

“to convene, in Geneva, a new open-ended working group, building on the work of the 2022–2023 open-ended working group and other relevant bodies, including the Group of Government Experts established in its resolution 77/250, and the existing international legal framework, including principles of international law, to further elaborate the concept, and to make recommendations on the prevention of an arms race in outer space through the development of norms, rules and principles of responsible behaviours, including, but not exclusively, in the following areas:

(a) Intentional damage to and destruction of space systems;

(b) Threats to the safe operation of space objects;

(c) Rendezvous operations and proximity operations that could increase the risk of misunderstanding and miscalculation;

(d) Protecting critical space-based services to civilians as well as services that support humanitarian operations;

(e) Other activities and measures that could reduce the risk of unintended escalation and conflict;

and to consider how the implementation of norms, rules and principles of responsible behaviours could be monitored and verified, including through the provision of capacity-building, cooperation on space situational awareness and the possible establishment of a mechanism for inter-State coordination and consultation on matters pertaining to space security, and how they would contribute to the negotiation of legally binding instruments, including on the prevention of an arms race in outer space.”

The General Assembly would also decide

“that the open-ended working group shall submit its report to the General Assembly at its eighty-first session, and that it shall adopt its final conclusions and recommendations by consensus”.

It would further decide

“that the open-ended working group shall hold a two-day organizational session and two substantive sessions of five days each in 2025, and two substantive sessions of five days each in 2026, and that the Chair may also hold intersessional consultative meetings with interested parties to exchange views on the issues within the mandate of the open-ended working group”.

For the Department for General Assembly and Conference Management, the implementation of the mandate would require interpretation in all six languages for the two-day organizational session (four meetings) as well as two substantive sessions of five days (ten meetings), each in 2025, comprising a total of 24 meetings in 2025, and two substantive sessions of five days (ten meetings) each in 2026, comprising a total of 20 meetings in 2026, in Geneva. With regard to documentation services, the requirements of translation in all six languages of 33 pre-session documents with a total word count of 96,525 words in 2025, 8 in-session documents with a total word count of 21,120 words in 2025, 30 pre-session documents with a total word count of 79,200 words in 2026, and 1 post-session report with a word count of 10,700 words in 2026 would constitute an addition to the documentation workload of the Department. That would amount to \$554,800 in 2025 and \$448,800 in 2026, for a total of \$1,003,600. In accordance with established practice, the dates of the meetings would be determined in consultation with the Department for General Assembly and Conference Management.

For the Office for Disarmament Affairs, the implementation of the mandate would require the services of a consultant to provide technical and substantive support in connection with preparations for and substantive servicing of two substantive sessions of five days each in 2025, and two substantive sessions of five days each in 2026, of the working group. This would amount to \$32,200 in 2025 and \$32,200 in 2026, for a total of \$64,400.

For the Department of Global Communications, the implementation of the mandate would require webcasting services for the two-day organizational session and two substantive sessions of five days each in 2025, comprising 24 meetings in 2025, and two substantive sessions of five days each in 2026, comprising 20 meetings in 2026, of the open-ended

working group. That would amount to \$13,200 and \$11,000 in 2026, for a total of \$24,200.

For the United Nations Office in Geneva, the implementation of the mandate would require the services of a sound technician for the two-day organizational session and two substantive sessions of five days each in 2025, comprising 24 meetings in 2025, and two substantive sessions of five days each in 2026, comprising 20 meetings in 2026. That would amount to \$8,400 in 2025 and \$7,000 in 2026, for a total of \$15,400.

Detailed cost estimates are provided in the annex to this statement.

Accordingly, should the General Assembly adopt draft resolution A/C.1/78/L.15/Rev.1, resource requirements estimated in the amount of \$1,107,600, comprising \$608,600 in 2025 and \$499,000 in 2026, as reflected in paragraphs 3 to 6, would be included in the proposed programme budget for 2025 and 2026 for the consideration of the General Assembly at its seventy-ninth and eightieth sessions, respectively.

The Chair: Separate, recorded votes have been requested on the eighth, thirteenth and fifteenth preambular paragraphs and operative paragraphs 2, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9 and 10 of draft resolution A/C.1/78/L.15/Rev.1. We shall now begin the voting process. I shall first put these paragraphs to the vote, first one by one.

I shall first put to the vote the eighth preambular paragraph.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour:

Afghanistan, Albania, Algeria, Andorra, Angola, Antigua and Barbuda, Argentina, Australia, Austria, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belgium, Belize, Bhutan, Bolivia (Plurinational State of), Bosnia and Herzegovina, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Canada, Central African Republic, Chad, Chile, Colombia, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Croatia, Cyprus, Czechia, Democratic Republic of the Congo, Denmark, Djibouti, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Eritrea, Estonia, Eswatini, Ethiopia, Fiji, Finland, France, Gabon, Gambia, Georgia, Germany, Ghana, Greece, Guatemala, Guyana, Haiti, Honduras, Hungary, Iceland, Indonesia, Iraq, Ireland, Israel,

Italy, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Kenya, Kiribati, Kuwait, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Latvia, Lebanon, Lesotho, Liberia, Libya, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Madagascar, Malawi, Malaysia, Maldives, Malta, Marshall Islands, Mauritania, Mexico, Micronesia (Federated States of), Monaco, Mongolia, Montenegro, Morocco, Mozambique, Myanmar, Namibia, Nepal, Netherlands (Kingdom of the), New Zealand, Nigeria, North Macedonia, Norway, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Qatar, Republic of Korea, Republic of Moldova, Romania, Rwanda, Saint Kitts and Nevis, Saint Lucia, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, Samoa, San Marino, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Slovakia, Slovenia, Somalia, South Africa, South Sudan, Spain, Sudan, Suriname, Sweden, Switzerland, Thailand, Timor-Leste, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Türkiye, Ukraine, United Arab Emirates, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United Republic of Tanzania, United States of America, Uruguay, Uzbekistan, Viet Nam, Yemen, Zambia

Against:

Belarus, China, Cuba, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Mali, Nicaragua, Russian Federation, Syrian Arab Republic

Abstaining:

Guinea, India, Kazakhstan, Niger, Sri Lanka

The eighth preambular paragraph was retained by 150 votes to 8, with 5 abstentions.

The Chair: I shall now put the thirteenth preambular paragraph to the vote.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour:

Albania, Algeria, Andorra, Angola, Antigua and Barbuda, Argentina, Australia, Austria, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belgium, Belize, Bhutan, Bolivia (Plurinational State of), Bosnia and Herzegovina, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Canada, Central African Republic, Chad, Chile, Colombia, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Croatia, Cyprus, Czechia, Democratic Republic of the Congo, Denmark, Djibouti, Dominican Republic, Ecuador,

Egypt, El Salvador, Eritrea, Estonia, Eswatini, Ethiopia, Fiji, Finland, France, Gambia, Georgia, Germany, Ghana, Greece, Guatemala, Guinea, Guyana, Haiti, Honduras, Hungary, Iceland, Indonesia, Iraq, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Kenya, Kiribati, Kuwait, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Latvia, Lebanon, Lesotho, Liberia, Libya, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Madagascar, Malawi, Malaysia, Maldives, Malta, Marshall Islands, Mauritania, Mexico, Micronesia (Federated States of), Monaco, Mongolia, Montenegro, Morocco, Mozambique, Myanmar, Namibia, Nepal, Netherlands (Kingdom of the), New Zealand, North Macedonia, Norway, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Qatar, Republic of Korea, Republic of Moldova, Romania, Rwanda, Saint Kitts and Nevis, Saint Lucia, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, Samoa, San Marino, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Slovakia, Slovenia, Somalia, South Africa, South Sudan, Spain, Sri Lanka, Suriname, Sweden, Switzerland, Thailand, Timor-Leste, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Türkiye, Ukraine, United Arab Emirates, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United Republic of Tanzania, United States of America, Uruguay, Uzbekistan, Viet Nam, Yemen, Zambia

Against:

Afghanistan, Belarus, China, Cuba, Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Mali, Nicaragua, Russian Federation, Syrian Arab Republic

Abstaining:

India, Kazakhstan, Niger, Nigeria, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Sudan

The thirteenth preambular paragraph was retained by 146 votes to 10, with 7 abstentions.

The Chair: I shall now put to the vote the fifteenth preambular paragraph

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour:

Afghanistan, Albania, Algeria, Andorra, Angola, Antigua and Barbuda, Argentina, Australia, Austria, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belgium, Belize, Bhutan, Bolivia (Plurinational

State of), Bosnia and Herzegovina, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Canada, Central African Republic, Chile, Colombia, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Croatia, Cyprus, Czechia, Democratic Republic of the Congo, Denmark, Djibouti, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Eritrea, Estonia, Eswatini, Ethiopia, Fiji, Finland, France, Gambia, Georgia, Germany, Ghana, Greece, Guatemala, Guinea, Guyana, Honduras, Hungary, Iceland, Indonesia, Iraq, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Kenya, Kiribati, Kuwait, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Latvia, Lebanon, Lesotho, Liberia, Libya, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Madagascar, Malawi, Malaysia, Maldives, Malta, Marshall Islands, Mauritania, Mexico, Micronesia (Federated States of), Monaco, Mongolia, Montenegro, Morocco, Mozambique, Myanmar, Namibia, Nepal, Netherlands (Kingdom of the), New Zealand, Nigeria, North Macedonia, Norway, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Qatar, Republic of Korea, Republic of Moldova, Romania, Rwanda, Saint Kitts and Nevis, Saint Lucia, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, Samoa, San Marino, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Slovakia, Slovenia, Somalia, South Africa, South Sudan, Spain, Sri Lanka, Suriname, Sweden, Switzerland, Thailand, Timor-Leste, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Türkiye, Ukraine, United Arab Emirates, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United Republic of Tanzania, United States of America, Uruguay, Uzbekistan, Viet Nam, Yemen, Zambia

Against:

Belarus, China, Cuba, Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Mali, Nicaragua, Russian Federation, Syrian Arab Republic

Abstaining:

Chad, India, Kazakhstan, Niger, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Sudan

The fifteenth preambular paragraph was retained by 146 to 9, with 7 abstentions.

The Chair: I shall now put to the vote operative paragraph 2.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour:

Afghanistan, Albania, Algeria, Andorra, Angola, Antigua and Barbuda, Argentina, Australia, Austria, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belgium, Belize, Bhutan, Bolivia (Plurinational State of), Bosnia and Herzegovina, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Canada, Central African Republic, Chad, Chile, Colombia, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Croatia, Cyprus, Czechia, Democratic Republic of the Congo, Denmark, Djibouti, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Eritrea, Estonia, Eswatini, Ethiopia, Fiji, Finland, France, Gambia, Georgia, Germany, Ghana, Greece, Guatemala, Guinea, Guyana, Haiti, Honduras, Hungary, Iceland, Indonesia, Iraq, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Kenya, Kiribati, Kuwait, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Latvia, Lebanon, Lesotho, Liberia, Libya, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Madagascar, Malawi, Malaysia, Maldives, Malta, Marshall Islands, Mauritania, Mexico, Micronesia (Federated States of), Monaco, Mongolia, Montenegro, Morocco, Mozambique, Myanmar, Namibia, Nepal, Netherlands (Kingdom of the), New Zealand, Nigeria, North Macedonia, Norway, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Qatar, Republic of Korea, Republic of Moldova, Romania, Rwanda, Saint Kitts and Nevis, Saint Lucia, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, Samoa, San Marino, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Slovakia, Slovenia, Somalia, South Africa, South Sudan, Spain, Sudan, Suriname, Sweden, Switzerland, Thailand, Timor-Leste, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Türkiye, Tuvalu, Ukraine, United Arab Emirates, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United Republic of Tanzania, United States of America, Uruguay, Uzbekistan, Viet Nam, Yemen, Zambia

Against:

Belarus, China, Cuba, Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Mali, Nicaragua, Russian Federation, Syrian Arab Republic

Abstaining:

India, Niger, Sri Lanka

Operative paragraph 2 was retained by 151 votes to 9, with 3 abstentions.

The Chair: I shall now put to the vote operative paragraph 4.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour:

Afghanistan, Albania, Algeria, Andorra, Angola, Antigua and Barbuda, Argentina, Australia, Austria, Bahamas, Bahrain, Barbados, Belgium, Belize, Bhutan, Bolivia (Plurinational State of), Bosnia and Herzegovina, Botswana, Brazil, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Canada, Central African Republic, Chad, Chile, Colombia, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Croatia, Cyprus, Czechia, Democratic Republic of the Congo, Denmark, Djibouti, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, El Salvador, Eritrea, Estonia, Eswatini, Ethiopia, Fiji, Finland, France, Gambia, Georgia, Germany, Ghana, Greece, Guatemala, Guinea, Guyana, Haiti, Honduras, Hungary, Iceland, Indonesia, Iraq, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Jamaica, Japan, Kenya, Kiribati, Kuwait, Latvia, Lesotho, Liberia, Libya, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Madagascar, Malawi, Malaysia, Maldives, Malta, Marshall Islands, Mauritania, Mexico, Micronesia (Federated States of), Monaco, Mongolia, Montenegro, Morocco, Mozambique, Myanmar, Namibia, Nepal, Netherlands (Kingdom of the), New Zealand, North Macedonia, Norway, Oman, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Qatar, Republic of Korea, Republic of Moldova, Romania, Rwanda, Saint Kitts and Nevis, Saint Lucia, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, Samoa, San Marino, Saudi Arabia, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Slovakia, Slovenia, Somalia, South Africa, South Sudan, Spain, Suriname, Sweden, Switzerland, Thailand, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Türkiye, Tuvalu, Uganda, Ukraine, United Arab Emirates, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United Republic of Tanzania, United States of America, Uruguay, Uzbekistan, Viet Nam, Yemen, Zambia

Against:

Belarus, China, Cuba, Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Mali, Nicaragua, Russian Federation, Syrian Arab Republic

Abstaining:

Bangladesh, Brunei Darussalam, Egypt, India, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lebanon, Niger, Pakistan, Senegal, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Togo

Operative paragraph 4 was retained by 140 votes to 9, with 12 abstentions.

The Chair: I shall now put to the vote operative paragraph 5.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour:

Afghanistan, Albania, Algeria, Andorra, Angola, Antigua and Barbuda, Argentina, Australia, Austria, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belgium, Belize, Bhutan, Bolivia (Plurinational State of), Bosnia and Herzegovina, Botswana, Brazil, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Canada, Central African Republic, Chad, Chile, Colombia, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Croatia, Cyprus, Czechia, Democratic Republic of the Congo, Denmark, Djibouti, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Eritrea, Estonia, Eswatini, Ethiopia, Fiji, Finland, France, Gambia, Georgia, Germany, Ghana, Greece, Guatemala, Guinea, Guyana, Haiti, Honduras, Hungary, Iceland, Indonesia, Iraq, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Kenya, Kiribati, Kuwait, Latvia, Lebanon, Lesotho, Liberia, Libya, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Madagascar, Malawi, Malaysia, Maldives, Malta, Marshall Islands, Mauritania, Micronesia (Federated States of), Monaco, Mongolia, Montenegro, Morocco, Mozambique, Myanmar, Namibia, Nepal, Netherlands (Kingdom of the), New Zealand, Nigeria, North Macedonia, Norway, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Qatar, Republic of Korea, Republic of Moldova, Romania, Rwanda, Saint Kitts and Nevis, Saint Lucia, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, Samoa, San Marino, Saudi Arabia, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Slovakia, Slovenia, Somalia, South Africa, South Sudan, Spain, Suriname, Sweden, Switzerland, Thailand, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Türkiye, Uganda, Ukraine, United Arab Emirates, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United Republic of Tanzania, United States of America, Uruguay, Uzbekistan, Viet Nam, Yemen, Zambia

Against:

Belarus, China, Cuba, Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Mali, Nicaragua, Russian Federation, Syrian Arab Republic

Abstaining:

Brunei Darussalam, India, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Mexico, Niger, Senegal, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Togo

Operative paragraph 5 was retained by 144 votes to 9, with 9 abstentions.

The Chair: I shall now put to the vote operative paragraph 6.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour:

Afghanistan, Albania, Algeria, Andorra, Angola, Antigua and Barbuda, Argentina, Australia, Austria, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belgium, Belize, Bhutan, Bolivia (Plurinational State of), Bosnia and Herzegovina, Botswana, Brazil, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Canada, Central African Republic, Chile, Colombia, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Croatia, Cyprus, Czechia, Democratic Republic of the Congo, Denmark, Djibouti, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Eritrea, Estonia, Eswatini, Ethiopia, Fiji, Finland, France, Gambia, Georgia, Germany, Ghana, Greece, Guatemala, Guinea, Guyana, Honduras, Hungary, Iceland, Indonesia, Iraq, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Kenya, Kiribati, Kuwait, Latvia, Lebanon, Lesotho, Liberia, Libya, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Madagascar, Malawi, Malaysia, Maldives, Malta, Marshall Islands, Mauritania, Mexico, Micronesia (Federated States of), Monaco, Mongolia, Montenegro, Morocco, Mozambique, Myanmar, Namibia, Nepal, Netherlands (Kingdom of the), New Zealand, Nigeria, North Macedonia, Norway, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Qatar, Republic of Korea, Republic of Moldova, Romania, Rwanda, Saint Kitts and Nevis, Saint Lucia, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, Samoa, San Marino, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Slovakia, Slovenia, Somalia, South Africa, South Sudan, Spain, Suriname, Sweden, Switzerland, Thailand, Trinidad and

Tobago, Tunisia, Türkiye, Uganda, Ukraine, United Arab Emirates, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United Republic of Tanzania, United States of America, Uruguay, Uzbekistan, Viet Nam, Yemen, Zambia

Against:

Belarus, China, Cuba, Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Mali, Nicaragua, Russian Federation, Syrian Arab Republic

Abstaining:

Brunei Darussalam, Chad, India, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Niger, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Togo

Operative paragraph 6 was retained by 144 votes to 9, with 8 abstentions.

The Chair: I shall now put to the vote operative paragraph 7.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour:

Afghanistan, Albania, Andorra, Angola, Antigua and Barbuda, Argentina, Australia, Austria, Bahamas, Barbados, Belgium, Belize, Bhutan, Bolivia (Plurinational State of), Bosnia and Herzegovina, Botswana, Brazil, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Canada, Central African Republic, Chile, Colombia, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Croatia, Cyprus, Czechia, Democratic Republic of the Congo, Denmark, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, El Salvador, Eritrea, Estonia, Eswatini, Ethiopia, Fiji, Finland, France, Georgia, Germany, Ghana, Greece, Guatemala, Guinea, Guyana, Haiti, Honduras, Hungary, Iceland, Indonesia, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Jamaica, Japan, Kenya, Kiribati, Latvia, Lesotho, Liberia, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Madagascar, Malawi, Malaysia, Maldives, Malta, Marshall Islands, Mexico, Micronesia (Federated States of), Monaco, Mongolia, Montenegro, Mozambique, Myanmar, Namibia, Nepal, Netherlands (Kingdom of the), New Zealand, North Macedonia, Norway, Pakistan, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Republic of Korea, Republic of Moldova, Romania, Rwanda, Saint Kitts and Nevis, Saint Lucia, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, Samoa, San Marino, Sierra Leone,

Singapore, Slovakia, Slovenia, South Africa, South Sudan, Spain, Suriname, Sweden, Switzerland, Thailand, Trinidad and Tobago, Türkiye, Uganda, Ukraine, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United Republic of Tanzania, United States of America, Uruguay, Uzbekistan, Viet Nam, Zambia

Against:

Belarus, China, Cuba, Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Mali, Nicaragua, Russian Federation, Syrian Arab Republic

Abstaining:

Algeria, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Brunei Darussalam, Chad, Djibouti, Egypt, Gambia, India, Iraq, Jordan, Kuwait, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lebanon, Libya, Mauritania, Morocco, Niger, Nigeria, Oman, Qatar, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Somalia, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Togo, Tunisia, United Arab Emirates, Yemen

Operative paragraph 7 was retained by 123 votes to 9, with 30 abstentions.

The Chair: I shall now put to the vote operative paragraph 8.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour:

Afghanistan, Albania, Andorra, Angola, Antigua and Barbuda, Argentina, Australia, Austria, Bahamas, Barbados, Belgium, Belize, Bhutan, Bolivia (Plurinational State of), Bosnia and Herzegovina, Botswana, Brazil, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Canada, Central African Republic, Chile, Colombia, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Croatia, Cyprus, Czechia, Democratic Republic of the Congo, Denmark, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, El Salvador, Eritrea, Estonia, Eswatini, Ethiopia, Fiji, Finland, France, Georgia, Germany, Ghana, Greece, Guatemala, Guyana, Haiti, Honduras, Hungary, Iceland, Indonesia, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Jamaica, Japan, Kenya, Kiribati, Latvia, Lesotho, Liberia, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Madagascar, Malawi, Malaysia, Maldives, Malta, Marshall Islands, Mexico, Micronesia (Federated States of), Monaco, Mongolia, Montenegro, Mozambique, Myanmar, Namibia, Nepal, Netherlands (Kingdom of the), New Zealand,

North Macedonia, Norway, Pakistan, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Republic of Korea, Republic of Moldova, Romania, Rwanda, Saint Kitts and Nevis, Saint Lucia, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, Samoa, San Marino, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Slovakia, Slovenia, South Africa, South Sudan, Spain, Suriname, Sweden, Switzerland, Trinidad and Tobago, Türkiye, Ukraine, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United Republic of Tanzania, United States of America, Uruguay, Uzbekistan, Zambia

Against:

Belarus, China, Cuba, Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Mali, Nicaragua, Russian Federation, Syrian Arab Republic

Abstaining:

Algeria, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Brunei Darussalam, Chad, Djibouti, Egypt, Gambia, Guinea, India, Iraq, Jordan, Kuwait, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lebanon, Libya, Mauritania, Morocco, Niger, Nigeria, Oman, Qatar, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Somalia, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Thailand, Togo, Tunisia, United Arab Emirates, Yemen

Operative paragraph 8 was retained by 119 votes to 9, with 32 abstentions.

The Chair: I shall now put to the vote operative paragraph 9.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour:

Afghanistan, Albania, Algeria, Andorra, Angola, Antigua and Barbuda, Argentina, Australia, Austria, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belgium, Belize, Bhutan, Bolivia (Plurinational State of), Bosnia and Herzegovina, Botswana, Brazil, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Canada, Central African Republic, Chad, Chile, Colombia, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Croatia, Cyprus, Czechia, Democratic Republic of the Congo, Denmark, Djibouti, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Eritrea, Estonia, Eswatini, Ethiopia, Fiji, Finland, France, Gambia, Georgia, Germany, Ghana, Greece, Guatemala, Guinea, Guyana, Haiti, Honduras, Hungary, Iceland, India, Indonesia, Iraq, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan,

Kenya, Kiribati, Kuwait, Latvia, Lebanon, Lesotho, Liberia, Libya, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Madagascar, Malawi, Malaysia, Maldives, Malta, Marshall Islands, Mauritania, Mexico, Micronesia (Federated States of), Monaco, Mongolia, Montenegro, Morocco, Mozambique, Myanmar, Namibia, Nepal, Netherlands (Kingdom of the), New Zealand, Nigeria, North Macedonia, Norway, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Qatar, Republic of Korea, Republic of Moldova, Romania, Rwanda, Saint Kitts and Nevis, Saint Lucia, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, Samoa, San Marino, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Slovakia, Slovenia, Somalia, South Africa, South Sudan, Spain, Suriname, Sweden, Switzerland, Thailand, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Türkiye, Tuvalu, Ukraine, United Arab Emirates, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United Republic of Tanzania, United States of America, Uruguay, Uzbekistan, Viet Nam, Yemen, Zambia

Against:

Belarus, China, Cuba, Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Mali, Nicaragua, Russian Federation, Syrian Arab Republic

Abstaining:

Brunei Darussalam, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Niger, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Togo

Operative paragraph 9 was retained by 147 votes to 9, with 6 abstentions.

The Chair: I shall now put to the vote operative paragraph 10.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour:

Afghanistan, Albania, Algeria, Andorra, Angola, Antigua and Barbuda, Argentina, Australia, Austria, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belgium, Belize, Bhutan, Bolivia (Plurinational State of), Bosnia and Herzegovina, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Canada, Central African Republic, Chad, Chile, Colombia, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Croatia, Cyprus, Czechia, Democratic Republic of the Congo, Denmark, Djibouti, Dominican Republic,

Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Eritrea, Estonia, Eswatini, Ethiopia, Fiji, Finland, France, Gambia, Georgia, Germany, Ghana, Greece, Guatemala, Guinea, Guyana, Haiti, Honduras, Hungary, Iceland, Indonesia, Iraq, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Kenya, Kiribati, Kuwait, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Latvia, Lebanon, Lesotho, Liberia, Libya, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Madagascar, Malawi, Malaysia, Maldives, Malta, Marshall Islands, Mauritania, Mexico, Micronesia (Federated States of), Monaco, Mongolia, Montenegro, Morocco, Mozambique, Myanmar, Namibia, Nepal, Netherlands (Kingdom of the), New Zealand, Nigeria, North Macedonia, Norway, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Qatar, Republic of Korea, Republic of Moldova, Romania, Rwanda, Saint Kitts and Nevis, Saint Lucia, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, Samoa, San Marino, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Slovakia, Slovenia, Somalia, South Africa, South Sudan, Spain, Sudan, Suriname, Sweden, Switzerland, Thailand, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Türkiye, Ukraine, United Arab Emirates, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United Republic of Tanzania, United States of America, Uruguay, Uzbekistan, Viet Nam, Yemen, Zambia

Against:

Belarus, China, Cuba, Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Mali, Nicaragua, Russian Federation, Syrian Arab Republic

Abstaining:

India, Niger, Sri Lanka

Operative paragraph 10 was retained by 149 votes to 9, with 3 abstentions.

The Chair: The Committee will now proceed to take action on draft resolution A/C.1/78/L.15/Rev.1 as a whole.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour:

Afghanistan, Albania, Algeria, Andorra, Angola, Antigua and Barbuda, Argentina, Australia, Austria, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belgium, Belize, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia

(Plurinational State of), Bosnia and Herzegovina, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Cabo Verde, Cambodia, Cameroon, Canada, Central African Republic, Chad, Chile, Colombia, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Croatia, Cyprus, Czechia, Democratic Republic of the Congo, Denmark, Djibouti, Dominica, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Equatorial Guinea, Eritrea, Estonia, Eswatini, Ethiopia, Fiji, Finland, France, Gabon, Gambia, Georgia, Germany, Ghana, Greece, Guatemala, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Haiti, Honduras, Hungary, Iceland, Indonesia, Iraq, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Kazakhstan, Kenya, Kiribati, Kuwait, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Latvia, Lebanon, Lesotho, Liberia, Libya, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Madagascar, Malawi, Malaysia, Maldives, Malta, Marshall Islands, Mauritania, Mexico, Micronesia (Federated States of), Monaco, Mongolia, Montenegro, Morocco, Mozambique, Myanmar, Namibia, Nepal, Netherlands (Kingdom of the), New Zealand, Nigeria, North Macedonia, Norway, Oman, Palau, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Qatar, Republic of Korea, Republic of Moldova, Romania, Rwanda, Saint Kitts and Nevis, Saint Lucia, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, Samoa, San Marino, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Serbia, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Slovakia, Slovenia, Solomon Islands, Somalia, South Africa, South Sudan, Spain, Sudan, Suriname, Sweden, Switzerland, Thailand, Timor-Leste, Togo, Tonga, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Türkiye, Tuvalu, Uganda, Ukraine, United Arab Emirates, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United Republic of Tanzania, United States of America, Uruguay, Uzbekistan, Vanuatu, Viet Nam, Yemen, Zambia, Zimbabwe

Against:

Belarus, China, Cuba, Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Mali, Nicaragua, Russian Federation, Syrian Arab Republic

Abstaining:

India, Niger, Pakistan, Sri Lanka, Tajikistan

Draft resolution A/C.1/78/L.15/Rev.1, as a whole, was adopted by 166 votes to 9, with 5 abstentions.

The Chair: The Committee will now proceed to take action on draft resolution A/C.1/78/L.53, “No first placement of weapons in outer space”.

I now give the floor to the Secretary of the committee.

Ms. Elliott (Secretary of the Committee): Draft resolution A/C.1/78/L.53 was submitted by the representative of the Russian Federation on 11 October. The sponsors of the draft resolution are contained in document A/C.1/78/L.53.

The Chair: Separate, recorded votes have been requested on the fifth, ninth and eleventh preambular paragraphs of draft resolution A/C.1/78/L.53. I shall now begin the voting process. I shall therefore put those paragraphs to the vote first, one by one.

I first put to the vote the fifth preambular paragraph.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour:

Algeria, Angola, Antigua and Barbuda, Argentina, Armenia, Azerbaijan, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belarus, Belize, Bhutan, Bolivia (Plurinational State of), Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Burkina Faso, Burundi, Cambodia, Cameroon, Central African Republic, Chad, Chile, China, Colombia, Costa Rica, Cuba, Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Democratic Republic of the Congo, Djibouti, Dominica, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Equatorial Guinea, Eritrea, Eswatini, Ethiopia, Fiji, Gabon, Gambia, Ghana, Guatemala, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Honduras, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Jamaica, Jordan, Kazakhstan, Kenya, Kiribati, Kuwait, Kyrgyzstan, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lebanon, Lesotho, Libya, Madagascar, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Myanmar, Namibia, Nepal, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Qatar, Russian Federation, Rwanda, Saint Kitts and Nevis, Saint Lucia, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, Samoa, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Solomon Islands, Somalia, South Africa, South Sudan, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Syrian Arab Republic, Tajikistan, Thailand, Timor-Leste, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Uganda, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of

Tanzania, Uruguay, Uzbekistan, Viet Nam, Yemen, Zambia

Against:

Albania, Andorra, Australia, Austria, Belgium, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Bulgaria, Canada, Croatia, Cyprus, Czechia, Denmark, Estonia, Finland, France, Georgia, Germany, Greece, Hungary, Iceland, India, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Japan, Latvia, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Malta, Monaco, Montenegro, Netherlands (Kingdom of the), New Zealand, North Macedonia, Norway, Poland, Portugal, Republic of Korea, Republic of Moldova, Romania, San Marino, Slovakia, Slovenia, Spain, Sweden, Ukraine, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America

Abstaining:

Côte d'Ivoire, Haiti, Papua New Guinea, Switzerland, Türkiye

The fifth preambular paragraph was retained by retained by 118 votes to 49, with 5 abstentions.

The Chair: I now put to the vote the ninth preambular paragraph.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour:

Algeria, Angola, Antigua and Barbuda, Argentina, Armenia, Azerbaijan, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belarus, Belize, Bhutan, Bolivia (Plurinational State of), Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Burkina Faso, Burundi, Cambodia, Cameroon, Central African Republic, Chad, Chile, China, Colombia, Costa Rica, Cuba, Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Democratic Republic of the Congo, Djibouti, Dominica, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Equatorial Guinea, Eritrea, Eswatini, Ethiopia, Gabon, Gambia, Ghana, Guatemala, Guinea, Guyana, Haiti, Honduras, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Jamaica, Jordan, Kazakhstan, Kenya, Kiribati, Kuwait, Kyrgyzstan, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lebanon, Lesotho, Libya, Madagascar, Malawi, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Mauritania, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Myanmar, Namibia, Nepal, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Qatar, Russian

Federation, Rwanda, Saint Kitts and Nevis, Saint Lucia, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, Samoa, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Singapore, Somalia, South Africa, South Sudan, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Syrian Arab Republic, Tajikistan, Thailand, Timor-Leste, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Uganda, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Tanzania, Uruguay, Uzbekistan, Viet Nam, Yemen, Zambia

Against:

Albania, Andorra, Australia, Austria, Belgium, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Bulgaria, Canada, Croatia, Cyprus, Czechia, Denmark, Estonia, Finland, France, Georgia, Germany, Greece, Hungary, Iceland, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Japan, Latvia, Liberia, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Malta, Monaco, Montenegro, Netherlands (Kingdom of the), New Zealand, North Macedonia, Norway, Poland, Portugal, Republic of Korea, Republic of Moldova, Romania, San Marino, Slovakia, Slovenia, Spain, Sweden, Ukraine, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America

Abstaining:

Côte d'Ivoire, Mauritius, Papua New Guinea, Switzerland, Türkiye

The ninth preambular paragraph was retained by retained by 116 votes to 49, with 5 abstentions.

The Chair: I now put to the vote the eleventh preambular paragraph.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour:

Algeria, Angola, Antigua and Barbuda, Argentina, Armenia, Azerbaijan, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belarus, Belize, Bhutan, Bolivia (Plurinational State of), Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Burkina Faso, Burundi, Cambodia, Cameroon, Central African Republic, Chad, Chile, China, Colombia, Costa Rica, Cuba, Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Democratic Republic of the Congo, Djibouti, Dominica, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Equatorial Guinea, Eritrea, Eswatini, Ethiopia, Fiji, Gabon, Gambia, Ghana, Guatemala, Guinea, Guyana, Haiti, Honduras, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Jamaica, Jordan,

Kazakhstan, Kenya, Kiribati, Kuwait, Kyrgyzstan, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lebanon, Lesotho, Libya, Madagascar, Malawi, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Myanmar, Namibia, Nepal, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Qatar, Russian Federation, Rwanda, Saint Kitts and Nevis, Saint Lucia, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, Samoa, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Singapore, Somalia, South Africa, South Sudan, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Syrian Arab Republic, Tajikistan, Thailand, Timor-Leste, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Uganda, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Tanzania, Uruguay, Uzbekistan, Viet Nam, Yemen, Zambia

Against:

Albania, Andorra, Australia, Austria, Belgium, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Bulgaria, Canada, Croatia, Cyprus, Czechia, Denmark, Estonia, Finland, France, Georgia, Germany, Greece, Hungary, Iceland, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Japan, Latvia, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Malta, Monaco, Montenegro, Netherlands (Kingdom of the), New Zealand, North Macedonia, Norway, Poland, Portugal, Republic of Moldova, Romania, San Marino, Slovakia, Slovenia, Spain, Sweden, Ukraine, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America

Abstaining:

Côte d'Ivoire, Papua New Guinea, Republic of Korea, Switzerland, Türkiye

The eleventh preambular paragraph was retained by 118 votes to 47, with 5 abstentions.

The Chair: The Committee will now proceed to take action on draft resolution A/C.1/78/L.53 as a whole.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour:

Afghanistan, Algeria, Angola, Antigua and Barbuda, Argentina, Armenia, Azerbaijan, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belarus, Belize, Bhutan, Bolivia (Plurinational State of), Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Burkina Faso, Burundi, Cambodia, Cameroon, Central African Republic, Chad, Chile, China, Colombia, Costa Rica, Cuba, Democratic People's

Republic of Korea, Democratic Republic of the Congo, Djibouti, Dominica, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Equatorial Guinea, Eritrea, Eswatini, Ethiopia, Fiji, Gabon, Gambia, Ghana, Guatemala, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Haiti, Honduras, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Jamaica, Jordan, Kazakhstan, Kenya, Kiribati, Kuwait, Kyrgyzstan, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lebanon, Lesotho, Libya, Madagascar, Malawi, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Myanmar, Namibia, Nauru, Nepal, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Qatar, Russian Federation, Rwanda, Saint Kitts and Nevis, Saint Lucia, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, Samoa, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Serbia, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Solomon Islands, Somalia, South Africa, South Sudan, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Syrian Arab Republic, Tajikistan, Thailand, Timor-Leste, Togo, Tonga, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Uganda, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Tanzania, Uruguay, Uzbekistan, Vanuatu, Viet Nam, Yemen, Zambia, Zimbabwe

Against:

Albania, Andorra, Australia, Austria, Belgium, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Bulgaria, Canada, Croatia, Cyprus, Czechia, Denmark, Estonia, Finland, France, Georgia, Germany, Greece, Hungary, Iceland, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Japan, Latvia, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Malta, Marshall Islands, Micronesia (Federated States of), Monaco, Montenegro, Netherlands (Kingdom of the), New Zealand, North Macedonia, Norway, Poland, Portugal, Republic of Korea, Republic of Moldova, Romania, San Marino, Slovakia, Slovenia, Spain, Sweden, Ukraine, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America

Abstaining:

Côte d'Ivoire, Papua New Guinea, Switzerland, Türkiye

Draft resolution A/C.1/78/L.53, as a whole, was adopted by 127 votes to 50, with 4 abstentions

The Chair: The Committee will now proceed to take action on draft resolution A/C.1/78/L.54,

“Transparency and confidence-building measures in outer space activities”.

I now give the floor to the Secretary of the Committee.

Ms. Elliott (Secretary of the Committee): On 11 October, draft resolution A/C.1/78/L.54 was submitted by the representatives of the Russian Federation and China. The sponsors of the draft resolution are contained in document A/C.1/78/L.54. The additional co-sponsors in the e-deleGATE portal of the First Committee are currently reflected on the screen. The additional co-sponsors of draft resolution A/C.1/78/L.54 are as follows: Eritrea.

The Chair: The sponsors of the draft resolution have expressed the wish that the draft resolution be adopted by the Committee without a vote. If I hear no objection, I will take it that the Committee wishes to act accordingly.

Draft resolution A/C.1/78/L.54 was adopted.

The Chair: The Committee will now proceed to take action on draft resolution A/C.1/78/L.55, “Further practical measures for the prevention of an arms race in outer space”.

I give the floor to the Secretary of the Committee.

Ms. Elliott (Secretary of the Committee): Draft resolution A/C.1/78/L.55 was submitted by the representative of the Russian Federation on 11 October. The sponsors of the draft resolution are contained in document A/C.1/78/L.55. A statement on the programme budget implications of the draft resolution has been issued as document A/C.1/78/L.67 and placed on the e-deleGATE portal.

The Chair: Separate, recorded votes have been requested on the fifth preambular paragraph and operative paragraphs 8, 9, 10 and 11 of draft resolution A/C.1/78/L.55. We shall now begin the voting process. I shall therefore put those paragraphs to the vote first, one by one.

I first put to the vote the fifth preambular paragraph.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour:

Algeria, Angola, Antigua and Barbuda, Argentina, Armenia, Azerbaijan, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belarus, Belize, Bhutan,

Bolivia (Plurinational State of), Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Burkina Faso, Burundi, Cambodia, Central African Republic, Chad, China, Colombia, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Cuba, Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Democratic Republic of the Congo, Djibouti, Dominica, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Equatorial Guinea, Eritrea, Eswatini, Ethiopia, Gambia, Ghana, Guatemala, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Haiti, Honduras, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Jamaica, Jordan, Kazakhstan, Kenya, Kiribati, Kuwait, Kyrgyzstan, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lebanon, Lesotho, Libya, Madagascar, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Myanmar, Namibia, Nepal, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Qatar, Russian Federation, Rwanda, Saint Kitts and Nevis, Saint Lucia, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Singapore, Solomon Islands, Somalia, South Africa, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Syrian Arab Republic, Tajikistan, Thailand, Timor-Leste, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Uganda, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Tanzania, Uruguay, Uzbekistan, Viet Nam, Yemen, Zambia

Against:

Albania, Andorra, Australia, Austria, Belgium, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Bulgaria, Canada, Croatia, Cyprus, Czechia, Denmark, Estonia, Finland, France, Germany, Greece, Hungary, Iceland, India, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Japan, Latvia, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Malta, Monaco, Montenegro, Netherlands (Kingdom of the), New Zealand, North Macedonia, Norway, Poland, Portugal, Republic of Korea, Republic of Moldova, Romania, San Marino, Slovakia, Slovenia, Spain, Sweden, Türkiye, Ukraine, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America

Abstaining:

Chile, Fiji, Georgia, Papua New Guinea, South Sudan, Switzerland

The fifth preambular paragraph was retained by 113 votes to 49, with 6 abstentions.

The Chair: I now put to the vote operative paragraph 8.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour:

Algeria, Angola, Antigua and Barbuda, Argentina, Armenia, Azerbaijan, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belarus, Belize, Bolivia (Plurinational State of), Botswana, Brazil, Burkina Faso, Burundi, Cambodia, Cameroon, Central African Republic, Chad, China, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Cuba, Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Democratic Republic of the Congo, Djibouti, El Salvador, Equatorial Guinea, Eritrea, Eswatini, Ethiopia, Gabon, Gambia, Ghana, Guinea, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Jamaica, Jordan, Kazakhstan, Kenya, Kiribati, Kuwait, Kyrgyzstan, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lebanon, Lesotho, Libya, Madagascar, Malawi, Malaysia, Mali, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Myanmar, Namibia, Nepal, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Peru, Philippines, Qatar, Russian Federation, Rwanda, Saint Kitts and Nevis, Saint Lucia, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, Saudi Arabia, Singapore, Somalia, South Africa, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Syrian Arab Republic, Tajikistan, Thailand, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Uganda, United Republic of Tanzania, Uruguay, Uzbekistan, Viet Nam, Yemen, Zambia

Against:

Albania, Andorra, Australia, Austria, Belgium, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Bulgaria, Canada, Croatia, Cyprus, Czechia, Denmark, Estonia, Finland, France, Germany, Greece, Hungary, Iceland, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Japan, Latvia, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Malta, Monaco, Montenegro, Netherlands (Kingdom of the), New Zealand, North Macedonia, Norway, Poland, Portugal, Republic of Korea, Republic of Moldova, Romania, San Marino, Slovakia, Slovenia, Spain, Sweden, Switzerland, Türkiye, Ukraine, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America

Abstaining:

Bhutan, Brunei Darussalam, Chile, Colombia, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, Fiji, Georgia, Guatemala, Guyana, Honduras, Mexico, Papua New Guinea, Paraguay, Senegal, South Sudan, United Arab Emirates

Operative paragraph 8 was retained by 98 votes to 49, with 18 abstentions.

The Chair: I now put to the vote operative paragraph 9.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour:

Algeria, Angola, Antigua and Barbuda, Argentina, Armenia, Azerbaijan, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belarus, Belize, Bolivia (Plurinational State of), Botswana, Brazil, Burkina Faso, Burundi, Cambodia, Cameroon, Central African Republic, Chad, China, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Cuba, Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Democratic Republic of the Congo, Djibouti, Egypt, El Salvador, Equatorial Guinea, Eritrea, Eswatini, Ethiopia, Gabon, Gambia, Ghana, Guinea, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Jamaica, Jordan, Kazakhstan, Kenya, Kiribati, Kuwait, Kyrgyzstan, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lebanon, Lesotho, Libya, Madagascar, Malawi, Malaysia, Mali, Mauritania, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Myanmar, Namibia, Nepal, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Philippines, Qatar, Russian Federation, Rwanda, Saint Kitts and Nevis, Saint Lucia, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, Saudi Arabia, Singapore, Somalia, South Africa, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Syrian Arab Republic, Tajikistan, Thailand, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Uganda, United Republic of Tanzania, Uruguay, Uzbekistan, Viet Nam, Yemen, Zambia

Against:

Albania, Andorra, Australia, Austria, Belgium, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Bulgaria, Canada, Croatia, Cyprus, Czechia, Denmark, Estonia, Finland, France, Germany, Greece, Hungary, Iceland, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Japan, Latvia, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Malta, Monaco, Montenegro, Netherlands (Kingdom of the), New Zealand, North Macedonia, Norway, Poland, Portugal, Republic of Korea, Republic of Moldova, Romania, San Marino, Slovakia, Slovenia, Spain, Sweden, Switzerland, Türkiye, Ukraine, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America

Abstaining:

Bhutan, Brunei Darussalam, Chile, Colombia, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Fiji, Georgia, Guatemala, Guyana, Honduras, Mauritius, Mexico, Papua New Guinea, Paraguay, Peru, Senegal, South Sudan, United Arab Emirates

Operative paragraph 9 was retained by 97 votes to 49, with 19 abstentions.

The Chair: I now put to the vote operative paragraph 10.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour:

Algeria, Angola, Antigua and Barbuda, Argentina, Armenia, Azerbaijan, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belarus, Belize, Bolivia (Plurinational State of), Botswana, Brazil, Burkina Faso, Burundi, Cambodia, Cameroon, Central African Republic, Chad, China, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Cuba, Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Democratic Republic of the Congo, Djibouti, Egypt, El Salvador, Equatorial Guinea, Eritrea, Eswatini, Ethiopia, Gabon, Gambia, Ghana, Guinea, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Jamaica, Jordan, Kazakhstan, Kenya, Kiribati, Kuwait, Kyrgyzstan, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lebanon, Lesotho, Libya, Madagascar, Malawi, Malaysia, Mali, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Myanmar, Namibia, Nepal, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Peru, Philippines, Qatar, Russian Federation, Rwanda, Saint Kitts and Nevis, Saint Lucia, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, Saudi Arabia, Singapore, Somalia, South Africa, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Syrian Arab Republic, Tajikistan, Thailand, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Uganda, United Republic of Tanzania, Uruguay, Uzbekistan, Viet Nam, Yemen, Zambia

Against:

Albania, Andorra, Australia, Austria, Belgium, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Bulgaria, Canada, Croatia, Cyprus, Czechia, Denmark, Estonia, Finland, France, Germany, Greece, Hungary, Iceland, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Japan, Latvia, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Malta, Monaco, Montenegro, Netherlands (Kingdom of the), New Zealand, North Macedonia, Norway, Poland, Portugal, Republic of Korea, Republic

of Moldova, Romania, San Marino, Slovakia, Slovenia, Spain, Sweden, Switzerland, Türkiye, Ukraine, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America

Abstaining:

Bhutan, Brunei Darussalam, Chile, Colombia, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Fiji, Georgia, Guatemala, Guyana, Honduras, Mexico, Papua New Guinea, Paraguay, Senegal, South Sudan, United Arab Emirates

Operative paragraph 10 was retained by 99 votes to 49, with 17 abstentions.

The Chair: I now put to the vote operative paragraph 11.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour:

Algeria, Angola, Antigua and Barbuda, Argentina, Armenia, Azerbaijan, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belarus, Belize, Bolivia (Plurinational State of), Botswana, Brazil, Burkina Faso, Burundi, Cambodia, Cameroon, Central African Republic, Chad, China, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Cuba, Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Democratic Republic of the Congo, Djibouti, Egypt, El Salvador, Equatorial Guinea, Eritrea, Eswatini, Ethiopia, Gabon, Gambia, Ghana, Guinea, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Jamaica, Jordan, Kazakhstan, Kenya, Kiribati, Kuwait, Kyrgyzstan, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lebanon, Lesotho, Libya, Madagascar, Malawi, Malaysia, Mali, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Myanmar, Namibia, Nepal, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Peru, Philippines, Qatar, Russian Federation, Rwanda, Saint Kitts and Nevis, Saint Lucia, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Singapore, Somalia, South Africa, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Syrian Arab Republic, Tajikistan, Thailand, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Uganda, United Republic of Tanzania, Uruguay, Uzbekistan, Viet Nam, Yemen, Zambia

Against:

Albania, Andorra, Australia, Austria, Belgium, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Bulgaria, Canada, Croatia, Cyprus, Czechia, Denmark, Estonia,

Finland, France, Germany, Greece, Hungary, Iceland, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Japan, Latvia, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Malta, Monaco, Montenegro, Netherlands (Kingdom of the), New Zealand, North Macedonia, Norway, Poland, Portugal, Republic of Korea, Republic of Moldova, Romania, San Marino, Slovakia, Slovenia, Spain, Sweden, Switzerland, Türkiye, Ukraine, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America

Abstaining:

Bhutan, Brunei Darussalam, Chile, Colombia, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Fiji, Georgia, Guatemala, Guyana, Honduras, Mexico, Papua New Guinea, Paraguay, South Sudan, United Arab Emirates

Operative paragraph 11 was retained by 100 votes to 49, with 16 abstentions.

The Chair: The Committee will now proceed to take action on draft resolution A/C.1/78/L.55 as a whole.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour:

Afghanistan, Algeria, Angola, Antigua and Barbuda, Argentina, Armenia, Azerbaijan, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belarus, Belize, Bhutan, Bolivia (Plurinational State of), Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Burkina Faso, Burundi, Cambodia, Cameroon, Central African Republic, Chad, China, Colombia, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Cuba, Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Democratic Republic of the Congo, Djibouti, Dominica, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Equatorial Guinea, Eritrea, Eswatini, Ethiopia, Gabon, Gambia, Ghana, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Jamaica, Jordan, Kazakhstan, Kenya, Kiribati, Kuwait, Kyrgyzstan, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lebanon, Lesotho, Libya, Madagascar, Malawi, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Myanmar, Namibia, Nauru, Nepal, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Qatar, Russian Federation, Rwanda, Saint Kitts and Nevis, Saint Lucia, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Serbia, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Solomon Islands, Somalia, South

Africa, South Sudan, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Syrian Arab Republic, Tajikistan, Thailand, Timor-Leste, Togo, Tonga, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Uganda, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Tanzania, Uruguay, Uzbekistan, Vanuatu, Viet Nam, Yemen, Zambia, Zimbabwe

Against:

Albania, Andorra, Australia, Austria, Belgium, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Bulgaria, Canada, Croatia, Cyprus, Czechia, Denmark, Estonia, Finland, France, Germany, Greece, Hungary, Iceland, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Japan, Latvia, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Malta, Marshall Islands, Monaco, Montenegro, Netherlands (Kingdom of the), New Zealand, North Macedonia, Norway, Poland, Portugal, Republic of Korea, Republic of Moldova, Romania, San Marino, Slovakia, Slovenia, Spain, Sweden, Türkiye, Ukraine, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America

Abstaining:

Chile, Fiji, Georgia, Guatemala, Honduras, Papua New Guinea, Switzerland

Draft resolution A/C.1/78/L.55, as a whole, was adopted by 122 votes to 49, with 7 abstentions.

The Chair: I now call on delegations wishing to explain their votes or positions.

Mr. Anderegg (Switzerland): Switzerland once again abstained in the voting on the text contained in draft resolution A/C.1/78/L.53, “No first placement of weapons in outer space”. Our delegation wishes to put on record that our explanations of vote on previous iterations of the draft resolution remain valid. Our reservations towards the text have been reinforced by the testing of counter-space capabilities by its promoter, which are inconsistent with the stated objective of the draft resolution.

Regarding draft resolution A/C.1/78/L. 55, “Further practical measures for the prevention of an arms race in outer space”, Switzerland abstained in the voting on the draft resolution as a whole and voted against operative paragraphs 8, 9, 10 and 11. That vote was motivated by the following reasons.

We share the view that progress is required with regard to addressing the risks posed by an arms race in outer space. We remain concerned by the development

and possible deployment of weapons systems in outer space or targeting space assets and are of the view that elaborating a legally binding instrument in that area remains an important objective. However, the question marks that we have regarding the wording of several paragraphs in the resolution, which underlined in our explanation of vote at previous sessions, remain unchanged.

For their part, our votes against operative paragraphs 8, 09, 10 and 11 are explained by our grave concern regarding the establishment of a second United Nations open-ended working group (OEWG) on space security, which raises questions of coherence, efficiency and capacity. An OEWG on space security already exists. It has met over the past two years and been renewed by the Committee, and we believe that its mandate is sufficiently flexible to address all aspects related to space security. While we are of the view that addressing both behavioural and capacity issues is necessary to meet the challenge of space security, we believe that this discussion should be undertaken in a comprehensive manner under a single process. In organizational terms, we are also concerned that the OEWG foreseen by A/C.1/78/L.55 would not provide for a sufficiently inclusive process, in particular as actors relevant to outer space questions are not limited to States.

Mr. Ahmed (Pakistan): With respect to the draft resolution contained in document A/C.1/78/L.15/Rev.1, “Reducing space threats through norms, rules and principles of responsible behaviours”, my delegation holds the following views.

We participated in the first Open-ended Working Group (OEWG) on reducing space threats through norms, rules and principles of responsible behaviours, despite having abstained in the voting on resolution 76/231, which established it. We believe that the prevention of an arms race in outer space (PAROS) should remain our north star and the ultimate objective of our collective efforts to increase space security.

Pakistan has consistently advocated for advancing negotiations on a legally binding instrument on PAROS. Concurrently, we have actively contributed to discussions on non-legally binding measures, such as transparency and confidence-building measures. We recognize the complementary relationship between the two approaches. Historically, non-legally binding measures have contributed to the development of

legally binding instruments and hold the potential to do so in the future. We appreciate the fact that the main sponsor of A/C.1/78/L.15/Rev.1 has acknowledged that complementarity in its text.

We also found the discussions in the first OEWG to be enriching and inclusive. It provided valuable insights into what activities States perceive as threatening and helped shed light on the underlying conceptual divergences that we must strive to bridge on the PAROS agenda.

The latest version of the draft text in A/C.1/78/L.15/Rev.1 has undergone significant changes from past years. We recognize the efforts of the lead sponsor and its outreach. We note some positive references in the text, including a reaffirmation of the importance of PAROS. However, we wish to point out a few gaps in the current text that obliged us to abstain again in the voting on the draft resolution as a whole, and in particular on its operative paragraph 4.

Many States continue to question the effectiveness of an exclusive focus on regulating or verifying behaviour, while ignoring capabilities. Traditional approaches to arms control include focus on both capabilities and behaviours. A balanced approach is essential to preventing a conflict and an arms race in outer space. Furthermore, the concept of responsible and irresponsible behaviour could also be subject to politicization if addressed without verifiable criteria and in isolation. We also would have preferred a more inclusive list of topics in operative paragraph 4 rather than the current narrow framing of safe operations of space systems — a notion that is also being dealt with in the work of the Committee on the Peaceful Uses of Outer Space.

Notwithstanding those gaps, Pakistan stands ready to participate in any future open-ended working group on reducing threats in space that contributes to PAROS. However, such an OEWG should focus on both capabilities and behaviours, examine threats in a comprehensive manner and contribute towards the development of a legally binding instrument.

While we abstained in the voting on A/C.1/78/L.15/Rev.1 and voted in favour of A/C.1/78/L.55 based on their respective mandates, we are concerned that competing initiatives are being proposed to be launched after 2024 at the same time. That would contribute to divisions on the PAROS agenda and place a burden on small delegations to follow and effectively contribute

to such discussions taking place in parallel streams. We would like to urge the sponsors of the two draft resolutions to undertake efforts next year to develop a common understanding on the timelines of those processes before they are launched.

Ms. Kristanti (Indonesia): I take the floor to explain Indonesia's vote on the draft resolutions considered under this cluster. Indonesia has consistently supported the five resolutions presented in this cluster, and the spirit of those five resolution are in line with our principled position to preserve outer space as a peaceful, safe, stable, secure and sustainable environment. We also believe that the establishment of a legally binding instrument to prevent an arms race in outer space (PAROS) should be our top priority.

However, we deeply regret to see a more apparent polarization among all Member States this year in the First Committee, particularly on this cluster. The proposal to establish two open-ended working groups (OEWGs) that would run in parallel on outer space, as proposed in draft resolutions A/C.1/78/L.15/Rev.1 and A/C.1/78/L.55, profoundly reflects the lack of trust, dialogue and political will to strive towards consensus. We must not let those factors continue to affect the credibility and legitimacy of our work in the First Committee. The proposed establishment of the two OEWGs might also prevent the effective, meaningful and inclusive participation of all Member States, especially those with smaller delegation.

At the same time, our delegation takes note that the two proposed OEWGs promotes a different set of foci. We feel that the two OEWGs could indeed work in complementarity and not serve as exclusive efforts that are disconnected from one another. Indonesia will respect all ongoing processes and discussions to promote the peaceful uses of outer space, in the understanding that all of those processes are, in the end, aimed at establishing a legally binding instrument on PAROS. Therefore, Indonesia voted in favour of both draft resolutions A/C.1/78/L.15/Rev.1 and A/C.1/78/L.55, including all of their paragraphs.

To conclude, allow me to share Indonesia's firm position that threats to outer space should be addressed in a comprehensive manner through the establishment of a legally binding instrument on PAROS. Members may rest assured of Indonesia's support and active contribution to the discussion on that matter in the future.

Miss Low (Singapore): Singapore recognizes the importance of preserving outer space as a peaceful environment for the conduct of space activities and as a global commons that is accessible and beneficial to all humankind. We have consistently supported the resolutions and relevant decisions on further practical measures for the prevention of an arms race in outer space as well as for reducing space threats through norms, rules and principles of responsible behaviours. We also participated actively in the Open-Ended Working Group (OEWG) on reducing space threats through norms, rules and principles of responsible behaviours that concluded in August, and regret that the OEWG was unable to adopt an outcome document by consensus.

Singapore supports practical approaches towards a common framework for outer space security, such as the development of norms of responsible behaviours and measures to prevent the threat or use of force in outer space. Singapore is also open to the possibility of a legally-binding instrument in the future to strengthen the application of international law in outer space.

While we voted in favour of both draft resolutions A/C.1/78/L.15/ Rev.1 and A/C.1/78/L.55 and their respective operative paragraphs establishing OEWGs, given the need to continue discussions on outer space security in an open and inclusive format, Singapore remains deeply concerned by the establishment of parallel processes on that important topic. The creation of parallel OEWGs would lead to duplication, inefficiencies and the fragmentation of discussions on outer space security and place a particular strain on small States with limited resources. Like other Member States, Singapore calls for efforts towards an eventual single-track mechanism that could integrate different approaches and views to move forward constructively on outer space discussions.

Our multilateral cooperative mechanisms must be used as they were intended — to promote engagement, not division. Singapore reaffirms our commitment to working with all Member States to preserve outer space as a peaceful global commons.

Mr. Gunaratna (Sri Lanka): Sri Lanka has been committed to the goal of the prevention of an arms race in outer space (PAROS) and it is with that intention that, together with Egypt, we submitted draft resolution A/C.1/78/L.3, on PAROS, which, we were pleased to note, was adopted by consensus. We

thank all delegations, particularly the sponsors, for their continued support. The draft resolution calls for negotiations to begin on an international legally binding instrument at the Conference on Disarmament.

Sri Lanka has also been supportive of other processes that support and buttress the international discourse on the subject. In that context, we voted in favour of draft resolutions A/C.1/78/L.55, “Further practical measures for the prevention of an arms race in outer space”; A/C.1/78/L.53, “No first placement of weapons in outer space”; and A/C.1/78/L.54, “Transparency and confidence-building measures in outer space activities”. However, we were compelled to abstain in the voting on draft resolution A/C.1/78/L.15/Rev.1, as the content of the draft resolution has changed from its previous version to include the establishment of another open-ended working group that would essentially duplicate other processes and create an undue burden on Member States with capacity constraints, especially those with smaller delegations.

We reiterate that discussions on norms, principles and responsible behaviours in outer space are intrinsically subjective and for that reason lack consistency, and the potential for exploitation can lead to increased tensions and conflicts and would surely limit progress and innovation. In the absence of objective criteria, different interpretations can fuel tensions and be an impediment to collaboration that could lead to conflict and a lack of trust among spacefaring nations. Without clear and universally agreed-upon guidelines, there may be room for manipulation and actions that would undermine the principles of fairness and equality in space activities. Their validity to non-spacefaring nations depends only on the extent to which they lend credence to the discussions on an international legally binding instrument.

My delegation considers that this must not be confused with discussions on rules that can include a legally binding instrument. Norms, principles and responsible behaviours are essentially the prerogative of the spacefaring nations, are generally non-binding and lack legal enforceability. They are no more than guidelines. On the other hand, legally binding instruments, such as a Treaty or an international agreement, are formal documents that create legal obligations for the parties involved and carry legal consequences if violated. Legally binding instruments create legally binding obligations, and non-compliance can lead to legal dispute sanctions or

other legal consequences. The adoption of norms and standards does not necessarily require the unanimous agreement of all parties involved, whereas a legally binding instrument requires a more formal process of negotiation and ratification.

As an international community, we must continue to work towards developing a comprehensive legal framework for outer space activities, balancing the need for regulation with the desire to foster innovation and cooperation.

Mr. Turner (United States of America): The United States has the honour to deliver this explanation of vote on behalf of the United States, France and the United Kingdom on draft resolution A/C.1/78/L.53, “No first placement of weapons in outer space”. We voted against the draft resolution and would like to explain why.

As we have in the past, we would like to reiterate that draft resolution A/C.1/78/L.53 contains a number of significant problems, and three in particular.

First, it does not adequately define a weapon in outer space. The dual use nature of many space systems makes it challenging to create a workable definition and could be the basis for spurious claims that civilian satellites are weapons and allow on purely political grounds that certain satellites can be targeted.

Secondly, it contains no elements that would make it possible to effectively confirm whether a State is meeting a commitment not to be the first to place weapons in outer space, not only because observing the nature of space systems is challenging but, more importantly, because it would demand that we judge the intentions of their operators, which is impossible without sharing a common understanding of what is threatening and what is not. As such, the draft resolution does not fulfil the criteria for effective transparency and confidence-building measures, as set out by the Group of Governmental Experts on Transparency and Confidence-Building Measures in Outer Space Activities in its 2013 report (A/68/189). Indeed, in the current security context, measures such as no first placement only introduce ambiguity and uncertainty and thus exacerbate the risks of misunderstanding and misperception.

Thirdly, it contains language that has no meaning or relation in the context of discussions on the prevention of an arms race in outer space, the Treaty on Principles Governing the Activities of States in the Exploration

and Use of Outer Space, including the Moon and Other Celestial Bodies, or multilateral arms control and disarmament, such as the reference in the fifth preambular paragraph to “a common effort towards a community of shared future for humankind”. Beyond that, we have reason to believe that the authors of the draft resolution and other countries’ military actions do not match the rhetoric of the commitment to no first placement.

Mr. Guerra (Argentina) (*spoke in Spanish*): My delegation wishes to make an explanation of vote in relation to draft resolutions A/C.1/78/L.15/Rev.1, “Reducing space threats through norms, rules and principles of responsible behaviours”, and A/C.1/78/L.55, “Further practical measures for the prevention of an arms race in outer space”, both of which we voted in favour of.

The Argentine Republic highlights the contributions of the Groups of Governmental Experts and the Open-ended Working Groups on the prevention of an arms race in outer space, which have made it possible to shed light on the discussions and lay the foundations for new understandings on the subject in a poorly regulated area. However, we stress the importance of avoiding the duplication of mechanisms and initiatives that refer to the same subject, which could hinder the participation of all delegations and affect the outcome of the various processes. Differences in relation to approaches to the treatment of the prevention of an arms race in outer space should be resolved within the mechanism that is created, avoiding overlapping.

Ms. Lipana (Philippines): The Philippines lends its support to draft resolutions A/C.1/78/L.15/Rev.1, “Reducing space threats through norms, rules and principles of responsible behaviours”, and A/C.1/78/L.55, “Further practical measures for the prevention of an arms race in outer space”. The draft resolutions are of paramount importance in the fields of disarmament and international security, and we commend the tireless efforts of the sponsors and co-sponsors.

Our commitment to the draft resolutions is evident in our active participation in the Group of Governmental Experts on further practical measures for the prevention of an arms race in outer space (PAROS) for 2023-2024. Furthermore, we take pride that we played a significant role in the recently concluded Open-ended Working Group (OEWG) on reducing space threats through

norms, rules, and principles of responsible behaviours. Those actions underscore our unwavering dedication to ensuring the security and stability of outer space.

However, we must candidly acknowledge the complexity of our decision to support the establishment of the two OEWGs. While both initiatives are commendable in their efforts to address the multifaceted concerns of States related to the preservation of peace and security in outer space, we earnestly hope that, should both processes be adopted, they can be harmonized in the future. Such harmonization would streamline our collective efforts, making them more efficient and effective.

We are also aware of the challenges that the OEWGs present to smaller delegations in Geneva. The need to allocate resources to participate in both processes creates a significant burden. Therefore, we call for cooperation among delegations to prevent the politicization of issues impacting our shared outer space domain. That realm should remain a symbol of peaceful cooperation. We advocate for a commitment to inclusivity and fairness in our efforts to ensure space security and disarmament.

As an emerging spacefaring nation, the Philippines eagerly engages in discussions about outer space. We champion the doctrine of “due regard” as responsible behaviour in outer space. We firmly believe that this principle, enshrined in the 1967 Treaty on Principles Governing the Activities of States in the Exploration and Use of Outer Space, including the Moon and Other Celestial Bodies, signifies a departure from the *laissez-faire* treatment of outer space and mirrors the evolution of norms governing the use of the high seas. Due regard calls for a careful balance of competing rights and interests between spacefaring nations and the broader international community. The due regard duty is not an absolute constraint on any State conduct. Nonetheless, it does not permit States to disregard the rights and interests of others without consideration. Its application depends on the nature and importance of the rights and duties involved, the potential for impairment, the nature and significance of planned activities, and the availability of alternative approaches. In most cases, it necessitates good-faith consultations that involve a conscious effort to balance rights and interests. Those consultations should encompass sincere consideration of other parties concerned, suggestions for compromise and a willingness to provide assurances.

We recognize that article IX of the 1967 Outer Space Treaty provides for consultations as an optional tool. While such consultations are not legally binding, we contend that responsible space behaviours should involve a low threshold for initiating them. Consequently, we support the suggestions made by the delegations of the Republic of Korea and Germany during the OEWG on reducing space threats to explore possibilities for actualizing such consultations, potentially designating national focal points for ease of coordination. Furthermore, the due regard duty places a due diligence obligation on States concerning the conduct of their nationals and vessels in outer space. That obligation ensures that their actions do not prejudice the rights and interests of other States, thereby preserving the peaceful use of outer space and preventing conflicts or accidents.

In conclusion, the Philippines remains dedicated to fostering responsible behaviours in outer space and supporting efforts to prevent arms race in that vital domain. We firmly believe that harmonization of the two OEWGs, along with the steadfast commitment to the principle of due regard, will significantly contribute to the preservation of peace and security in outer space, for the benefit of all humankind. That is why we voted in favour of both draft resolutions and the establishment of both OEWGs. We eagerly anticipate collaborative efforts with all States to achieve the crucial objectives set forth by A/C.1/78/L.15/Rev.1 and A/C.1/78/L.55.

Mr. Sánchez Kiesslich (Mexico) (*spoke in Spanish*): Mexico voted in favour of draft resolutions A/C.1/78/L.15/Rev.1 and A/C.1/78/L.55 because we recognize the complementary approach between both.

My country strongly supports the approach of preventing an arms race in outer space, in particular through the development of legally binding instruments. As the international community works towards those objectives, we also support the development of norms and principles of responsible behaviours in outer space in the context of confidence-building measures among States. However, we insist that they cannot substitute for one another. Our position is clear that outer space should be preserved exclusively for peaceful uses. That is a priority for countries, such as Mexico, that do not have special advanced space capabilities and will never support the placement of weapons in outer space.

While we voted in favour of both draft resolutions as a whole, I would like to explain our abstentions in the

recorded votes on certain paragraphs. With respect to operative paragraph 5 of draft resolution A/C.1/78/L.15/Rev.1 and operative paragraph 9 of A/C.1/78/L.55, the position of Mexico on the improper use of consensus is well known. During the thematic debate on outer space, we heard complaints from delegations about the blocking of outcomes in the Open-ended Working Group on reducing space threats through norms, rules and principles of responsible behaviours. Why repeat this method of work when it only leads to 193 vetoes? We are also concerned about the formulation of operative paragraph 9 of A/C.1/78/L.55, which, in addition to focusing on consensus, indicates that this does not bind Member States in future negotiations. Why do we want to seek consensus if it is not respected in subsequent negotiations?

Concerning operative paragraphs 8, 10 and 11 of draft resolution A/C.1/78/L.55, we do not agree in forcing the General Assembly to establish a new open-ended working group when the Group of Governmental Experts on further practical measures for the prevention of an arms race in outer space, mandated by the immediately prior resolution, has not even begun its work.

Lastly, we once again appeal to all Member States not to present competing initiatives that only lead to political divisiveness and the inefficient use of human and financial resources. I believe that both of those approaches should be combined in a single approach.

Mexico supports draft resolution A/C.1/78/L.53, “No first placement of weapons in outer space”, because we see the need to highlight the importance and urgency of preventing an arms race in outer space, faithful to our commitment to preserving outer space for peaceful purposes. However, we reiterate that such support should not be understood at any time as a tacit endorsement or acceptance of a supposed right to place arms in outer space or to launch such weapons from the Earth if another State does so first or in response to an attack. Mexico will continue to strive to ensure that no actor under any circumstances places weapons in outer space. Further, Mexico reiterates that, specifically, all nuclear weapons must be prohibited and eliminated, independently of their category or their location, in conformity with the provisions of the 1967 Treaty on Principles Governing the Activities of States in the Exploration and Use of Outer Space, including the Moon and Other Celestial Bodies and the Treaty on the Prohibition of Nuclear Weapons.

Mr. Ghorbanpour (Islamic Republic of Iran): I have taken the floor to explain the position and votes of my delegation regarding draft resolutions A/C.1/78/L.53, “First placement of weapons in outer space”, and A/C.1/78/L.54, “Transparency and confidence-building measures in outer space activities”.

My delegation voted in favour of A/C.1/78/L.53 and A/C.1/78/L.54. I wish to place on record that our previously announced position on them remains valid. Furthermore, Iran’s joining the consensus on A/C.1/78/L.54 should not be taken as its support for the report of the Group of Governmental Experts on Transparency and Confidence-Building Measures in Outer Space Activities (A/68/189), as reflected in operative paragraph 1 of the draft resolution. The group was limited and selective, and Iran was not one of its members. In addition, our support for the draft proposals should not be implied to acknowledge the proposal concerning anti-satellite missile tests.

Mr. Kulkarni (India): With respect to draft resolution A/C.1/78/L.15/Rev.1, “Reducing space threats through norms, rules and principles of responsible behaviours”, India, as a major spacefaring nation, has vital development and security interests in space.

India has opposed the weaponization of outer space. India has been a consistent advocate of preserving outer space as an ever-expanding frontier for cooperative endeavours. India supports substantive consideration of the prevention of an arms race in outer space (PAROS) and we remain committed to a legally binding instrument on PAROS that is universally acceptable, verifiable and multilaterally negotiated in the Conference on Disarmament.

Subjectivity in the interpretation of space behaviours and the perception of threats, how they are understood and the application of such determinations have been a matter of concern for us. We also have concerns about the appropriate verification and situational awareness of space behaviour using current technology and access to such technology. The means for arriving at an unbiased assessment of a space behaviours that are accepted and understood by consensus and that are immune to politicization are a related matter of concern.

Despite our concerns, we participated constructively in the Open-ended Working Group on reducing space threats through norms, rules and principles of responsible behaviours established pursuant to resolution 76/231. We note that the Group was not

able to produce an outcome report owing to divergent views. We were therefore, in line with our position on the previous resolutions on the subject, constrained to abstain in the voting on A/C.1/78/L.15/Rev.1.

India voted in favour of A/C.1/78/L.53, “No first placement of weapons in outer space”. The draft resolution states that the legal regime applicable to outer space needs to be consolidated and reinforced. India supports that objective, as well as the strengthening of the international legal regime to protect and preserve access to space for all and to prevent, without exception, the weaponization of outer space. We support the substantive consideration of PAROS in the Conference on Disarmament. We see no first placement of weapons in outer space as a useful initiative and not as a substitute for substantive legal measures to ensure the prevention of an arms race in outer space.

We voted against the fifth preambular paragraph of the draft resolution due to the inclusion of the phrase “a community of shared future for humankind”. That phrase is part of a political ideology, and a resolution of the General Assembly is not the appropriate place to reflect ideologies of countries.

On A/C.1/78/L.55, India has traditionally supported the resolution on further practical measures for the prevention of an arms race in outer space. As to its fifth preambular paragraph, India cast a negative vote, the reasons for which I have just explained in our explanation of vote for A/C.1/78/L.53 with respect to a similar inclusion. India continues to support substantive consideration of PAROS and we remain committed to a legally binding instrument on PAROS that is universally acceptable, verifiable and multilaterally negotiated in the Conference on Disarmament.

Mr. Namekawa (Japan): Japan would like to explain the reasoning for its vote against draft resolution A/C.1/78/L.55, “Further practical measures for the prevention of an arms race in outer space”. While we agree with the objective of preventing an arms race in outer space and the need for further practical measures in this regard, the draft resolution contains the following problematic issues.

First, on substance, there is a need for a practical and holistic approach to prevent an arms race in outer space. Given the increasing reliance on, as well as multiplying activities and actors related to outer space, it is vital to take into account the dual-use nature of

space objects and technologies and address current and potential space threats.

Secondly, on procedure, operative paragraph 8 of the draft resolution stipulates the establishment of an open-ended working group (OEWG) to continue building on the work of the Group of Governmental Experts on further practical measures for the prevention of an arms race in outer space (GGE) to consider and to make recommendations on substantial elements of an international legally binding instrument on the prevention of an arms race. However, as the GGE has yet to commence its formal sessions, it is premature to prejudge its results. Indeed, there is no urgency to establish an OEWG at this stage, considering the significant resource implications. Therefore, the establishment of an OEWG should be considered when the prospects of the GGE become clear, for instance, after the seventy-ninth session of the General Assembly. Further, as the United Nations budget is limited, the duration of the OEWG should also be considered carefully.

Thirdly, there is another issue pertaining to the period of the OEWG. The period of this OEWG is expected to extend from 2024 to 2028, which would overlap with the proposal to establish another OEWG on reducing space threats through norms, rules and principles of responsible behaviours. The latter OEWG on responsible behaviours explicitly avoided parallel processes to the upcoming GGE, based on due consideration, to ensure complementary and avoid excessive workload for delegations. Japan is strongly committed to deepening the discussion pertaining to the prevention of an arms race in outer space, but we voted against draft resolution A/C.1/78/L.55 in light of the aforementioned reasons.

Mr. Zhang Junjie (China) (*spoke in Chinese*): Regarding draft resolution A/C.1/78/L.15/Rev.1, “Reducing space threats through norms, rules and principles of response behaviours”, China voted against it. I should like to explain why. My delegation’s main concerns as regards A/C.1/78/L.15/Rev.1 are as follows.

First, there is a strong element of subjectivity in the dichotomy between responsible and irresponsible behaviours. There are no agreed objective criteria by which this notion is defined, thus leaving it wide open for a scant few countries to instrumentalize it to instigate geopolitical confrontations.

Secondly, the topics to be discussed by the envisaged open-ended working group (OEWG) are one-sided and selective. In other words, its proposed agenda is truncated and unbalanced. Conspicuously absent are issues that matter the most to outer space security, including outer space military doctrines.

Thirdly, the envisaged OEWG fails to focus on the prevention of an arms race in outer space (PAROS). It conflates two distinct concepts, namely, the threats to outer space security versus the security risks brought about by the peaceful uses of outer space, which has the potential to duplicate or even distract from the relevant discussions at the Committee on the Peaceful Uses of Outer Space and may skew the outer space arms control process out of focus.

Fourthly, the OEWGs envisaged in draft resolutions A/C.1/78/L.15/Rev.1 and A/C.1/78/L.55 would form parallel processes. Seeing that they both serve the goal of negotiating a legally binding instrument on PAROS, the issues covered by the OEWG envisaged in A/C.1/78/L.15/Rev.1 can be subsumed in the Group of Governmental Experts to consider and to make recommendations on substantial elements of an international legally binding instrument on the prevention of an arms race in outer space and the subsequent OEWG process. China is not in favour of creating a dedicated OEWG on reducing space threats through norms, rules and principles of responsible behaviours, as we believe that it would sidetrack the international effort to negotiate an international legally binding instrument on PAROS.

In the light of the foregoing, China voted against draft resolution A/C.1/78/L.15/Rev.1. It is China's consistent position that negotiating an international legally binding instrument on PAROS would be the most conclusive solution for the maintenance of security in outer space. All efforts within the General Assembly framework should converge on that fundamental path. After all, a secure outer space is not possible without a return to the right track, that is, international law.

Mr. Wazima Szatmari (Brazil): Brazil joined the consensus on draft resolutions A/C.1/78/L.3, "Prevention of an arms race in outer space", and A/C.1/78/L.54, "Transparency and confidence-building measures in outer space activities", and voted in favour of draft resolutions A/C.1/78/L.15/Rev.1, "Reducing space threats through norms, rules and principles of responsible behaviours"; A/C.1/78/L.53, "Further

practical measures for the prevention of an arms race in outer space"; and A/C.1/78/L.55, "No first placement of weapons in outer space".

Our approach to the cluster of outer space is to give the green light to all draft resolutions submitted under this topic, based on the understanding that there is an urgent need to regulate activities in outer space due to their critical impact on Earth structures and to the impending risks of the weaponization of outer space. Yet, the international community was not able, this time around, to coalesce around common terms of reference to address simultaneously the vexing question of behaviours versus capabilities.

We are disappointed by the fact that it was not possible for the sponsors of the establishment of three competing negotiating bodies to arrive at a compromise that would have enabled a similar process of convergence to that achieved in cybersecurity. Long-held views, hardened positions, memories of past grievances kept fresh, and an eye-for-an-eye mentality are not a good recipe for overcoming suspicions.

The result of this mix is that the General Assembly, in its wisdom, opted not to opt and kept all avenues open. It can be considered, with much good will, to be a second best. Delegations, particularly the smaller ones, will be compelled to spread thin their resources to attend the competing bodies. Worse still, we have no guarantees that this dispersion of resources will lead to the results to which we aspire. In any event, Brazil will participate in every negotiating effort to find the elusive path that will enable both the establishment of norms of behaviours in outer space to decrease security risks and steps in the direction of a legally binding agreement on the prevention of an arms race in outer space.

Brazil firmly believes that a first step to disarmament is to disarm the spirits. Having approved these twin processes, let us put behind us this regrettable failure to find short-term convergence and let us do our best to continue to seek convergence in the medium-term, working from within both processes.

Mr. Hegazy (Egypt): I take the floor to explain my delegation's votes on the proposals contained in documents A/C.1/78/L.15/Rev.1 and A/C.1/78/L.55.

Egypt supported the two draft resolutions as a whole, in line with its principled position to support all credible efforts aimed at the elaboration of rules that pave the way to the conclusion of legally binding

instruments on the prevention of an arms race in outer space (PAROS) in all its aspect. Nevertheless, we abstained in the voting on operative paragraph 4 of A/C.1/78/L.15/Rev.1 and operative paragraph 8 of A/C.1/78/L.55 due to the negative consequences of establishing competing processes. It is regrettable to witness the creation of parallel duplicating processes. That will lead only to the further polarization and fragmentation of the relevant deliberations and efforts.

Egypt has consistently warned against the multiple negative implications of the establishment of parallel processes under the same agenda item in the context of the First Committee. Having different approaches towards any topic does not mean that we should establish different processes to address it. The relevant mandate of one process can easily be designed in a comprehensive and balanced manner that allows for the consideration of different approaches. Those resource-intensive competing processes would most likely have difficulties in achieving the desired progress as the sponsors of each process view the other process as a threat to their own initiative. Moreover, most developing countries, including my own, simply do not possess the necessary resources to meaningfully and effectively participate in parallel processes under the same agenda item, in addition to other processes that address different disarmament-related issues.

Egypt has constructively engaged with all relevant parties and the main sponsors of the two draft resolutions in an attempt to bridge the gaps and to establish a unified, comprehensive process. Unfortunately, those efforts could not achieve the desired outcome due to the prevailing geopolitical circumstances. We were hoping that Member States would give a chance to the established process — namely, the Group of Governmental Experts on further practical measures for the prevention of an arms race in outer space (GGE), established pursuant to resolution 77/ 250, which will conclude its work by next summer — to represent a stepping stone towards a single, comprehensive process, instead of racing and competing to establish future processes in such a pre-emptive and counterproductive manner. A comprehensive and balanced outcome from the new GGE, in a manner that would truly address PAROS in all its aspects, without excluding the consideration of different approaches, would represent a unifying foundation for a comprehensive and consensual process in the future, and we urge all Member States to exert the necessary efforts and flexibility to achieve those goals.

Furthermore, we abstained in the voting on operative paragraphs 7 and 8 of A/C.1/78/L.15/Rev.1, as their languages are too descriptive and contain modalities that go beyond the recently agreed practices in the context of the first Committee.

Finally, we reiterate our willingness to participate constructively in the two new open-ended working groups, as we have always done in all previous similar processes on space security. Like other delegations, we look forward to the harmonization of the future work of the two processes.

Mr. Çetin (Türkiye): I am delivering an explanation of vote on draft resolution A/C.1/78/L.55, “Further practical measures on the prevention of an arms race in outer space”. My delegation voted against the draft resolution and its related paragraphs.

Türkiye attaches particular attention both to the prevention of an arms race in outer space and the protection of the right of unrestricted access to and use of outer space for the benefit and the welfare of all countries. In that respect, we believe that there is an increasing need for differentiating between the civil and military objectives of space objects, which could be regarded as a good example of norms in that field. It is also important to maintain transparency and trust by increasing international cooperation. Bearing in mind the current state of play in international affairs, the establishment of a legal basis does not seem to be likely in the near future. On the other hand, that should not impede us from working towards the development of a peaceful and stable space domain.

While reaffirming the importance of developing legally binding norms in this field, we believe that a behaviour-based approach is a faster and more pragmatic way forward to make progress on the prevention of an arms race in outer space and improve space security. Developing a shared understanding of norms, rules and principles of responsible behaviours is essential to providing transparency and increasing trust and international cooperation in outer space. That could also pave the way for a future legally binding instrument in the field.

Based on those principles, Türkiye fully supported the Open-ended Working Group on reducing space threats through norms, rules and principles of responsible behaviours, which came to an end this summer. With the same understanding, we also welcome and support the initiative to establish a new open-ended working

group to continue the valuable work of its predecessor. We will continue to support efforts for the promotion of standards of responsible State behaviours, as well as transparency and confidence-building measures in outer space activities.

Ms. Ávila Becerril (Costa Rica) (*spoke in Spanish*): My delegation would like to explain our voting on the draft resolutions under the outer space cluster.

The management of outer space should be addressed in a holistic way and take security and peaceful uses into account as inseparable components because all space activities have significant implications for Earth. That is why Costa Rica values all initiatives that allow us to engage in dialogue to make progress in preventing an arms race in outer space. Dialogue is the only path that can ensure that space is used exclusively for peaceful purposes.

That is why Costa Rica voted in favour of draft resolutions A/C.1/78/L.15/Rev.1 and A/C.1/78/L.55. Costa Rica believes that the creation of an open-ended working group is a positive step on the topic, although we would have preferred to create only one rather than two, as has been the case. We regret that it has not been possible for the authors of both draft resolutions to find common ground. Costa Rica believes that one single discussion would allow for an exchange of views on the prevention of the placement of arms in outer space and on what should constitute responsible behaviours in space, and that the recommendations generated could apply both to the creation of norms, rules and principles and to the formulation of a legally binding instrument. All this could be done in an inclusive way through a single open-ended working group.

We will now have two forums in which to outline our visions. We voted in favour because it is better to have two forums of negotiation than not to have any. However, the situation is not ideal, both in terms of the resources that we will need to invest as delegations in order to follow both groups and of the resources that we will have to invest together. That is not the most efficient way to carry out our deliberations. That is why we appeal to all delegations to approach the discussions in both working groups in a constructive spirit.

With respect to draft resolution A/C.1/78/L.53, Costa Rica reaffirms its position that the placement of weapons in outer space is unacceptable in any circumstances or in arguments concerning first, second or third use. Outer space cannot be converted

into a platform for launching aggressions or war, or a place from which to threaten or assert superiority or supremacy. On the contrary, outer space should always be an area of peace.

Mrs. Romero López (Cuba) (*spoke in Spanish*): The Cuban delegation voted against draft resolution A/C.1/78/L.15/Rev.1, “Reducing space threats through norms, rules and principles of responsible behaviours”. The draft maintains and reinforces the deficiencies that have led us to vote against the text in previous years, and in particular duplicates many of the tasks to be undertaken in the Committee on the Peaceful Uses of Outer Space and the Fourth Committee, in particular regarding the security of space operations and the guidelines of sustainability.

Secondly, the draft resolution seeks to modify the approach that has prevailed on this item on the agenda in the First Committee on the main threats in space. We continue to believe that the placement of weapons and the greater militarization of outer space, together with the continuing development and updating of weapons, are the main threats facing us in outer space.

Thirdly, the text seeks to also legitimize the fact that technology, means and space systems could be used for purposes that are incompatible with the objective of maintaining international peace and security. Ambiguous language that opens the door for the possibility of the use or the threat of the use of force in outer space is contrary to our commitment to the use and exploration of outer space for strictly peaceful purposes.

Fourthly, the draft seeks to establish a sequence between the development of new voluntary measures — both transparency and confidence-building measures and norms, rules and principles of responsible behaviours — and the adoption of legally binding instruments. Our delegation is involved in efforts to create transparency and confidence-building measures. However, those measures cannot be a substitute or any kind of precondition for a legally binding instrument for the prevention of an arms race in outer space, nor should they divert our attention from the urgent need for binding provisions to put an end to the long-standing absence of a ban on the placement of weapons in outer space.

In spite of our reservations concerning the notion of responsible State behaviours in the context of discussions on outer space, our delegation participated

actively and constructively in the discussions in the Open-ended Working Group on reducing space threats through norms, rules and principles of responsible behaviours, which met in Geneva in 2022 and 2023. The Group concluded its work without a consensual result, and yet the draft resolution continues to prioritize the promotion of voluntary norms, rules and principles responsible behaviours to address threats in outer space. At the same time, it de-emphasizes the path towards the adoption of a legally binding international instrument that would complement the existing legal regime for the prevention of an arms race, even though it is a long-standing goal supported by a large majority of States and the international community and on which our common efforts should be focused.

Ms. Rodríguez Acosta (El Salvador) (*spoke in Spanish*): El Salvador voted in favour of draft resolutions A/C.1/78/L.15/Rev.1, “Reducing space threats through norms, rules and principles of responsible behaviours”, and A/C.1/78/L.55, “Further practical measures for the prevention of an arms race in outer space”, fully aware that they will generate two parallel processes with common goals in preventing an arms race in outer space. As we indicated in the debate on methods of work that was held on 12 October (see A/C.1/78/PV.10), my country is concerned by the challenges and obstacles that the two parallel processes will represent, especially for smaller delegations.

El Salvador is working tirelessly to contribute constructively to the work of the United Nations, as shown by our commitment to the Organization. However, when a lack of will, flexibility and the capacity to overcome our differences prevails among Member States, we are depriving other States of the opportunities to share their valuable points of views. That is due not to a lack of interest, but rather to the inability to provide equitable conditions for their participation. In using our sovereign right to vote as a way to avoid dialogue, we are moving farther away from the founding principles of the Organization. That practice should be discouraged because not only does it complicate our work, but it is an improper use of the limited resources of the Organization and widens already deep geopolitical divides.

El Salvador will continue working constructively, participating in the work of the first committee with the hope that in the future we can be more constructive and achieve better agreements regarding our common goal of general and complete disarmament.

Mr. Sharoni (Israel): I would like to deliver Israel’s explanation of vote on draft resolutions A/C.1/78/L.3 and A/C.1/78/L.54. Israel joined the consensus on draft resolutions A/C.1/78/L.3, “Prevention of an arms race in outer space”, and A/C.1/78/L.54, “Transparency and confidence-building measures in outer space activities”, although we have reservations about some aspects contained therein.

The Chair: We have heard the last speaker in explanation of vote on draft resolutions under cluster 3, “Outer space (disarmament aspects).”

The Committee will now turn to the draft proposals under cluster 4, “Conventional weapons”. We will first hear general statements or the introduction of new and revised drafts, and most likely we can also hear some explanations of votes before the voting. I remind representatives that statements are limited to 5 minutes.

I give the floor to the representative of Austria to introduce draft resolution A/C.1/78/L.56.

Mr. Edtmayer (Austria): We take the floor to introduce draft resolution A/C.1/78/L.56, “Lethal autonomous weapon systems”. This is the first draft resolution on the impacts of artificial intelligence in the military field, which is a topic that has garnered considerable attention in recent years. That has also manifested itself in this year’s General Assembly, with a large number of site events.

The draft resolution was developed by a cross-regional group of States that consists of Belgium, Costa Rica, Germany, Ireland, Mexico, New Zealand, the Philippines, Sierra Leone, Sri Lanka, Switzerland and Austria. The group reflects the wide interest of States from different parts of the world in addressing the challenges and concerns that those new types of weapons raise from the humanitarian, legal, security, technological and ethical perspectives. The draft resolution has also received the support of a considerable number of States that have declared their co-sponsorship. Here again, we see large cross-regional support for the draft resolution and its goals, and want to express our gratitude to all States that have taken this step.

The text of the draft resolution has undergone limited changes that reflect the feedback we received during the consultations conducted in New York. At the same time, we have maintained the neutral and balanced

character of the text. We want to thank all delegations for their input and their views.

Finally, we want to stress once again the many benefits of the draft resolution and the future report of the Secretary-General, which will not only provide renewed impetus for ongoing international discussions, in particular within the Group of Governmental Experts on Emerging Technologies in the Area of Lethal Autonomous Weapons Systems, but also clearly demonstrates our collective treatment to addressing the challenges and concerns related to that new kind of weapons systems through collective multilateral efforts.

The Chair: I would like to inform the Committee that due to its heavy workload, the Secretariat has requested additional time to consider the financial implications of draft resolution A/C.1/78/L.41, contained in cluster 4. Accordingly, action on that draft resolution has been postponed to a later stage of the Committee's work.

I give the floor to the representative of Japan to introduce draft resolution A/C.1/78/L.40.

Ms. Nagai (Japan): Japan would like to introduce draft resolution A/C.1/78/L.40, "The illicit trade in small arms and light weapons in all its aspects"

Since 2001, Japan, together with Colombia and South Africa, has submitted a draft resolution on the illicit trade in small arms and light weapons in all its aspects every year. All have been adopted by consensus. The draft resolution this year has already received 82 sponsors. Japan would like to extend our sincere gratitude to Colombia and South Africa for their cooperation and to many States for their support as sponsors.

Described as de facto weapons of mass destruction, small arms and light weapons continue to proliferate and contribute to conflict prolongation and escalation, hindering the restoration of public security and post-conflict reconstruction and development. The prevention of the illicit trade in small arms and light weapons and their diversion to unauthorized users remains a challenge that the international community must address together.

The draft resolution reaffirms the determination of the international community to continue and strengthen efforts through the implementation of

the United Nations Programme of Action to Prevent, Combat and Eradicate the Illicit Trade in Small Arms and Light Weapons in All its Aspects and the International Instrument to Enable States to Identify and Trace, in a Timely and Reliable Manner, Illicit Small Arms and Light Weapons. In 2024, the fourth United Nations Conference to Review Progress Made in the Implementation of the Programme of Action, and the meeting of its preparatory committee, will be held here in New York. The draft resolution presents the dates for those meetings and reaffirms the direction the international community should take on issues of small arms and light weapons.

Japan believes that the draft resolution will contribute to building momentum for the Review Conference next year and strongly hopes that it will be adopted by consensus again.

The Chair: We have 30 minutes remaining. Given the time left for this meeting and the provisions of rule 128 of the rules of procedure of the General Assembly that no representative shall interrupt the voting except on a point of order in connection with the actual conduct of the voting, the Committee will proceed with the voting on the draft proposals contained in cluster 4 tomorrow morning at 10 a.m. But as we still have 30 minutes, I would ask delegations if they would like to proceed with explanations of vote or position before the voting.

Mr. Belousov (Russian Federation) (*spoke in Russian*): In response to your proposal, Sir, that we begin delivering explanations of vote on individual draft resolutions, I would like to express the view that it is very important to give these statements right before action is taken. For that reason, our delegation proposes that we turn to explanations of vote before the voting tomorrow at 10 a.m.

Ms. Storsve (United States of America): We were prepared to deliver an explanation of vote prior to the voting on draft resolutions under cluster 4, but I will await your determination on the point of order, Si.

The Chair: I would concur that we should probably end the meeting and reconvene tomorrow morning to start our deliberations with explanations of vote before the voting. After that, we will take action on the draft resolutions under cluster 4.

The meeting rose at 12.35 p.m.