



# General Assembly

Seventy-seventh session

## First Committee

28<sup>th</sup> meeting

Tuesday, 1 November 2022, 3 p.m.  
New York

Official Records

*Chair:* Mr. Pieris .....(Sri Lanka)

*The meeting was called to order at 3.05 p.m.*

*Draft resolution A/C.1/77/L.3 was adopted.*

### Agenda items 90 to 108 (continued)

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

**The Chair:** This afternoon the Committee will be guided by the same procedure agreed upon at our meeting on 28 October (see A/C.1/77/PV.25). We will begin by taking action on the draft resolutions and decisions under cluster 3, “Outer space”, as listed in informal paper No.2/Rev.3. Thereafter, the Committee will consider the remaining draft resolutions and decisions contained in informal paper No.2/Rev.3.

The Committee will now proceed to take action on draft resolution A/C.1/77/L.3, entitled “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.1/77/L.3 was submitted on 27 September by the representatives of Egypt and Sri Lanka. The sponsors of the draft resolution are listed in document A/C.1/77/L.3. The additional sponsors are listed on the e-deleGATE portal of the First Committee. The Islamic Republic of Iran has also become a sponsor of the draft resolution.

**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.

**The Chair:** The Committee will now proceed to take action on draft decision A/C.1/77/L.27, entitled “Prevention of an arms race in outer space: reducing space threats through norms, rules and principles of responsible behaviours”.

I give the floor to the Secretary of the Committee.

**Ms. Elliott** (Secretary of the Committee): Draft decision A/C.1/77/L.27 was submitted on 10 October by the representative of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland. The sponsors of the draft decision are contained in document A/C.1/77/L.27.

**The Chair:** A recorded vote has been requested.

*A recorded vote was taken.*

*In favour:*

Afghanistan, Albania, Algeria, Andorra, Angola, Antigua and Barbuda, Argentina, Australia, Austria, Azerbaijan, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belgium, Belize, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia (Plurinational State of), Bosnia and Herzegovina, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Burundi, Cabo Verde, Cambodia, Cameroon, Canada, Chad, Chile, Colombia, Comoros, Congo, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Croatia, Cyprus, Czechia, Denmark, Djibouti, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Eritrea, Estonia, Eswatini, Ethiopia, Finland, France, Gabon, Gambia, Georgia, Germany, Ghana, Greece, Guatemala, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Haiti, Honduras, Hungary, Iceland, Indonesia,

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-0601 (verbatimrecords@un.org). Corrected records will be reissued electronically on the Official Document System of the United Nations (<http://documents.un.org>).

22-66563(E)



Accessible document

Please recycle



Iraq, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Kazakhstan, Kenya, Kiribati, Kuwait, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Latvia, Lebanon, Lesotho, Liberia, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Madagascar, Malawi, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Marshall Islands, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mexico, Micronesia (Federated States of), Monaco, Mongolia, Montenegro, Morocco, Mozambique, Myanmar, Namibia, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Niger, 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, Singapore, Slovakia, Slovenia, Solomon Islands, Somalia, South Africa, Spain, Sri Lanka, 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

*Against:*

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

*Abstaining:*

Belarus, Equatorial Guinea, India, Pakistan, Tajikistan

*Draft decision A/C.1/77/L.27 was adopted by 165 votes to 7, with 5 abstentions.*

[Subsequently, the delegations of Fiji and Libya informed the Secretariat that they had intended to vote in favour.]

**The Chair:** The Committee will now proceed to take action on draft resolution A/C.1/77/L.62, entitled "Destructive direct-ascent anti-satellite missile testing".

I give the floor to the Secretary of the Committee.

**Ms. Elliott** (Secretary of the Committee): Draft resolution A/C.1/77/L.62 was submitted on 13 October by the representative of the United States of America. The sponsors of the draft resolution are listed in document A/C.1/77/L.62. The additional sponsors

are listed on the e-deleGATE portal of the First Committee. Timor-Leste has also become a sponsor of the draft resolution.

**The Chair:** A recorded vote has been requested.

*A recorded vote was taken.*

*In favour:*

Albania, Algeria, Andorra, Angola, Antigua and Barbuda, Argentina, Australia, Austria, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belgium, Belize, Bhutan, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Bulgaria, Burundi, Cabo Verde, Cameroon, Canada, Central African Republic, Chad, Chile, Colombia, Comoros, Congo, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Croatia, Cyprus, Czechia, Denmark, Djibouti, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Equatorial Guinea, Estonia, Eswatini, Ethiopia, Finland, France, 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, Kyrgyzstan, Latvia, Lebanon, Lesotho, Liberia, Libya, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Malawi, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Marshall Islands, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mexico, Micronesia (Federated States of), Monaco, Mongolia, Montenegro, Morocco, Mozambique, Myanmar, Namibia, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Niger, 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, San Marino, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Slovakia, Slovenia, Solomon Islands, Somalia, South Africa, Spain, Suriname, Sweden, Switzerland, Tajikistan, Thailand, Timor-Leste, Tonga, 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, Vanuatu, Viet Nam, Yemen, Zambia

*Against:*

Belarus, Bolivia (Plurinational State of), China, Cuba, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Nicaragua, Russian Federation, Syrian Arab Republic

*Abstaining:*

India, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Madagascar, Pakistan, Serbia, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Togo, Uganda, Zimbabwe

*Draft resolution A/C.1/77/L.62 was adopted by 154 votes to 8, with 10 abstentions.*

[Subsequently, the delegation of Fiji informed the Secretariat that it had intended to vote in favour.]

**The Chair:** The Committee will now proceed to take action on draft resolution A/C.1/77/L.67, entitled "No first placement of weapons in outer space".

I give the floor to the Secretary of the Committee.

**Ms. Elliott** (Secretary of the Committee): Draft resolution A/C.1/77/L.67 was submitted on 13 October by the representative of the Russian Federation. The sponsors of the draft resolution are listed in document A/C.1/77/L.67. The additional sponsors are listed on the e-deleGATE portal of the First Committee. Eritrea has also become a sponsor of the draft resolution.

**The Chair:** Separate votes have been requested on the fifth, ninth and eleventh preambular paragraphs of draft resolution A/C.1/77/L.67. I shall therefore first put those paragraphs to the vote, one by one.

I shall 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, Burundi, Cabo Verde, Cambodia, Cameroon, Central African Republic, Chad, Chile, China, Colombia, Comoros, Congo, Costa Rica, Cuba, Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Equatorial Guinea, Eritrea, Eswatini, Ethiopia, 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, Saint Lucia, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, Samoa, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Singapore, South Africa, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Syrian Arab Republic, Tajikistan, Thailand, Timor-Leste, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkmenistan, Uganda, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Tanzania, Uruguay, Uzbekistan, Viet Nam, Yemen, Zambia, Zimbabwe

*Against:*

Albania, Andorra, Australia, Austria, Belgium, Bulgaria, Canada, Croatia, Cyprus, Czechia, Denmark, Estonia, Finland, France, Georgia, Germany, Greece, Hungary, Iceland, India, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Japan, Latvia, Liberia, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Malta, Monaco, Montenegro, Netherlands, New Zealand, North Macedonia, Norway, Papua New Guinea, 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:*

Bosnia and Herzegovina, Côte d'Ivoire, Djibouti, Haiti, Malawi, Switzerland

*The fifth preambular paragraph was retained by 111 votes to 50, with 6 abstentions.*

**The Chair:** I shall 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, Cabo Verde, Cambodia, Cameroon, Central African Republic, Chad, Chile, China, Colombia, Comoros, Congo, Costa Rica, Cuba, Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Djibouti, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Equatorial Guinea, Eritrea, Eswatini, Ethiopia, Gambia, Ghana, Guatemala, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Honduras, India, 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 Lucia, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, Samoa, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Singapore, South Africa, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Syrian Arab Republic, Tajikistan, Thailand, Timor-Leste, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkmenistan, Uganda, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Tanzania, Uruguay, Uzbekistan, Viet Nam, Yemen, Zambia, Zimbabwe

*Against:*

Albania, Andorra, Australia, Austria, Belgium, 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, New Zealand, North Macedonia, Norway, Papua New Guinea, 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:*

Bosnia and Herzegovina, Côte d'Ivoire, Malawi, Switzerland

*The ninth preambular paragraph was retained by 115 votes to 48, with 4 abstentions.*

**The Chair:** I shall 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, Cabo Verde, Cambodia, Cameroon, Central African Republic, Chad, Chile, China, Colombia, Comoros, Congo, Costa Rica, Cuba, Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Djibouti,

Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Equatorial Guinea, Eritrea, Eswatini, Ethiopia, Gambia, Ghana, Guatemala, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Honduras, India, 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 Lucia, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, Samoa, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Singapore, South Africa, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Syrian Arab Republic, Tajikistan, Thailand, Timor-Leste, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkmenistan, Uganda, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Tanzania, Uruguay, Uzbekistan, Viet Nam, Yemen, Zambia, Zimbabwe

*Against:*

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

*Abstaining:*

Belgium, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Canada, Côte d'Ivoire, Italy, Papua New Guinea, Republic of Korea, Spain, Switzerland

*The eleventh preambular paragraph was retained by 115 votes to 42, with 9 abstentions.*

**The Chair:** The Committee will now proceed to take action on draft resolution A/C.1/77/L.67, as a whole. A recorded vote has been requested.

*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, Cabo Verde, Cambodia, Cameroon, Central African Republic, Chad, Chile, China, Colombia, Comoros, Congo, Costa Rica, Cuba, Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Djibouti, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Equatorial Guinea, Eritrea, Eswatini, Ethiopia, 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, 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, South Africa, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Syrian Arab Republic, Tajikistan, Thailand, Timor-Leste, Togo, Tonga, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkmenistan, Uganda, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Tanzania, Uruguay, Uzbekistan, Vanuatu, Viet Nam, Yemen, Zambia, Zimbabwe

*Against:*

Albania, Andorra, Australia, Austria, Belgium, Bulgaria, Canada, Croatia, Cyprus, Czechia, Denmark, Estonia, Finland, France, Georgia, Germany, Greece, Hungary, Iceland, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Japan, Latvia, Liberia, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Malta, Marshall Islands, Micronesia (Federated States of), Monaco, Montenegro, Netherlands, 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:*

Bosnia and Herzegovina, Côte d'Ivoire, Papua New Guinea, Switzerland

*Draft resolution A/C.1/77/L.67, as a whole, was adopted by 123 votes to 50, with 4 abstentions.*

**The Chair:** The Committee will now proceed to take action on draft resolution A/C.1/77/L.70, entitled "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.1/77/L.70 was submitted on 13 October by the representative of the Russian Federation. A statement on the programme budget implications of the draft resolution has been issued as document A/C.1/77/L.82 and is available on the e-deleGATE portal of the First Committee. The sponsors of the draft resolution are listed in document A/C.1/77/L.70. The additional sponsors are listed on the e-deleGATE portal of the First Committee.

**The Chair:** Separate votes have been requested on the fifth preambular paragraph and on operative paragraphs 8, 9, 10, 11 and 12 of draft resolution A/C.1/77/L.70. I shall therefore first put those paragraphs to the vote, one by one.

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

*A recorded vote was taken.*

*In favour:*

Afghanistan, Algeria, Angola, Antigua and Barbuda, Argentina, Armenia, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belarus, Belize, Bhutan, Bolivia (Plurinational State of), Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Burkina Faso, Burundi, Cabo Verde, Cambodia, Cameroon, Central African Republic, Chad, China, Colombia, Comoros, Congo, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Cuba, Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Djibouti, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Equatorial Guinea, Eritrea, Eswatini, Ethiopia, 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, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Myanmar, Namibia, Nepal, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Qatar, Russian Federation, Rwanda, Saint Lucia, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Singapore, South Africa, Sri Lanka, Sudan,

Suriname, Syrian Arab Republic, Tajikistan, Thailand, Timor-Leste, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkmenistan, Uganda, United Arab Emirates, Uruguay, Uzbekistan, Viet Nam, Yemen, Zambia, Zimbabwe

*Against:*

Albania, Andorra, Australia, Austria, Belgium, 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, 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:*

Bosnia and Herzegovina, Chile, Georgia, Madagascar, Malawi, Mozambique, Papua New Guinea, Switzerland

*The fifth preambular paragraph was retained by 110 votes to 47, with 8 abstentions.*

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

*A recorded vote was taken.*

*In favour:*

Afghanistan, Algeria, Angola, Antigua and Barbuda, Argentina, Armenia, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belarus, Belize, Bolivia (Plurinational State of), Botswana, Brunei Darussalam, Burundi, Cabo Verde, Cambodia, Cameroon, Central African Republic, Chad, China, Comoros, Congo, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Cuba, Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Djibouti, Egypt, El Salvador, Equatorial Guinea, Eritrea, Eswatini, Ethiopia, Ghana, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Jordan, Kazakhstan, Kenya, Kiribati, Kuwait, Kyrgyzstan, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lebanon, Lesotho, Libya, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mongolia, Morocco, Myanmar, Namibia, Nepal, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Paraguay, Peru, Qatar, Russian Federation, Rwanda, Saudi

Arabia, Senegal, Singapore, South Africa, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Syrian Arab Republic, Tajikistan, Thailand, Timor-Leste, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkmenistan, Uganda, United Arab Emirates, Uruguay, Uzbekistan, Viet Nam, Yemen, Zambia, Zimbabwe

*Against:*

Albania, Andorra, Australia, Austria, Belgium, 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, 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:*

Bhutan, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Brazil, Chile, Colombia, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Georgia, Guatemala, Honduras, Jamaica, Madagascar, Mexico, Mozambique, Papua New Guinea, Philippines, Switzerland

*Operative paragraph 8 was retained by 97 votes to 46, with 17 abstentions.*

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

*A recorded vote was taken.*

*In favour:*

Afghanistan, Algeria, Angola, Antigua and Barbuda, Argentina, Armenia, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belarus, Belize, Bolivia (Plurinational State of), Botswana, Brunei Darussalam, Burundi, Cabo Verde, Cambodia, Cameroon, Central African Republic, Chad, China, Comoros, Congo, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Cuba, Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Djibouti, Egypt, El Salvador, Equatorial Guinea, Eritrea, Eswatini, Ethiopia, Ghana, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Jordan, Kazakhstan, Kenya, Kiribati, Kuwait, Kyrgyzstan, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lebanon, Lesotho, Libya, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mongolia,

Morocco, Mozambique, Myanmar, Namibia, Nepal, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Paraguay, Peru, Qatar, Russian Federation, Rwanda, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Singapore, South Africa, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Syrian Arab Republic, Tajikistan, Thailand, Timor-Leste, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkmenistan, Uganda, United Arab Emirates, Uruguay, Uzbekistan, Viet Nam, Yemen, Zambia, Zimbabwe

*Against:*

Albania, Andorra, Australia, Austria, Belgium, 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, 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:*

Bhutan, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Brazil, Chile, Colombia, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Georgia, Guatemala, Honduras, Jamaica, Madagascar, Mexico, Papua New Guinea, Philippines, Switzerland

*Operative paragraph 9 was retained by 98 votes to 46, with 16 abstentions.*

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

*A recorded vote was taken.*

*In favour:*

Afghanistan, Algeria, Angola, Antigua and Barbuda, Argentina, Armenia, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belarus, Belize, Bolivia (Plurinational State of), Botswana, Brunei Darussalam, Burundi, Cabo Verde, Cambodia, Cameroon, Central African Republic, Chad, China, Comoros, Congo, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Cuba, Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Djibouti, Egypt, El Salvador, Equatorial Guinea, Eritrea, Eswatini, Ethiopia, Ghana, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Jordan, Kazakhstan, Kenya, Kiribati,

Kuwait, Kyrgyzstan, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lebanon, Lesotho, Libya, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Myanmar, Namibia, Nepal, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Paraguay, Peru, Qatar, Russian Federation, Rwanda, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Singapore, South Africa, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Syrian Arab Republic, Tajikistan, Thailand, Timor-Leste, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkmenistan, Uganda, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Tanzania, Uruguay, Uzbekistan, Viet Nam, Yemen, Zambia, Zimbabwe

*Against:*

Albania, Andorra, Australia, Austria, Belgium, 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, 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:*

Bhutan, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Brazil, Chile, Colombia, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Fiji, Georgia, Guatemala, Honduras, Jamaica, Madagascar, Mexico, Papua New Guinea, Philippines, Switzerland

*Operative paragraph 10 was retained by 99 votes to 46, with 17 abstentions.*

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

*A recorded vote was taken.*

*In favour:*

Afghanistan, Algeria, Angola, Antigua and Barbuda, Argentina, Armenia, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belarus, Belize, Bolivia (Plurinational State of), Botswana, Brunei Darussalam, Burundi, Cabo Verde, Cambodia, Cameroon, Central African Republic, Chad, China, Comoros, Congo, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Cuba, Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Djibouti,

Egypt, El Salvador, Equatorial Guinea, Eritrea, Eswatini, Ethiopia, Ghana, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Jordan, Kazakhstan, Kenya, Kiribati, Kuwait, Kyrgyzstan, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lebanon, Lesotho, Libya, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Myanmar, Namibia, Nepal, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Paraguay, Peru, Qatar, Russian Federation, Rwanda, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Singapore, South Africa, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Syrian Arab Republic, Tajikistan, Thailand, Timor-Leste, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkmenistan, Uganda, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Tanzania, Uruguay, Uzbekistan, Viet Nam, Yemen, Zambia, Zimbabwe

*Against:*

Albania, Andorra, Australia, Austria, Belgium, 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, 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:*

Bhutan, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Brazil, Chile, Colombia, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Fiji, Georgia, Guatemala, Honduras, Jamaica, Madagascar, Mexico, Papua New Guinea, Philippines, Switzerland

*Operative paragraph 11 was retained by 99 votes to 46, with 17 abstentions.*

**The Chair:** I shall now put to the vote operative paragraph 12.

*A recorded vote was taken.*

*In favour:*

Afghanistan, Algeria, Angola, Antigua and Barbuda, Argentina, Armenia, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belarus, Belize, Bolivia (Plurinational State of), Botswana, Brunei

Darussalam, Burundi, Cabo Verde, Cambodia, Cameroon, Central African Republic, Chad, China, Comoros, Congo, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Cuba, Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Djibouti, Egypt, El Salvador, Equatorial Guinea, Eritrea, Eswatini, Ethiopia, Ghana, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Jordan, Kazakhstan, Kenya, Kiribati, Kuwait, Kyrgyzstan, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lebanon, Lesotho, Libya, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Myanmar, Namibia, Nepal, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Qatar, Russian Federation, Rwanda, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Singapore, South Africa, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Syrian Arab Republic, Tajikistan, Thailand, Timor-Leste, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkmenistan, Uganda, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Tanzania, Uruguay, Uzbekistan, Viet Nam, Yemen, Zambia, Zimbabwe

*Against:*

Albania, Andorra, Australia, Austria, Belgium, 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, 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:*

Bhutan, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Brazil, Chile, Colombia, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Fiji, Georgia, Guatemala, Honduras, Jamaica, Madagascar, Mexico, Papua New Guinea, Switzerland

*Operative paragraph 12 was retained by 100 votes to 46, with 16 abstentions.*

**The Chair:** The Committee will now proceed to take action on draft resolution A/C.1/77/L.70, as a whole. A recorded vote has been requested.

*A recorded vote was taken.*



*In favour:*

Afghanistan, Algeria, Angola, Antigua and Barbuda, Argentina, Armenia, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belarus, Belize, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia (Plurinational State of), Botswana, Brunei Darussalam, Burkina Faso, Burundi, Cabo Verde, Cambodia, Cameroon, Central African Republic, Chad, China, Colombia, Comoros, Congo, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Cuba, Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Djibouti, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Equatorial Guinea, Eritrea, Eswatini, Ethiopia, Gabon, Gambia, Ghana, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Haiti, 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, South Africa, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Syrian Arab Republic, Tajikistan, Thailand, Timor-Leste, Togo, Tonga, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkmenistan, Tuvalu, Uganda, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Tanzania, Uruguay, Uzbekistan, Vanuatu, Viet Nam, Yemen, Zambia, Zimbabwe

*Against:*

Albania, Andorra, Australia, Austria, Belgium, Bulgaria, Canada, Croatia, Cyprus, Czechia, Denmark, Estonia, Finland, France, Germany, Greece, Hungary, Iceland, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Japan, Latvia, Liberia, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Malta, Marshall Islands, Monaco, Montenegro, Netherlands, 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:*

Bosnia and Herzegovina, Brazil, Chile, Fiji, Georgia, Guatemala, Honduras, Papua New Guinea, Switzerland

*Draft resolution A/C.1/77/L.70, as a whole, was adopted by 124 votes to 48, with 9 abstentions.*

**The Chair:** The Committee will now proceed to take action on draft resolution A/C.1/77/L.71/Rev.1, entitled "Transparency and confidence-building measures in outer space activities".

I give the floor to the Secretary of the Committee.

**Ms. Elliott** (Secretary of the Committee): Draft resolution A/C.1/77/L.71 was submitted on 13 October by the representative of the Russian Federation. Subsequently, a revised draft resolution was submitted on 20 October.

A statement on the programme budget implications of the draft resolution has been issued as document A/C.1/77/L.79 and is available on the e-deleGATE portal of the First Committee. The sponsors of the draft resolution are listed in document A/C.1/77/L.71/Rev.1. The additional sponsors are listed in the e-deleGATE portal of the First Committee.

**The Chair:** The sponsors of the draft resolution have expressed the wish that the Committee adopt it without a vote. Unless I hear any objection, I shall take it that the Committee wishes to act accordingly.

*Draft resolution A/C.1/77/L.71/Rev.1 was adopted.*

**The Chair:** I shall now call on those delegations wishing to explain their position after the voting.

**Mr. Vorontsov** (Russian Federation) (*spoke in Russian*): We wish to explain the position of the Russian Federation on draft decision A/C.1/77/L.27, entitled "Reducing space threats through norms, rules and principles of responsible behaviours".

As the author of a number of decisive initiatives aimed at preventing an arms race in outer space, the Russian Federation welcomes any ideas that may contribute to maintaining outer space free of weapons of any kind and preventing outer space from becoming yet another theatre of tension and armed confrontation. We are ready to discuss and work on such ideas with all interested States. Our principled position has remained unchanged for several decades. That objective can be

achieved only by developing a multilateral, legally binding agreement that is comprehensive and geared strictly towards preventing an arms race in outer space.

With regard to the United Kingdom's initiative, we can only reiterate that we see a whole range of fundamental imbalances and flaws in it. The link between the initiative set out in General Assembly resolution 76/231 and the prevention of an arms race in space is still not clear, and the past two sessions of the open-ended working group on reducing space threats through norms, rules and principles of responsible behaviours have only confirmed our concerns. The main focus of the activities of that working group is quite different. It is not about preventing an arms race in outer space, it is about different aspects of improving the sustainability and safety of space operations, as well as combating space debris.

We once again recall that the Committee on the Peaceful Uses of Outer Space has long been successfully addressing such issues. The Russian Federation is of the view that the entire range of issues relating to ensuring the security of outer space activities, with the exception of the prevention of an arms race in outer space, lies within the remit of the Committee. We believe that duplicating the consideration of those issues in other forums is unacceptable.

With regard to negotiating any measures for transparency and confidence-building in outer space activities— and the United Kingdom initiative could be considered a part of such efforts — we are convinced that they should seek to achieve a complete ban on the placement of weapons in outer space and the use or threat of use of force against, or by using, space objects. They should complement, but in no way replace, agreements on the prevention of an arms race in outer space. Some fragmented, non-inclusive rules for regulating outer space activities that do not take into account the approaches of all States Members of the United Nations and that seek to ensure the dominance of space by a small group of States, rather than addressing the key objective of preventing an arms race in outer space, will not facilitate the maintenance of international peace and security, but only lead to an escalation of tensions in outer space, further divisions within the international community and limiting equitable access to outer space for research and its use for peaceful purposes.

In that context, we see the initiative of the United Kingdom to develop norms, rules and principles for so-called responsible behaviour in outer space as an attempt to shift the focus of the efforts of States Members of the United Nations to prevent an arms race in outer space towards secondary, less relevant topics and to entrench rules for regulating outer space activities that are advantageous to Western States to the detriment of other countries. In that approach, we see an attempt by Western States to consolidate the use of outer space as an arena for confrontation and possible military activities. In other words, that would essentially legitimize the possibility of the use of force and conducting combat operations in space, as provided for in the doctrinal documents of those States. We therefore voted against this draft decision.

We call on States Members of the United Nations to focus on making commitments at the national and international levels to ensure that no weapons of any kind would be placed in space, including in orbit around the Earth and on celestial bodies. The use or threat of force against, or by using, space objects should also be prohibited, and a comprehensive ban on space-based strike weapons intended to destroy space objects should be enshrined. Only such measures will allow us to ensure that our goals of preventing an arms race in outer space are achieved.

**Mr. Peñaranda** (Philippines): The Philippines would like to explain its position on draft resolution A/C.1/77/L.70, entitled “Further practical measures for the prevention of an arms race in outer space”.

The Philippines is actively engaged in the open-ended working group on reducing space threats through norms, rules and principles of responsible behaviours, established pursuant to General Assembly resolution 76/231. Given the inclusive and transparent nature of the format of the open-ended working group, the Philippines had to abstain on the establishment of the Group of Governmental Experts (GGE) that will make recommendations on substantial elements of an international legally binding instrument on the prevention of an arms race in outer space. The Philippines is of the view that a legally binding instrument should be driven by Member States in an inclusive manner. If the GGE does not have a negotiating mandate, it is likely to only extend the discussion without actual progress, and therefore be prejudicial to the open-ended working group's work. Nevertheless, we remain driven by our aspiration for legally binding instruments on

preventing an arms race in outer space, including the prevention of the placement of weapons and the threat or use of force against space objects, and we must continue to work to that end.

**Mr. Choffat** (Switzerland): Switzerland once again abstained in the voting on draft resolution A/C.1/77/L.67, entitled “No first placement of weapons in outer space”. Our delegation wishes to place on record that our explanations of vote on previous iterations of this draft resolution remain valid. Our reservations regarding the text have been reinforced by the recent testing of counter-space capabilities by its promoter, which are inconsistent with the stated objective of the draft resolution.

Switzerland also abstained in the voting on draft resolution A/C.1/77/L.70, entitled “Further practical measures for the prevention of an arms race in outer space”. That vote is motivated by the following elements.

We share the view that progress is required with regards to addressing the risks posed by an arms race in outer space and that elaborating a legally binding instrument in that area represents an important objective.

However, we have a number of question marks concerning the wording of several paragraphs of the draft resolution, including paragraph 6, which, in our view, should be revisited. Also, the draft resolution refers to space-to-earth and earth-to-space weapons, but remains silent about the space-to-space threats dimension, and does not mention anti-satellite tests, which put space objects and activities in danger by creating debris.

Our vote of abstention is also motivated by the importance of ensuring coherence and complementarity with ongoing processes addressing outer space security. In particular, we would have seen value in deferring any decision on the establishment of a new Governmental Group of Experts (GGE) tasked with developing substantial elements of an international legally binding instrument on the prevention of an arms race in outer space until after the completion of the work of the open-ended working group on reducing space threats through norms, rules and principles of responsible behaviours and its recommendations on the way forward.

In that context, we must underline that the establishment of the GGE foreseen in the draft resolution does not prejudice in any way recommendations that the open-ended working group may make on further work

or any decision thereon by the First Committee, notably in view of the fact that the scope of issues addressed by the open-ended working group is much broader than that of the GGE.

**Mr. Sánchez Kiesslich** (Mexico) (*spoke in Spanish*): Mexico voted in favour of draft resolution A/C.1/77/L.62, entitled “Destructive direct-ascent anti-satellite missile testing”, as we are committed to the preservation of outer space for exclusively peaceful purposes, consistent with the pursuit of general and complete disarmament, under strict international control. We support any measure aimed at preventing outer space from being militarized and used as a theatre of armed conflict or war.

In that regard, we support the establishment of new frameworks complementary to the existing ones that prohibit the development of an arms race and the testing and deployment of weapons in space, and we reiterate that those should not be understood as substitutes for a legally binding instrument that complies with the principles of equity, viability and verification, favours international cooperation to promote the peaceful uses of outer space and preserves it as the heritage of humankind.

We recognize the relative merit of the measures included in the draft resolution. However, we are concerned that there is no express prohibition in the text. Mexico will continue to advocate that no actor place weapons in outer space or launch them from Earth.

Mexico supports draft resolution A/C.1/77/L.67, on the commitment not to be the first to place weapons in outer space, as we agree with stressing the importance and urgency of preventing an arms race in outer space, in keeping with our commitment to the preservation of outer space for exclusively peaceful purposes. However, we reiterate that support should in no way be understood as a tacit endorsement or the acceptance of an alleged right to place weapons in space or to launch them from Earth if another State is the first to do so or in response to an attack.

Mexico will continue to strive to ensure that no actor under any circumstances places weapons in outer space. Mexico also reiterates that, in particular, all nuclear weapons must be prohibited and eliminated, regardless of their type or location, in accordance with the 1967 Outer Space Treaty and the Treaty on the Prohibition of Nuclear Weapons.

**Mr. Gunaratna** (Sri Lanka): Sri Lanka's position on the peaceful uses of outer space and commitment to the prevention of weaponization of outer space has been clear and consistent. The common heritage of humankind of outer space, the moon and other celestial bodies should be preserved at all times. To that end, it is essential to ensure that its exploration and use for peaceful purposes are in the common interest of all humankind.

It is our firm conviction that the important objective of the prevention of an arms race in outer space will effectively be achieved only through the early conclusion of an effective and verifiable multilateral, legally binding agreement on the prevention of an arms race in outer space, which would contribute to the strengthening of the existing legal framework on the safety and security of outer space and through the prohibition of the placement of weapons in outer space and the prohibition of the threat or use of force against outer space objects.

In that context, Sri Lanka has been presenting the draft resolution on the prevention of an arms race in outer space with Egypt on an annual basis — this year it is submitted as draft resolution A/C.1/77/L.3. We thank all delegations for adopting it without a vote.

We remain fully committed to the prevention of an arms race in outer space and will support any initiative to achieve that goal. It is in line with that same logic that Sri Lanka voted in favour of draft resolution A/C.1/77/L.70, entitled “Further practical measures for the prevention of an arms race in outer space”, and its operative paragraphs 8 to 12.

The placement of weapons in outer space will only weaken the already fragile international peace and security and jeopardize the stability of States that possess space capabilities, as well as of those that do not possess such technology. We are therefore pleased to have co-sponsored draft resolution A/C.1/77/L.67, entitled “No first placement of weapons in outer space”.

Sri Lanka maintains its position in favour of draft decision A/C.1/77/L.27, entitled “Reducing space threats through norms, rules and principles of responsible behaviours”, in line with its principled position of supporting all multilateral initiatives aimed at the promotion of the peaceful use of outer space and on the importance of increased coordination and understanding among spacefaring nations. Sri Lanka's vote in support of draft decision A/C.1/77/L.27 is

based on the understanding that the continuation of the open-ended working group on reducing space threats through norms, rules and principles of responsible behaviours is a stepping stone towards the negotiation and development of a comprehensive legally binding treaty on the prevention of an arms race in outer space.

While we recognize the value and usefulness of voluntary commitments and enhanced transparency and confidence-building measures on the peace and security of outer space, such non-binding norms, rules and principles are only complementary in nature and cannot be a substitute for a comprehensive legally binding multilateral treaty in that regard.

We also underscore the importance of the reaffirmation of compliance with the obligations under the existing space law regime, particularly by spacefaring nations, and to ensure that the development of any new norms and principles on space behaviour are built on the existing legal framework.

Sri Lanka also abstained in the voting on draft resolution A/C.1/77/L.62, entitled “Destructive direct-ascent anti-satellite missile testing”, as the text contains several limitations, such as focusing only on the testing of direct-ascent anti-satellite missiles. Such an activity has the potential for the proliferation of other connected activities in space. The draft resolution does not refer to the issue of production, research and development and use, and has a limited focus only on direct-ascent anti-satellite weapons, which are not in line with the objective of guaranteeing the safe and peaceful uses of outer space. We are of the view that the text lacks sufficient transparency with regard to the ultimate objective to be achieved and is not sufficiently comprehensive to ensure that outer space will not be weaponized.

The impending threat of space warfare once again calls for an international regime that regulates and mitigates threats, and perhaps eliminate such threats completely.

**Ms. Kristanti** (Indonesia): I take the floor to explain Indonesia's vote on the draft resolutions under cluster 3, on outer space.

Let me begin by thanking the proponent countries for their long-standing commitment and efforts in taking forward the six draft resolutions. Indonesia fully recognizes that outer space and its technology and systems have become an integral part of our lives. The



increasing use of, and reliance on, outer space require States to take a multilateral approach in addressing the current and future challenges and threats in outer space.

In that regard, Indonesia supports the six draft resolutions that have been submitted to this Committee, most of which have traditionally enjoyed our support, while some are relatively new. Our support for those draft resolutions are in line with our principled position to maintain outer space as a peaceful, safe, stable, secure and sustainable environment and that outer space must be used, explored and utilized only for peaceful purposes, in accordance with the relevant international laws and instruments.

Indonesia continues to believe that the existing instruments are insufficient, and we therefore reiterate our call to the Conference on Disarmament to start negotiations on an international, legally binding instrument on the prevention of an arms race in outer space. We also recognize the value of the various voluntary and practical measures, including the declaratory commitment not to conduct destructive direct-ascent anti-satellite missile tests in draft resolution A/C.1/77/L.62 and the promotion of transparency and confidence-building measures in outer space activities in draft resolution A/C.1/77/L.71/Rev.1. Rather than seeing them as mutually exclusive efforts, Indonesia sees them as stepping stones that could lead, or contribute, to the development of a legally binding instrument on the prevention of an arms race in outer space. It is under the same consideration that we support the establishment of a Group of Governmental Experts (GGE) under draft resolution A/C.1/77/L.70 and voted in favour of operative paragraphs 8 to 12 of that draft resolution. We hope that the future work of such a GGE will complement and reinforce the ongoing process and eventually bring us closer to the establishment of a treaty on the prevention of an arms race in outer space.

In conclusion, Indonesia will maintain its position that threats to outer space should be addressed in a comprehensive manner and through a legally binding instrument. Our efforts should be guided by the objective of preventing both the militarization and weaponization of outer space and the use of space and Earth space capabilities against the peaceful use of outer space. In that regard, Indonesia stands ready to engage constructively in any efforts that contribute to the formulation of a legally binding instrument on the prevention of an arms race in outer space. The

absence of a universal, legally binding instrument on the prevention of an arms race in outer space opens up the possibility of the increased risks and threats of weaponization in outer space. We therefore believe that such an instrument will consolidate and reinforce the outer space regime in the context of preventing an arms race and will serve as an important cornerstone in reducing the space threat.

**Mr. Sharoni** (Israel): Israel voted in favour of draft resolution A/C.1/77/L.62, entitled “Destructive direct-ascent anti-satellite missile testing”.

This draft resolution resonates strongly with Israel’s principles and policy regarding the protection of the outer space environment and promotes space-related confidence-building measures reflecting responsible behaviour in outer space. The draft resolution is also consistent with the Treaty on Principles Governing the Activities of States in the Exploration and Use of Outer Space, including the Moon and Other Celestial Bodies, the Space Debris Mitigation Guidelines and the 2018 Guidelines for the Long-term Sustainability of Outer Space Activities, drafted by the Committee on the Peaceful Uses of Outer Space and adopted by the General Assembly.

Notwithstanding, Israel dissociates itself from operative paragraph 3 and from any reference to a legally binding instrument in that context. Israel’s long-standing position holds that, owing to the constant technological developments in outer space and the changes in space activities in the new space era, continual adaptations are required and a gradual approach, preferring norms and soft law over legally binding instruments, must be taken.

In conclusion, Israel voted in favour of the draft resolution, while dissociating itself from operative paragraph 3.

Israel joined the consensus on draft resolution A/C.1/77/L.3, on the prevention of an arms race in outer space, and draft resolution A/C.1/77/L.71/Rev.1, on transparency and confidence-building measures in outer space activities, although we have reservations regarding some aspects contained in this draft resolution,

**Mr. Aho** (United States of America): I would like to explain our position in supporting draft resolution A/C.1/77/L.71/Rev.1, entitled “Transparency and confidence-building measures in outer space activities”.



The United States long-standing support for voluntary transparency and confidence-building measures for outer space activities is well known. As we noted earlier, the United States Government believes that advancing a shared understanding of transparency and confidence-building measures and norms of behaviours in outer space can enable risk-reduction measures and increased transparency and therefore enhance stability. Implementing multilateral measures that are voluntary, pragmatic and transparent builds confidence and is an important step in addressing misunderstandings or misinterpretations.

Transparency and confidence-building measures can be developed and implemented more quickly and address immediate threats. Such measures are part of a comprehensive strategy that is needed to reduce insecurity in outer space and damage to the space environment from the irresponsible and destructive testing of counter-space capabilities or from conflict extending into outer space.

We regret that this year, we could not co-sponsor this draft resolution. The fourth preambular paragraph of the draft resolution reminds us of the important work that we are doing when it states preventing an arms race in outer space is in the interest of maintaining international peace and security. Upholding international peace and security everywhere should be the goal of this body. Instead, the lead author of this draft resolution, Russia, is engaged in an illegal war in Ukraine, which is an affront to international peace and security. At the United Nations, the international community has repeatedly and soundly rejected that affront to territorial integrity, national sovereignty, peace and security caused by Russia's invasion of Ukraine. We call on the Russian Federation to immediately cease its unprovoked war in Ukraine and abide by international law, including the Charter of the United Nations.

The United States remains devoted to the international arms control system and the principles contained in this draft resolution, notwithstanding the antithetical actions of its author. While the United States agreed to this draft resolution, we reiterate our steadfast support for Ukraine's sovereignty and territorial integrity in the face of Russia's ongoing aggression.

**Mrs. Romero López** (Cuba) (*spoke in Spanish*): The Cuban delegation voted against draft resolution A/C.1/77/L.62, entitled "Destructive direct-ascent

anti-satellite missile testing". The draft resolution has significant limitations and shortcomings. We will mention some of them.

First, it calls on States only to commit to not conducting destructive tests of direct-ascent anti-satellite missiles. Such a commitment has no legal force.

Secondly, it does not discourage all destructive testing of directly ascending anti-satellite missiles, but only tests that would generate debris.

Thirdly, it does not endorse a ban on the use or threat of use of force in outer space.

Fourthly, it advocates non-binding norms of responsible behaviour by States in outer space, to the detriment of promoting the adoption of legal instruments in that area. The threat or use of force in outer space is contrary to our commitment to the strictly peaceful use and exploitation of outer space.

We condemn all military activities in outer space and any use of that domain as a theatre of war. The weaponization and militarization of outer space constitutes a serious threat to the future of humanity and our planet. The preservation of outer space for exclusively peaceful uses must be guaranteed in all circumstances.

**Ms. Minh Vu** (Viet Nam): I am delivering an explanation of vote on draft resolution A/C.1/77/L.62, entitled "Destructive direct-ascent anti-satellite missile testing". My delegation voted in favour of this draft resolution as it is Viet Nam's consistent policy to support and promote the right of all States to explore and use outer space for peaceful purposes, in accordance with international law.

Viet Nam also supports all efforts aimed at preventing an arms race and the placement of weapons in outer space. We therefore have strongly supported all initiatives towards this end, including relevant draft resolutions in the First Committee related to outer space.

We believe that the renouncement of destructive direct-ascent anti-satellite missile tests resulting in space debris to the detriment of other civil activities in outer space is consistent with the overall goal of the international community, namely, to preserve outer space exclusively for peaceful activities. On the other hand, to achieve the general goal of preventing an arms race in outer space, draft resolution A/C.1/77/L.62

should be complemented by various other measures that address the issue in a comprehensive manner, taking into consideration all views and the legitimate interests of all States. This will contribute to the overall objective of ensuring the sustainable use of outer space as a global commons.

**Ms. Nam** (New Zealand): I take the floor to explain New Zealand's position on a number of draft resolutions related to space under consideration by this body.

First, with regard to draft resolution A/C.1/77/L.71/Rev.1, entitled "Transparency and confidence-building measures in outer space activities", New Zealand continues to advocate the implementation of measures contained in the 2013 report of the Group of Governmental Experts and therefore welcomes the substance of this draft resolution. However, we note our reservation that operative paragraph 11 of the draft resolution creates a measure that is potentially duplicative to the work being undertaken at the United Nations Disarmament Commission.

Secondly, New Zealand continues to vote against draft resolution A/C.1/77/L.67, entitled "No first placement of weapons in outer space". New Zealand is concerned that an approach such as that outlined in the text before us, which seeks to regulate no first placement of weapons, risks providing tacit approval for second and subsequent placement of weapons. Even if this is considered an interim measure until such time as a binding treaty could be agreed upon, New Zealand is concerned that with no widely acceptable treaty negotiations on the horizon, the draft resolution risks effectively sanctioning second and subsequent placement of weapons.

Thirdly, New Zealand has previously abstained in the voting on A/C.1/77/L.70, entitled "Further practical measures for the prevention of an arms race in outer space". We continue to have significant reservations about the draft treaty on the prevention of placement of weapons in outer space as proposed by China and the Russian Federation as a viable mechanism for addressing space security issues. However, the addition of operative paragraphs 8 to 12 has forced us to further consider our position. New Zealand considers that the proposed group of governmental experts creates an exclusive and competing mechanism to the open-ended working group (OEWG) established by resolution 76/231. The OEWG provides a mechanism for all Member States to engage on this important topic, and we

have welcomed the broad participation in the process so far. Any further mechanisms should await the outcome of the OEWG, which reports to the General Assembly this time next year. We call on all Member States to continue to engage actively and constructively in the existing OEWG process. For this reason, New Zealand voted against operative paragraphs 8 to 12 and against the draft resolution as a whole.

I wish to take this opportunity to make it clear that New Zealand supports measures to prevent an arms race in outer space. The safe, secure and sustainable use of outer space, in conformity with international law, is essential to our collective interests. It seems to us that voluntary and legally binding measures can play a part in preventing an arms race in outer space, and we need to further discuss both types of approach. New Zealand does not oppose engagement on the question of legally binding approaches to preventing an arms race in outer space; indeed we welcome it. However, we do not agree that the proposals set out in A/C.1/77/L.67 and A/C.1/77/L.70 constitute a productive way forward at this point in time.

**Ms. Ávila Becerril** (Costa Rica) (*spoke in Spanish*): I take the floor to explain, first, my country's votes in favour of draft resolution A/C.1/77/L.67, entitled "No first placement of weapons in outer space", and all its paragraphs. Since Costa Rica agrees on the need to prevent an arms race in space, our votes in relation to draft resolution A/C.1/77/L.67 are based on the commitment to general and complete disarmament, and specifically the obligation to preserve space for exclusively peaceful purposes. The placement of weapons in space is unacceptable under any circumstances, and there is no argument that justifies first, second or third use. We must as one humankind go further and recognize space as a zone of peace. We regret that it has not been possible to have a full, clear and forceful prohibition against the placement of all types of weapons in space, which is how it really should be.

With the foregoing in mind, Costa Rica has supported the creation of all deliberative mechanisms that will allow us to move towards adequate regulations that guarantee the exclusively peaceful use of outer space. For this reason, Costa Rica voted in favour of draft resolution A/C.1/77/L.70, entitled "Further practical measures for the prevention of an arms race in outer space". We recognize the value of generating opportunities for discussion that will allow us to move in this direction. We also continue to support the

work of the open-ended working group on reducing space threats through norms, rules and principles of responsible behaviours. We value both contexts as complementary in moving the discussion forward.

**Ms. Narayanan** (India): With regard to draft resolution A/C.1/77/L.62, entitled “Destructive direct-ascent anti-satellite missile testing”, India has always been opposed to the weaponization of outer space. We share the concerns about the potential dangers arising from space debris to the safety and long-term sustainability of outer space. India’s implementation of existing guidelines and measures that relate to debris is class leading. India also participates actively and constructively in multilateral processes that consolidate and strengthen the international regime for outer space. However, India believes that matters relating to debris fall within the purview of the Convention on International Liability for Damage Caused by Space Objects.

India remains committed to substantive consideration of the prevention of an arms race in outer space within the multilateral framework of the United Nations. We support negotiation of a legally binding instrument on the prevention of an arms race in outer space (PAROS) in the Conference on Disarmament (CD). Draft resolution A/C.1/77/L.62 does not address the key issue of preventing an arms race in outer space through a universally acceptable, verifiable and multilaterally negotiated legally binding instrument on PAROS. India believes that such an instrument should focus on all space threats in a comprehensive manner. Accordingly, we were constrained to abstain in the voting on the draft resolution.

India voted in favour of draft resolution A/C.1/77/L.67, entitled “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 this objective as well as the strengthening of the international legal regime to protect and preserve access to space for all and to prevent, without exceptions, the weaponization of outer space.

We support the substantive consideration of PAROS in the CD. We see no first placement of weapons in outer space as a useful initiative and not 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”. This phrase is part of a political ideology, and a draft resolution of the General Assembly is not the appropriate place to reflect ideologies of countries.

On A/C.1/77/L.70, entitled “Further practical measures for the prevention of an arms race in outer space”, India, having traditionally supported this draft resolution, voted in favour of it this year. We voted against inclusion of its fifth preambular paragraph, the reasons for which we explained in our explanation of vote with respect to draft resolution A/C.1/77/L.67.

India continues to support substantive consideration of the prevention of an arms race in outer space, and we remain committed to a legally binding instrument on PAROS that is universally acceptable, verifiable and multilaterally negotiated in the CD.

**Mr. Namekawa** (Japan): I would like to explain Japan’s vote on draft resolutions A/C.1/77/L.70 and A/C.1/77/L.71/Rev.1.

First, Japan voted against draft resolution A/C.1/77/L.70, entitled “Further practical measures for the prevention of an arms race in outer space”. While we agree with the need for further practical measures for the prevention of an arms race in outer space (PAROS), there remain several outstanding issues relating to the measures contained in this draft resolution. First, as our society is becoming increasingly reliant on space systems, Japan expresses its concern over outer space activities that lack transparency. Japan notes that the increasing levels of such activities could lead to misunderstandings or even pose threats. We therefore believe that the first issue to which further practical measures for PAROS ought to promptly respond is this current situation. Accordingly, we emphasize the need for further development of discussions on norms, rules and principles in outer space.

Secondly, the dual-use nature or dual-purpose use of space objects and technologies should be taken into account, including how to enable effective verification.

Thirdly, we do not support the immediate commencement of negotiations on an international legally binding instrument. In this regard, we would like to recall paragraph 47 of the report of the Secretary-

General entitled “Reducing space threats through norms, rules and principles of responsible behaviours” (A/76/77), which states that

“It is encouraging that Member States reaffirm that voluntary norms, rules and principles, including non-binding transparency and confidence-building measures, can form the basis for legal measures.”

We opposed the fifth preambular paragraph since it contains language that does not enjoy consensus in the General Assembly.

Lastly, we do not agree with operative paragraph 8, which requests the establishment of a group of governmental experts, as doing so would conflict with the ongoing open-ended working group (OEWG) on reducing space threat through norms, rules and principles of responsible behaviours. At this time, Japan believes that we should focus our efforts on the ongoing OEWG. Japan reiterates its commitment to continuing to exchange views in a transparent manner between countries with various positions and to promote international rulemaking in outer space with a view to reflecting a wide range of opinions.

Next, I would like to explain our position on A/C.1/77/L.71/Rev.1, entitled “Transparency and confidence-building measures in outer space activities”, and to share our concern with regard to its substance. We fully agree with the importance of transparency and confidence-building measures in outer space activities (TCBMs), and Japan joined the consensus in adopting draft resolution A/C.1/77/L.71/Rev.1. However, we would like to express our concern about paragraph 11 of the draft resolution, which outlines a request to the Secretary-General to seek the views and proposals of Member States about the practical implementation of transparency and confidence-building measures in outer space provided for in the report of the 2013 Group of Governmental Experts on transparency and confidence-building measures in outer space activities. It also requests that a substantive report with an annex containing those views to the General Assembly be submitted at its seventy-eighth session for further discussion by Member States. As the United Nations Disarmament Commission, scheduled to be held in April 2023, is already expected to issue a report on TCBMs, it would be preferable to avoid duplication and minimize the programme budget implications by managing such activities using existing United Nations resources.

**The Chair:** We have heard the last speaker in the explanation of vote after the voting on measures under cluster 3, “Outer space”. The Committee will now turn to cluster 4, “Conventional weapons”.

I shall first give the floor to delegations wishing to make either a general statement or to introduce a new or revised drafts under cluster 4, “Conventional weapons”. Statements are limited to five minutes.

**Mr. Kim Sunghoon** (Republic of Korea): I have the honour to take the floor today to briefly introduce the annual draft resolution on the Arms Trade Treaty (ATT), contained in document A/C.1/77/L.39. The Arms Trade Treaty aims to establish the highest possible common standards for conventional arms trade and reduce human suffering, in particular violence against women and children. The ATT has been a milestone achievement in fostering the well-regulated and legal trade in arms while preventing illicit trade and diversion. As a long supporter of the Treaty and president of the ninth session of the Conference of States Parties to the ATT, the Republic of Korea has taken on the work for introducing this year’s draft resolution in the First Committee. This draft mainly reflects technical and factual updates based on the previous resolution, resolution 76/50, adopted last year.

Aiming at preserving the extensive support of Member States for that resolution, the Republic of Korea held informal consultations multilaterally and bilaterally in a transparent and open manner. We tried to duly reflect the proposals made by delegations while bearing in mind the overall balance of the draft text. I would like to take this opportunity to thank all Member States that have co-sponsored and shown support for this draft resolution. We are pleased to announce that we have 78 co-sponsors at this stage. I encourage others that have not done so yet to join as co-sponsors and hope that draft resolution A/C.1/77/L.39 will be adopted with overwhelming support as in previous years.

**Mr. Underwood** (Australia): I take the floor on behalf of France and my own country, Australia, to briefly introduce draft resolution A/C.1/77/L.41, entitled “Countering the threat posed by improvised explosive devices”.

Improvised explosive devices (IEDs) continue to cause indiscriminate death, displace populations and hinder sustainable development. In 2021, these devices accounted for approximately 43 per cent of all global civilian casualties from explosive weapons. They



also continue to pose a grave threat to peacekeeping operations, causing losses to personnel in multiple operations this year alone. In June, the United Nations reported that the United Nations Multidimensional Integrated Stabilization Mission in Mali had lost 93 peacekeepers to IEDs since its deployment to Mali in 2013.

First introduced in 2015, this draft resolution provides an avenue for States to express shared concern with regard to these weapons and their humanitarian impacts. It encourages consistent data collection, awareness-raising, effective regulation of components and precursor materials, and international cooperation and assistance. The draft resolution has been adopted without a vote since its inception and this year contains only minor amendments.

One delegation has called a vote on the eighth and ninth preambular paragraphs, which, respectively, recognize

“the importance of full involvement and equal opportunities for participation for both women and men in countering the threat posed by improvised explosive devices”,

and underline

“the importance of addressing the threat of improvised explosive devices and their differential impacts on women, girls, boys and men”.

I wish to underscore that both paragraphs represent language that has been adopted without a vote in every iteration of the draft resolution since 2018. This language has been acceptable to all States in previous years and should continue to be so in 2022.

With regard to the eighth preambular paragraph, I wish to recall that the importance of the full, equal and meaningful participation of women in all efforts for the maintenance and promotion of peace and security has been recognized in many forums and should continue to command consensus.

The ninth preambular paragraph addresses critically important issues. The United Nations Institute for Disarmament Research has found that explosive weapons, including IEDs, have differentiated impacts upon women, men, girls and boys. This is a matter of fact. It remains crucial to consider the gendered

implications of improvised explosive devices, including to enable effective international cooperation, relief and recovery efforts.

States may reasonably inquire as to why language that has commanded consensus for many years is now being put to a vote by one delegation. It is not the draft resolution, or the nature of the issues at hand, that has changed. We are confident that States will see the motivations for this vote for what they are — political. Draft resolution A/C.1/77/L.41 is particularly relevant for States that are most affected by improvised explosive devices. These States should not be the collateral damage of one country’s desire to undermine the draft resolution. These votes on preambular paragraphs dedicated to consideration of gender are a clear attempt to politicize an important issue that deserves the international community’s support and unified engagement.

We strongly encourage all delegations to vote in favour of these paragraphs to support consensus on issues that we should be able to tackle together. We hope that we can return to full consensus on this important draft resolution in future years.

**Ms. Quintero Correa** (Colombia) (*spoke in Spanish*): Together with Japan and South Africa, Colombia is introducing draft resolution A/C.1/77/L.50, entitled “The illicit trade in small arms and light weapons in all its aspects”, which is being co-sponsored by more than 80 States.

The illicit trade in small arms and light weapons in all its aspects, their excessive accumulation and diversion to unauthorized recipients continue to be a concern and a threat to peace, security, sustainable development and global stability, because of the humanitarian and socioeconomic consequences therefrom and because of their link to violence, organized crime, terrorism, illicit drug trafficking and other crimes. No country is immune to these phenomena, which have an impact on the lives, integrity and dignity of individuals, families and communities across entire nations. We must therefore deploy every effort and do everything possible to mitigate this global tragedy.

It is essential to address current and emerging challenges by integrating efforts aimed at implementing the Programme of Action to Prevent, Combat and Eradicate the Illicit Trade in Small Arms and Light Weapons in All Its Aspects (UNPOA) with those aimed at the implementation of the 2030 Agenda for



Sustainable Development, including promoting the effective participation of women and civil society. This draft resolution seeks to maintain dialogue, concerted action and cooperation to strengthen the implementation of the UNPOA and the International Tracing Instrument.

Colombia thanks all delegations for their valuable comments and constructive participation, both in the consultations we carried out on the options with respect to the administrative and funding arrangements for the permanent fellowship programme established by eighth Biennial Meeting of States, and in the consultations on the draft resolution. We thank all the sponsors and invite all delegations to again adopt the draft resolution without a vote.

Together with Germany and the Netherlands, Colombia is also introducing draft resolution A/C.1/77/L.40, entitled “Implementation of the Convention on the Prohibition of the Use, Stockpiling, Production and Transfer of Anti-Personnel Mines and on Their Destruction”. According to information provided by *Landmine Monitor*, at least 7,073 mine victims were recorded in 2020. That figure is more than double the lowest annual total on record. Of these, the vast majority, 80 per cent, were civilians, and half were children. We are talking about recorded mine casualties, and when they are known, updated figures will be set out in the 2021 report, which will be published next week.

We know the impact that anti-personnel mines have on people’s lives, communities and sustainable development, as well as the suffering and prolonged consequences they generate, given the unfortunate reality of conflicts that are breaking out around the world. As mines and improvised explosives are the weapons of choice for non-State armed actors, the Convention becomes more relevant and its universalization and strengthening more necessary. Draft resolution A/C.1/77/L.40 seeks to continue working in this direction, pulling together efforts aimed at attaining the common goal of a world free of anti-personnel mines. We invite all States to continue to support the draft resolution.

Finally, we wish to reiterate the need to incorporate a gender perspective in disarmament, arms control and non-proliferation policies and programmes. The full, equal and meaningful participation of women in the formulation and implementation of policies is important, recognizing their fundamental role in

building peace and security. We are therefore surprised by the number of paragraphs in draft resolutions under consideration by the First Committee relating to this approach that have been subject to calls that they be put to a vote, even though their content consists of previously agreed language.

**The Chair:** Before the Committee proceeds to take action on the draft resolutions and draft decisions in cluster 4, we will hear from delegations wishing to explain their positions on those drafts.

**Mr. Balouji (Iran):** I would like to explain the position of my delegation regarding draft resolution A/C.1/77/L.39, on the Arms Trade Treaty (ATT). My delegation will abstain in the voting on that draft resolution for the following reasons.

First, in the ATT, the political and commercial interests of certain arms-exporting countries are prioritized over observance of the fundamentals of international law. The international prohibition on the use of force by one State against another State or States is the most fundamental principle of modern international law. However, the ATT has failed to uphold that principle and to prohibit the transfer of arms to countries that commit acts of aggression, including foreign occupation. That is a significant loophole and major legal deficiency of the ATT.

Second, draft resolution A/C.1/77/L.39 calls upon non-parties to accede to the Treaty. Such a call for the universalization of the ATT is unacceptable because the Treaty was not adopted by consensus, owing to its substantive flaws and disregard for the concerns and interests of some of the States participating in the negotiation process. Furthermore, some of its States parties are committing major violations of its provisions, exporting billions of dollars of arms to Israel and certain countries in the Persian Gulf region while said arms are being used for death and destruction by occupiers in Palestine and aggressors in other countries. Those are only two examples of such violations.

Finally, I would like to put on record that our position on the ATT applies to all paragraphs in the draft resolutions and decisions that have been adopted or will be adopted by the Committee this year. My delegation disassociates itself from all such references.

I should also mention that although we join the consensus on draft resolution A/C.1/77/L.76, entitled “Assistance to States for curbing the illicit traffic in small arms and light weapons and collecting them”,

our position on the ATT here — or in any other draft resolution — was expressed in our explanation of position on draft resolution A/C.1/77/L.39.

I should now like to explain the position of Iran with regard to draft resolution A/C.1/77/L.48, on transparency in armaments. My delegation will abstain in the voting. We have repeatedly stated that the existing United Nations mechanism for transparency in conventional arms without transparency in weapons of mass destruction (WMDs) is not balanced and comprehensive, particularly given the realities in the volatile region of the Middle East, where the Israeli regime continues to develop nuclear weapons and other weapons of mass destruction and is not a party to any international instrument that bans WMDs.

Section L of General Assembly resolution 46/36, of 9 December 1991, the main terms of reference for transparency in armaments, has not been fully and faithfully implemented. After many years of operation of the United Nations Register of Conventional Arms, there is only a mention of that resolution in the current draft, while the Register was supposed to be a first step towards initiating a comprehensive transparency mechanism in all kinds of armaments, including weapons of mass destruction, in particular nuclear weapons. We hope that the General Assembly will, in future, pursue genuine and comprehensive transparency in armaments of all kinds, particularly weapons of mass destruction.

**Mr. Kulkarni** (India): I would like to explain the position of my delegation on draft resolutions A/C.1/77/L.40 and A/C.1/77/L.39.

India will abstain in the voting on draft resolution A/C.1/77/L.40, entitled: “Implementation of the Convention on the Prohibition of the Use, Stockpiling, Production and Transfer of Anti-Personnel Mines and on Their Destruction”. India supports the vision of a world free of anti-personnel landmines and is committed to their eventual elimination. The availability of militarily effective alternative technologies that can perform the legitimate defensive role of anti-personnel landmines in a cost-effective manner will considerably facilitate the goal of the complete elimination of anti-personnel mines. India is a high-contracting party to Amended Protocol II of the Convention on Certain Conventional Weapons, which enshrines the approach of taking into account the legitimate defence requirements of States, especially those with long borders. India has fulfilled

its obligations under Amended Protocol II, including stopping the production of non-detectable mines, as well as rendering all our anti-personnel mines detectable.

India is observing a moratorium on the export and transfer of anti-personnel landmines. We have taken a number of measures to address humanitarian concerns arising from the use of anti-personnel landmines, in accordance with international humanitarian law. India remains committed to increased international cooperation and assistance for mine clearance, as well as the rehabilitation of mine victims, and has been contributing technical assistance and expertise to that end. India also regularly participates as an observer at the Meetings of the States Parties to the Convention on the Prohibition of the Use, Stockpiling, Production and Transfer of Anti-Personnel Mines and Their Destruction.

With regard to draft resolution A/C.1/77/L.39, entitled “The Arms Trade Treaty”, India has established strong and effective national export controls with respect to the export of defence items. India subscribes to the objective of the Arms Trade Treaty (ATT), and our export control system meets those objectives. As part of our commitment to international transparency measures, India submits an annual report under the United Nations Register of Conventional Arms for the same categories of conventional arms that are regulated under the ATT. Our commitment is also reflected in India’s participation in the Wassenaar Arrangement. India continues to keep the ATT under review from the perspective of our defence, security and foreign policy interests. We will therefore abstain in the voting on draft resolution A/C.1/77/L.39.

**Mr. Hegazy** (Egypt): I take the floor to explain my delegation’s vote before the vote on the proposals contained in documents A/C.1/77/L.39 and A/C.1/77/L.40.

On draft resolution A/C.1/77/L.39, entitled “The Arms Trade Treaty”, and the references to this Treaty in other proposals presented to the Committee, I would like to highlight that Egypt will continue to be at the forefront of any genuine effort to combat illicit trafficking in arms and eradicate any arms transfers to terrorists and illegal armed groups. We also actively and constructively participated in the negotiations leading to the adoption of the Arms Trade Treaty.

Nevertheless, motivations related to the desire of some States to manipulate and politicize legitimate arms trade led to several shortcomings and loopholes in this Treaty, especially its deliberate lack of several necessary definitions and clear criteria, making the implementation

of the Treaty selective and subjective and allowing exporting States to abuse its provisions. The Treaty also completely ignored the prohibition of the intentional State-sponsored supply of weapons to unauthorized recipients, including terrorists and illegal armed groups, which represents the real main threat in this domain.

My delegation will therefore continue to abstain in the voting on the draft resolution contained in document A/C.1/77/L.39, as well as on paragraphs that refer to this Treaty in the draft resolutions contained in documents A/C.1/77/L.48, A/C.1/77/L.50 and A/C.1/77/L.76.

Regarding the draft resolution contained in document A/C.1/77/L.40, on the Convention on the Prohibition of the Use, Stockpiling, Production and Transfer of Anti-Personnel Mines and on Their Destruction, Egypt will continue to abstain in the voting. On several occasions, Egypt has expressed its reservations about the unbalanced nature of this instrument, which was developed and concluded outside the framework of the United Nations.

Mindful of the humanitarian considerations associated with landmines, Egypt has imposed a moratorium on its capacity to produce and export landmines since the 1980s, long before the conclusion of this Convention. We believe that the Convention lacks a balance between the humanitarian concerns related to anti-personnel landmines and their possible legitimate military uses, especially in countries with long borders facing extraordinary security challenges.

Furthermore, the Convention does not establish any legal obligation on States to remove the anti-personnel mines they have placed in the territory of other States, making it almost impossible for many States to meet the demining requirements on their own. That is particularly the case for Egypt, which is one of the most affected countries, as it still has millions of landmines that were placed in its territory during the Second World War.

**Mr. Vorontsov** (Russian Federation) (*spoke in Russian*): The Russian Federation is respectful with regards to the efforts of activists on the Convention on Cluster Munitions in order to decrease the negative impacts of the use of such weapons on civilian populations, both during armed conflicts and after their conclusion.

At the same time, the position of the Russian Federation regarding this hastily prepared draft outside of the United Nations, which is rather dubious, remains

unchanged. We were not a participant in the process of developing the Convention on Cluster Munitions, because it initially sought to introduce discriminatory restrictions that run counter to the interests of the defence and security of the Russian Federation.

The Convention only declares a full ban on cluster munitions. In effect, however, the aim is to redivide up the market for such weapons based on a ban on so-called “bad types” of such weapons, while allowing certain types of high-tech cluster munitions, thus benefiting only a specific narrow group of producing countries. We see that as a manifestation of double standards.

Another shortcoming of the document is the fact that, without any basis whatsoever, it allows all States to participate in the use of such munitions during military operations being carried out jointly with States that have not acceded to the Convention. We believe that cluster munitions are a lawful type of munitions and that the main reason for the humanitarian issues connected with them is not the type of weapon itself, but their inappropriate use. The accession of the Russian Federation to the Convention on Cluster Munitions is currently seen by us as inadvisable.

The optimal forum for discussing all issues relating to cluster munitions is the Convention on Certain Conventional Weapons. We therefore intend to vote against the draft resolution on the Convention on Cluster Munitions, A/C.1/77/L.68.

**Mrs. Romero López** (Cuba) (*spoke in Spanish*): The Cuban delegation would like to explain its vote on draft resolutions A/C.1/77/L.39, entitled “The Arms Trade Treaty”, and A/C.1/77/L.40, entitled “Implementation of the Convention on the Prohibition of the Use, Stockpiling, Production and Transfer of Anti-Personnel Mines and on Their Destruction”.

The Cuban delegation will abstain in the voting on draft resolution A/C.1/77/L.39, on the Arms Trade Treaty, as a whole, as well as on the ninth and tenth preambular paragraphs. We recall that the Arms Trade Treaty (ATT), adopted in a premature vote, when negotiations had not yet been concluded, does not enjoy international consensus. The ATT is an unbalanced treaty that favours arms-exporting States. The parameters established for those States to evaluate and decide on the approval and denial of transfers are subjective and can be easily manipulated for political reasons, which interferes with the right of States to acquire and possess arms for self-defence, as recognized in the Charter of the United Nations.

The ATT does not prohibit — and therefore ultimately legitimizes — arms transfers to unauthorized non-State actors, despite the fact that they are the main source of illicit arms trafficking. A treaty plagued by ambiguities, inconsistencies, vagueness and legal loopholes that undermine its effectiveness cannot be effective.

We also reject attempts to establish synergies between this Treaty and other instruments that do have universal acceptance and whose legal nature, membership, scope and category of weapons regulated are different.

Our delegation dissociates itself from all paragraphs referring to the ATT contained in the various draft resolutions on which the First Committee will take action.

With regard to draft resolution A/C.1/77/L.40, the Cuban delegation will continue to abstain in the voting. We reiterate that, as long as the policy of continued hostility and aggression of the United States against Cuba — imposed more than 60 years ago — remains, our country will not be able to renounce the possession and use of anti-personnel mines for the preservation of its sovereignty and territorial integrity, in accordance with the right to legitimate self-defence recognized in the Charter of the United Nations.

Cuba is a State party to the Convention on Certain Conventional Weapons, including its original Protocol II on anti-personnel mines, booby traps and other devices, and strictly complies with the prohibitions and restrictions on the use of mines established in that instrument. We reaffirm our commitment to the implementation of a strict policy to ensure the responsible use of anti-personnel mines on an exclusively defensive basis.

We fully share the legitimate humanitarian concerns associated with the indiscriminate and irresponsible use of anti-personnel mines and will continue to support all efforts which, while maintaining the necessary balance between humanitarian and national security concerns, are aimed at eliminating the terrible effects on the civilian population and the economy of many countries caused by the indiscriminate and irresponsible use of anti-personnel mines.

**Mr. Edu Mbasogo** (Equatorial Guinea) (*spoke in Spanish*): Equatorial Guinea will vote in favour of all the draft resolutions presented under cluster 4,

“Conventional weapons”, because Equatorial Guinea continues to be concerned about the trade, transfer, production, possession, stockpiling and illicit circulation of small arms and light weapons, as well as their excessive accumulation and their uncontrolled proliferation in many parts of the world, especially on the African continent.

The violence in our African nations is closely related to illicit markets, which are the result of various forms of transnational organized crime and the illicit trafficking of weapons and their munitions and components. Those effects are due to the lack of control over the arms trade in various parts of the world and specifically in countries that manufacture weapons. It is difficult to understand how, with such sophisticated controls and progressive legislation, weapons produced in non-African countries wind up in our underdeveloped societies, which do not produce weapons. Someone is allowing that commerce. We do not want arms trafficking to occur. It exists deliberately because of financial rather than human concerns. We demand transparency and good faith from countries that manufacture light weapons so that their final use is controlled. We hope that through these draft resolutions, representatives of countries that produce light weapons will be able to convey to their respective Governments that their weapons are exterminating our people.

**The Chair:** The Committee will now proceed to take action on draft resolution A/C.1/77/L.39, entitled “The Arms Trade Treaty”. I give the floor to the Secretary of the Committee.

**Ms. Elliot** (Secretary of the Committee): Draft resolution A/C.1/77/L.39 was submitted by the representative of the Republic of Korea on 11 October. The sponsors of the draft resolution are listed in document A/C.1/77/L.39. The additional sponsors are listed in the e-deleGATE portal of the First Committee. Antigua and Barbuda, Belize, Lesotho, Namibia, Sierra Leone and Vanuatu have also become sponsors of the draft resolution.

**The Chair:** Separate votes have been requested on the ninth and tenth preambular paragraphs of A/C.1/77/L.39. I shall therefore put those paragraphs to the vote, one by one.

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

*A recorded vote was taken.*



*In favour:*

Afghanistan, Albania, Algeria, Andorra, Angola, Antigua and Barbuda, Argentina, Australia, Austria, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belarus, Belgium, Belize, Bhutan, Bolivia (Plurinational State of), Bosnia and Herzegovina, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Burundi, Cabo Verde, Cambodia, Cameroon, Canada, Central African Republic, Chad, Chile, China, Colombia, Comoros, Congo, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Croatia, Cuba, Cyprus, Czechia, Denmark, Djibouti, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, El Salvador, Equatorial Guinea, Estonia, Eswatini, Ethiopia, Finland, France, Gambia, Georgia, Germany, Ghana, Greece, Guatemala, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Haiti, Honduras, Hungary, Iceland, India, Indonesia, Iraq, Ireland, Italy, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Kazakhstan, Kenya, Kiribati, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Latvia, Lebanon, Lesotho, Liberia, Libya, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Madagascar, Malawi, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mexico, Micronesia (Federated States of), Monaco, Mongolia, Montenegro, Morocco, Mozambique, Myanmar, Namibia, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, 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, Serbia, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Slovakia, Slovenia, South Africa, Spain, Suriname, Sweden, Switzerland, Thailand, Timor-Leste, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Türkiye, Ukraine, United Arab Emirates, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, Uruguay, Zambia, Zimbabwe

*Against:*

Russian Federation

*Abstaining:*

Armenia, Egypt, Eritrea, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Israel, Kuwait, Oman, Qatar, Saudi Arabia, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Syrian Arab Republic, United States of America, Yemen

*The ninth preambular paragraph was retained by 150 votes to 1, with 14 abstentions.*

[Subsequently, the delegation of Senegal informed the Secretariat that it had intended to vote in favour.]

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

*A recorded vote was taken.*

*In favour:*

Afghanistan, Albania, Andorra, Angola, Antigua and Barbuda, Argentina, Australia, Austria, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belgium, Belize, Bhutan, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Burundi, Cabo Verde, Cambodia, Cameroon, Canada, Central African Republic, Chad, Chile, China, Colombia, Comoros, Congo, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Croatia, Cyprus, Czechia, Denmark, Djibouti, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, El Salvador, Equatorial Guinea, Estonia, Eswatini, Ethiopia, Finland, France, Gambia, Georgia, Germany, Ghana, Greece, Guatemala, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Haiti, Honduras, Hungary, Iceland, Iraq, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Kazakhstan, Kenya, Kiribati, Latvia, Lebanon, Lesotho, Liberia, Libya, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Madagascar, Malawi, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mexico, Micronesia (Federated States of), Monaco, Mongolia, Montenegro, Morocco, Mozambique, Myanmar, Namibia, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Niger, Nigeria, 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, Senegal, Serbia, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Slovakia, Slovenia, South Africa, Spain, 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 States of America, Uruguay, Zambia, Zimbabwe

*Against:*

None

*Abstaining:*

Algeria, Armenia, Belarus, Bolivia (Plurinational State of), Cuba, Egypt, India, Indonesia, Iran



(Islamic Republic of), Kuwait, Nicaragua, Oman, Qatar, Russian Federation, Saudi Arabia, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Syrian Arab Republic, Yemen

*The tenth preambular paragraph was retained by 145 votes to none, with 19 abstentions.*

**The Chair:** The Committee will now proceed to take action on draft resolution A/C.1/77/L.39, 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, Burundi, Cabo Verde, Cambodia, Cameroon, Canada, Central African Republic, Chad, Chile, China, Colombia, Comoros, Congo, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Croatia, Cyprus, Czechia, Denmark, Djibouti, Dominican Republic, El Salvador, Equatorial Guinea, Eritrea, Estonia, Eswatini, Ethiopia, Finland, France, Gabon, Gambia, Georgia, Germany, Ghana, Greece, Guatemala, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Haiti, Honduras, Hungary, Iceland, Iraq, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Kazakhstan, Kenya, Kiribati, Latvia, Lebanon, Lesotho, Liberia, Libya, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Madagascar, Malawi, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Marshall Islands, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mexico, Micronesia (Federated States of), Monaco, Mongolia, Montenegro, Morocco, Mozambique, Myanmar, Namibia, Nauru, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Niger, Nigeria, North Macedonia, Norway, Pakistan, Palau, 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, Senegal, Serbia, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Slovakia, Slovenia, Solomon Islands, Somalia, South Africa, Spain, Suriname, Sweden, Switzerland, Thailand, Timor-Leste, Togo, Tonga, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Türkiye, Turkmenistan, Tuvalu, Ukraine, United Arab Emirates, United Kingdom of Great Britain and

Northern Ireland, United Republic of Tanzania, United States of America, Uruguay, Vanuatu, Zambia, Zimbabwe

*Against:*

None

*Abstaining:*

Armenia, Belarus, Cuba, Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Ecuador, Egypt, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Kuwait, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Nicaragua, Oman, Qatar, Russian Federation, Saudi Arabia, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Syrian Arab Republic, Tajikistan, Uganda, Yemen

*Draft resolution A/C.1/77/L.39, as a whole, was adopted by 159 votes to none, with 22 abstentions.*

[Subsequently, the delegation of the Plurinational State of Bolivia informed the Secretariat that it had intended to abstain.]

**The Chair:** The Committee will now proceed to take action on draft resolution A/C.1/77/L.40, entitled "Implementation of the Convention on the Prohibition of the Use, Stockpiling, Production and Transfer of Anti-Personnel Mines and on Their Destruction". I give the floor to the Secretary of the Committee.

**Ms. Elliot** (Secretary of the Committee): Draft resolution A/C.1/77/L.40 was submitted by the representative of Colombia, Germany and the Netherlands on 11 October. The sponsors of the draft resolution are listed in document A/C.1/77/L.40.

**The Chair:** A recorded vote has been requested.

*A recorded vote was taken.*

*In favour:*

Afghanistan, Albania, Algeria, Andorra, Angola, Antigua and Barbuda, Argentina, Armenia, Australia, Austria, Azerbaijan, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belarus, Belgium, Belize, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia (Plurinational State of), Bosnia and Herzegovina, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Burundi, Cabo Verde, Cambodia, Cameroon, Canada, Central African Republic, Chad, Chile, China, Colombia, Comoros, Congo, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Croatia, Cyprus, Czechia, Denmark, Djibouti, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, 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, Italy, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Kazakhstan, Kenya, Kiribati, Kuwait, Kyrgyzstan, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Latvia, Lebanon, Lesotho, Liberia, Libya, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Madagascar, Malawi, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Marshall Islands, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mexico, Micronesia (Federated States of), Monaco, Mongolia, Montenegro, Morocco, Mozambique, Myanmar, Namibia, Nauru, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, North Macedonia, Norway, Oman, Palau, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Qatar, Republic of Moldova, Romania, Rwanda, Saint Kitts and Nevis, Saint Lucia, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, Samoa, San Marino, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Slovakia, Slovenia, Solomon Islands, Somalia, South Africa, Spain, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Sweden, Switzerland, Tajikistan, Thailand, Timor-Leste, Togo, Tonga, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Türkiye, Turkmenistan, Tuvalu, Uganda, Ukraine, United Arab Emirates, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United Republic of Tanzania, Uruguay, Vanuatu, Yemen, Zambia, Zimbabwe

*Against:*

None

*Abstaining:*

Cuba, Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Egypt, India, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Israel, Nepal, Pakistan, Republic of Korea, Russian Federation, Saudi Arabia, Serbia, Syrian Arab Republic, United States of America, Uzbekistan, Viet Nam

*Draft resolution A/C.1/77/L.40 was adopted by 170 votes to none, with 16 abstentions.*

**The Chair:** The Committee will now proceed to take action on draft resolution A/C.1/77/L.41, entitled "Countering the threat posed by improvised explosive devices". I give the floor to the Secretary of the Committee.

**Ms. Elliot** (Secretary of the Committee): Draft resolution A/C.1/77/L.41 was submitted by the representative of Australia and France on 11 October.

The sponsors of the draft resolution are listed in document A/C.1/77/L.41. The additional sponsors are listed in the e-deleGATE portal of the First Committee.

**The Chair:** Separate votes have been requested on the eighth and ninth preambular paragraphs of A/C.1/77/L.41. I shall therefore put those paragraphs to the vote, 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, Armenia, Australia, Austria, Azerbaijan, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belarus, Belgium, Belize, Bhutan, Bolivia (Plurinational State of), Bosnia and Herzegovina, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Bulgaria, Burundi, Cabo Verde, Cambodia, Cameroon, Canada, Central African Republic, Chad, Chile, China, Colombia, Comoros, Congo, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Croatia, Cuba, Cyprus, Czechia, Denmark, Djibouti, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Equatorial Guinea, Eritrea, Estonia, Eswatini, Ethiopia, Fiji, Finland, France, Gambia, Georgia, Germany, Ghana, Greece, Guatemala, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Haiti, Honduras, Hungary, Iceland, India, Indonesia, Iraq, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Kazakhstan, Kenya, Kiribati, Kuwait, Kyrgyzstan, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Latvia, Lebanon, Lesotho, Liberia, Libya, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Madagascar, Malawi, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Marshall Islands, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mexico, Micronesia (Federated States of), Monaco, Mongolia, Montenegro, Morocco, Mozambique, Myanmar, Namibia, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, North Macedonia, Norway, Oman, Pakistan, Palau, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Qatar, Republic of Korea, Republic of Moldova, Romania, Rwanda, Saint Lucia, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, Samoa, San Marino, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Serbia, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Slovakia, Slovenia, Somalia, South Africa, Spain, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Sweden, Switzerland, Thailand, Timor-Leste, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia,

Türkiye, Turkmenistan, 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:*  
none

*Abstaining:*

Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Russian Federation, Syrian Arab Republic

*The eighth preambular paragraph was retained by 174 votes to none, with 4 abstentions.*

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

*A recorded vote was taken.*

*In favour:*

Afghanistan, Albania, Algeria, Andorra, Angola, Antigua and Barbuda, Argentina, Armenia, Australia, Austria, Azerbaijan, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belarus, Belgium, Belize, Bhutan, Bolivia (Plurinational State of), Bosnia and Herzegovina, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Burundi, Cabo Verde, Cambodia, Cameroon, Canada, Central African Republic, Chad, Chile, China, Colombia, Comoros, Congo, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Croatia, Cuba, Cyprus, Czechia, Denmark, Djibouti, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Equatorial Guinea, Eritrea, Estonia, Eswatini, Ethiopia, Fiji, Finland, France, Gambia, Georgia, Germany, Ghana, Greece, Guatemala, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Haiti, Honduras, Hungary, Iceland, India, Indonesia, Iraq, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Kazakhstan, Kenya, Kiribati, Kuwait, Kyrgyzstan, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Latvia, Lebanon, Lesotho, Liberia, Libya, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Madagascar, Malawi, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Marshall Islands, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mexico, Micronesia (Federated States of), Monaco, Mongolia, Montenegro, Morocco, Mozambique, Myanmar, Namibia, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, North Macedonia, Norway, Oman, Pakistan, Palau, Panama, Papua

New Guinea, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Qatar, Republic of Korea, Republic of Moldova, Romania, Rwanda, Saint Lucia, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, Samoa, San Marino, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Serbia, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Slovakia, Slovenia, Somalia, South Africa, Spain, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Sweden, Switzerland, Thailand, Timor-Leste, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Türkiye, Turkmenistan, Tuvalu, Uganda, Ukraine, United Arab Emirates, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America, Uruguay, Uzbekistan, Vanuatu, Viet Nam, Yemen, Zambia, Zimbabwe

*Against:*  
none

*Abstaining:*

Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Russian Federation, Syrian Arab Republic

*The ninth preambular paragraph was retained by 174 votes to none, with 4 abstentions.*

**The Chair:** The sponsors of draft resolution A/C.1/77/L.41 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.1/77/L.41, as a whole, was adopted.*

**The Chair:** The Committee will now proceed to take action on draft resolution A/C.1/77/L.43, entitled "Convention on prohibitions or restrictions on the use of certain conventional weapons which may be deemed to be excessively injurious or to have indiscriminate effects".

I give the floor to the Secretary of the Committee.

**Ms. Elliott** (Secretary of the Committee): Draft resolution A/C.1/77/L.43 was submitted by the representative of France on 11 October. The sponsor of the draft resolution is listed in document A/C.1/77/L.43.

**The Chair:** The sponsor of the draft resolution has 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.1/77/L.43 was adopted.*

**The Chair:** The Committee will now proceed to take action on draft resolution A/C.1/77/L.48, entitled “Transparency in armaments”.

I give the floor to the Secretary of the Committee.

**Ms. Elliott** (Secretary of the Committee): Draft resolution A/C.1/77/L.48 was submitted by the representative of the Netherlands on 12 October. The sponsors of the draft resolution are listed in document A/C.1/77/L.48. The additional sponsors are listed on the e-deleGATE portal of the First Committee.

The present statement, pertaining to operative paragraph 6 of draft resolution A/C.1/77/L.48, is made in the context of rule 153 of the rules of procedure of the General Assembly. The statement will also be distributed to Member States.

The request contained in operative paragraph 6 of the draft resolution would constitute an addition to the meetings and documentation workload for the Department for General Assembly and Conference Management in 2024 and 2025 and would entail additional non-recurring resource requirements in the amount of \$187,200 in 2024 and \$373,700 in 2025.

Furthermore, the request contained in operative paragraph 6 would constitute an additional workload for the Office for Disarmament Affairs, requiring the provision of resources for the travel costs, daily subsistence allowance and terminal expenses for up to 20 governmental experts to attend the three five-day sessions, one in New York in 2024 and one each in New York and Geneva in 2025; the costs for a consultant to provide technical and substantive support to the substantive servicing of the work of the United Nations Group of Governmental Experts in 2024 and 2025; and the costs for travel, daily subsistence allowance and terminal expenses for staff of the Office of Disarmament Affairs to support the session in Geneva in 2025. The additional workload for the Office for Disarmament Affairs would entail additional non-recurring resource requirements in the amount of \$121,100 in 2024 and \$246,800 in 2025.

In addition, the request contained in operative paragraph 6 would entail additional non-recurring resources for the Office of Information and Communications Technology for \$7,900 in 2024 and 2025. Further, the request contained in operative paragraph 6 would entail additional non-recurring resources for the United Nations Office in Geneva for \$3,500 in 2025.

Detailed cost estimates and their underlying assumptions for the requirements are provided in the annex to this statement, which has been circulated to Member States.

Accordingly, should the General Assembly adopt draft resolution A/C.1/77/L.48, additional resource requirements estimated in the amount of \$948,100, comprising \$187,200 in 2024 and \$373,700 in 2025 under section 2, “General Assembly and Economic and Social Council affairs and conference management”; \$121,100 in 2024 and \$246,800 in 2025 under section 4, “Disarmament”; \$7,900 each year in 2024 and 2025 under section 29C, “Office of Information and Communication Technology”; and \$3,500 in 2025 under section 29E, “Administration, Geneva”, would be included in the proposed programme budget for 2024 and 2025 for the consideration of the General Assembly at its seventy-seventh and seventy-eighth sessions.

With regard to the use of the phrase “within existing resources” in operative paragraph 6, the attention of the General Assembly is drawn to the provisions of section VI of General Assembly resolution 45/248 B of 21 December 1990 and subsequent resolutions, the most recent of which is resolution 76/245 of 24 December 2021, in which the Assembly reaffirmed that the Fifth Committee is the appropriate Main Committee of the Assembly entrusted with the responsibilities for administrative and budgetary matters and reaffirmed the role of the Advisory Committee on Administrative and Budgetary Questions.

**The Chair:** Separate votes have been requested on the seventh preambular paragraph of draft resolution A/C.1/77/L.48 and on draft resolution A/C.1/77/L.48 as a whole.

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

*A recorded vote was taken.*

*In favour:*

Albania, Andorra, Angola, Antigua and Barbuda, Argentina, Australia, Austria, Azerbaijan, Bahamas, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belgium, Belize, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Burundi, Cabo Verde, Cambodia, Cameroon, Canada, Central African Republic, Chad, Chile, China, Colombia, Comoros, Congo, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Croatia, Cyprus, Czechia, Denmark, Dominican



Republic, Ecuador, El Salvador, Equatorial Guinea, Eritrea, Estonia, Ethiopia, Fiji, Finland, France, Gambia, Georgia, Germany, Ghana, Greece, Guatemala, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Haiti, Honduras, Hungary, Iceland, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Jamaica, Japan, Kazakhstan, Kenya, Kiribati, Latvia, Lesotho, Liberia, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Madagascar, Malawi, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Mauritius, Mexico, Micronesia (Federated States of), Monaco, Mongolia, Montenegro, Mozambique, Myanmar, Namibia, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Niger, Nigeria, 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, Senegal, Serbia, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Slovakia, Slovenia, South Africa, Spain, Suriname, Sweden, Switzerland, Thailand, Timor-Leste, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tuvalu, Uganda, Ukraine, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America, Uruguay, Zambia

*Against:*

Eswatini

*Abstaining:*

Algeria, Armenia, Bahrain, Belarus, Bhutan, Bolivia (Plurinational State of), Cuba, Djibouti, Egypt, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Jordan, Kuwait, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lebanon, Libya, Mauritania, Morocco, Nicaragua, Oman, Qatar, Russian Federation, Saudi Arabia, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Syrian Arab Republic, Tunisia, Türkiye, United Arab Emirates, Uzbekistan, Yemen, Zimbabwe

*The seventh preambular paragraph was retained by 135 votes to 1, with 34 abstentions.*

[Subsequently, the delegation of Eswatini informed the Secretariat that it had intended to vote in favour.]

**The Chair:** The Committee will now proceed to take action on draft resolution A/C.1/77/L.48, entitled "Transparency in armaments", as a whole. A recorded vote has been requested.

*A recorded vote was taken.*

*In favour:*

Afghanistan, Albania, Andorra, Angola, Antigua and Barbuda, Argentina, Armenia, Australia, Austria, Azerbaijan, Bahamas, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belgium, Belize, Benin, Bhutan, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Burundi, Cabo Verde, Cambodia, Cameroon, Canada, Central African Republic, Chad, Chile, China, Colombia, Comoros, Congo, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Croatia, Cyprus, Czechia, Denmark, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, 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, India, Indonesia, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Jamaica, Japan, Kazakhstan, Kenya, Kiribati, Kyrgyzstan, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Latvia, Lesotho, Liberia, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Madagascar, Malawi, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Marshall Islands, Mauritius, Mexico, Micronesia (Federated States of), Monaco, Mongolia, Montenegro, Mozambique, Myanmar, Namibia, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Niger, Nigeria, North Macedonia, Norway, Pakistan, Palau, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Republic of Korea, Republic of Moldova, Romania, Russian Federation, Rwanda, Saint Kitts and Nevis, Saint Lucia, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, Samoa, San Marino, Senegal, Serbia, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Slovakia, Slovenia, Solomon Islands, South Africa, Spain, Sri Lanka, Suriname, Sweden, Switzerland, Tajikistan, Thailand, Timor-Leste, Togo, Tonga, Trinidad and Tobago, Türkiye, Turkmenistan, Tuvalu, Uganda, Ukraine, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United Republic of Tanzania, United States of America, Uruguay, Uzbekistan, Vanuatu, Zambia, Zimbabwe

*Against:*

none

*Abstaining:*

Algeria, Bahrain, Belarus, Bolivia (Plurinational State of), Cuba, Djibouti, Egypt, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Jordan, Kuwait, Lebanon, Libya, Mauritania, Morocco, Nicaragua, Oman, Qatar, Saudi Arabia, Sudan, Syrian Arab Republic, Tunisia, United Arab Emirates, Yemen



*Draft resolution A/C.1/77/L.48, as a whole, was adopted by 158 votes to none, with 24 abstentions.*

**The Chair:** The Committee will now proceed to take action on draft resolution A/C.1/77/L.50, entitled “The illicit trade in small arms and light weapons in all its aspects”.

I give the floor to the Secretary of the Committee.

**Ms. Elliott** (Secretary of the Committee): Draft resolution A/C.1/77/L.50 was submitted on 12 October by the representative of Colombia, also on behalf of Japan and South Africa. The sponsors of the draft resolution are listed in document A/C.1/77/L.50. The additional sponsors are listed on the e-deleGATE portal of the First Committee. Antigua and Barbuda and Equatorial Guinea have also become sponsors.

The present statement, pertaining to operative paragraph 23 of draft resolution A/C.1/77/L.50, is made in the context of rule 153 of the rules of procedure of the General Assembly. The present statement will also be distributed to Member States.

The request contained in operative paragraph 23 of the draft resolution would constitute an addition to the workload of the Office for Disarmament Affairs and entail additional resource requirements in the range of \$1.8 to \$1.9 million, net of staff assessment, in 2024. Detailed cost estimates and their underlying assumptions for the requirements are provided in the annex to this statement.

Accordingly, should the General Assembly adopt draft resolution A/C.1/77/L.50, additional recurring resource requirements estimated in the range of \$1.8 to \$1.9 million, net of staff assessment, under section 4, “Disarmament”, would be included in the proposed programme budget for 2024 for the consideration of the General Assembly at its seventy-eighth session.

The attention of the General Assembly is drawn to the provisions of section VI of General Assembly resolution 45/248 B of 21 December 1990 and subsequent resolutions, the most recent of which is resolution 76/245 of 24 December 2021, in which the Assembly reaffirmed that the Fifth Committee is the appropriate Main Committee of the Assembly entrusted with the responsibilities for administrative and budgetary matters and reaffirmed the role of the Advisory Committee on Administrative and Budgetary Questions.

**The Chair:** A separate vote has been requested on the twenty-third preambular paragraph of draft resolution A/C.1/77/L.50. I shall now put to the vote the twenty-third preambular paragraph.

*A recorded vote was taken.*

*In favour:*

Afghanistan, Albania, Andorra, Angola, Antigua and Barbuda, Argentina, Australia, Austria, Azerbaijan, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belgium, Belize, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Burundi, Cabo Verde, Cambodia, Cameroon, Canada, Central African Republic, Chad, Chile, China, Colombia, Comoros, Congo, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Croatia, Cyprus, Czechia, Denmark, Djibouti, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, El Salvador, Equatorial Guinea, Eritrea, Estonia, Eswatini, Ethiopia, Fiji, Finland, France, Gambia, Georgia, Germany, Ghana, Greece, Guatemala, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Haiti, Honduras, Hungary, Iceland, Iraq, Ireland, Italy, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Kazakhstan, Kenya, Kiribati, Latvia, Lebanon, Lesotho, Liberia, Libya, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Madagascar, Malawi, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Mauritius, Mexico, Micronesia (Federated States of), Monaco, Mongolia, Montenegro, Morocco, Mozambique, Myanmar, Namibia, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Niger, Nigeria, 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, Senegal, Serbia, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Slovakia, Slovenia, Solomon Islands, South Africa, Spain, Sudan, Suriname, Sweden, Switzerland, Thailand, Timor-Leste, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Tuvalu, Uganda, Ukraine, United Arab Emirates, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United Republic of Tanzania, United States of America, Uruguay, Vanuatu, Zambia, Zimbabwe

*Against:*

none

*Abstaining:*

Algeria, Armenia, Belarus, Bhutan, Bolivia (Plurinational State of), Cuba, Egypt, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Israel,

Kuwait, Mauritania, Nicaragua, Oman, Qatar, Russian Federation, Saudi Arabia, Sri Lanka, Syrian Arab Republic, Türkiye, Yemen

*The twenty-third preambular paragraph was retained by 150 votes to none, with 22 abstentions.*

**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 will take it that the Committee wishes to act accordingly.

*Draft resolution A/C.1/77/L.50, as a whole, was adopted.*

**The Chair:** The Committee will now proceed to take action on draft decision A/C.1/77/L.51, entitled “Problems arising from the accumulation of conventional ammunition stockpiles in surplus”.

I give the floor to the Secretary of the Committee.

**Ms. Elliott** (Secretary of the Committee): Draft decision A/C.1/77/L.51 was submitted on 12 October by the representatives of Germany and France. The sponsors of the draft decision are listed in document A/C.1/77/L.51. A statement on the programme budget implications of the draft decision has been issued as document A/C.1/77/L.81 and placed on the e-deleGATE portal.

**The Chair:** We shall now take action on draft decision A/C.1/77/L.51. A recorded vote has been requested.

*A recorded vote was taken.*

*In favour:*

Afghanistan, Albania, Algeria, Andorra, Angola, Antigua and Barbuda, Argentina, Armenia, Australia, Austria, Azerbaijan, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belarus, Belgium, Belize, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia (Plurinational State of), Bosnia and Herzegovina, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Burundi, Cabo Verde, Cambodia, Cameroon, Canada, Central African Republic, Chad, Chile, China, Colombia, Comoros, Congo, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Croatia, Cyprus, Czechia, Denmark, Djibouti, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Eritrea, Estonia, Eswatini, Ethiopia, Fiji, Finland, France, Gabon, Gambia, Georgia, Germany, Ghana, Greece, Guatemala, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Haiti, Honduras,

Hungary, Iceland, India, Indonesia, Iraq, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Kazakhstan, Kenya, Kiribati, Kuwait, Kyrgyzstan, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Latvia, Lebanon, Lesotho, Liberia, Libya, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Madagascar, Malawi, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mexico, Micronesia (Federated States of), Monaco, Mongolia, Montenegro, Morocco, Mozambique, Myanmar, Namibia, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Niger, Nigeria, North Macedonia, Norway, Oman, Pakistan, 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, Spain, Sri Lanka, 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, Vanuatu, Viet Nam, Yemen, Zambia, Zimbabwe

*Against:*

none

*Abstaining:*

Cuba, Equatorial Guinea, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Nicaragua, Russian Federation, Syrian Arab Republic

*Draft decision A/C.1/77/L.51 was adopted by 173 votes to none, with 6 abstentions.*

**The Chair:** The Committee will now proceed to take action on draft resolution A/C.1/77/L.53, entitled “Information on confidence-building measures in the field of conventional arms”.

I give the floor to the Secretary of the Committee.

**Ms. Elliott** (Secretary of the Committee): Draft resolution A/C.1/77/L.53 was submitted on 12 October by the representative of Argentina. The sponsors of the draft resolution are listed in document A/C.1/77/L.53. The additional sponsors are listed on the e-deleGATE portal of the First Committee. Norway has become an additional sponsor.

**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 will take it that the Committee wishes to act accordingly.

*Draft resolution A/C.1/77/L.53 was adopted.*

**The Chair:** The Committee will now proceed to take action on draft resolution A/C.1/77/L.68, entitled “Implementation of the Convention on Cluster Munitions”.

I give the floor to the Secretary of the Committee.

**Ms. Elliott** (Secretary of the Committee): Draft resolution A/C.1/77/L.68 was submitted on 13 October by the representative of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland on behalf of the States members of the Convention on Cluster Munitions Coordination Committee. The sponsors of the draft resolution are listed in document A/C.1/77/L.68.

**The Chair:** The Committee will now take action on draft resolution A/C.1/77/L.68. A recorded vote has been requested.

*A recorded vote was taken.*

*In favour:*

Afghanistan, Albania, Algeria, Andorra, Angola, Antigua and Barbuda, Armenia, Australia, Austria, Azerbaijan, Bahamas, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belgium, Belize, Bhutan, Bolivia (Plurinational State of), Bosnia and Herzegovina, Botswana, Brunei Darussalam, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Burundi, Cabo Verde, Cameroon, Canada, Central African Republic, Chad, Chile, China, Colombia, Comoros, Congo, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Croatia, Cuba, Czechia, Denmark, Djibouti, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, El Salvador, Equatorial Guinea, Eritrea, Eswatini, Ethiopia, Fiji, France, Gabon, Gambia, Germany, Ghana, Guatemala, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Haiti, Honduras, Hungary, Iceland, Indonesia, Iraq, Ireland, Italy, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Kazakhstan, Kenya, Kiribati, Kuwait, Kyrgyzstan, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lebanon, Lesotho, Liberia, Libya, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Madagascar, Malawi, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Marshall Islands, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mexico, Micronesia (Federated States of), Monaco, Mongolia, Montenegro, Mozambique, Myanmar, Namibia, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua,

Niger, Nigeria, North Macedonia, Norway, Palau, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Portugal, Republic of Moldova, Rwanda, Saint Kitts and Nevis, Saint Lucia, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, Samoa, San Marino, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Slovakia, Slovenia, Solomon Islands, Somalia, South Africa, Spain, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Sweden, Switzerland, Thailand, Timor-Leste, Togo, Tonga, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United Republic of Tanzania, Uruguay, Vanuatu, Yemen, Zambia

*Against:*

Russian Federation

*Abstaining:*

Argentina, Bahrain, Belarus, Brazil, Cambodia, Cyprus, Egypt, Estonia, Finland, Georgia, Greece, India, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Israel, Latvia, Morocco, Nepal, Oman, Pakistan, Poland, Qatar, Republic of Korea, Romania, Saudi Arabia, Serbia, Syrian Arab Republic, Tajikistan, Türkiye, Uganda, Ukraine, United Arab Emirates, United States of America, Uzbekistan, Viet Nam, Zimbabwe

*Draft resolution A/C.1/77/L.68 was adopted by 145 votes to 1, with 35 abstentions.*

[Subsequently, the delegation of Madagascar informed the Secretariat that it had intended to vote in favour; the delegation of Kuwait informed the Secretariat that it had intended to abstain.]

**The Chair:** The Committee will now proceed to take action on draft resolution A/C.1/77/L.76, entitled “Assistance to states for curbing the illicit traffic in small arms and light weapons and collecting them”.

I give the floor to the Secretary of the Committee.

**Ms. Elliott** (Secretary of the Committee): Draft resolution A/C.1/77/L.76 was submitted on 13 October by the representative of Nigeria on behalf of the States Members of the United Nations that are members of the Economic Community of West African States. The sponsors of the draft resolution are listed in document A/C.1/77/L.76. The additional sponsors are listed on the e-deleGATE portal of the First Committee. Lesotho, the United Republic of Tanzania and Zambia have also become sponsors.

**The Chair:** A separate, recorded vote has been requested on the sixteenth preambular paragraph of draft resolution A/C.1/77/L.76. I shall now put the sixteenth preambular paragraph to a vote.

*A recorded vote was taken.*

*In favour:*

Afghanistan, Albania, Andorra, Angola, Antigua and Barbuda, Argentina, Australia, Austria, Azerbaijan, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belgium, Belize, Benin, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Burundi, Cabo Verde, Cambodia, Cameroon, Canada, Central African Republic, Chad, Chile, China, Colombia, Comoros, Congo, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Croatia, Cyprus, Czechia, Denmark, Djibouti, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, 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, Iraq, Ireland, Italy, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Kazakhstan, Kenya, Kiribati, Latvia, Lebanon, Lesotho, Liberia, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Madagascar, Malawi, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mexico, Micronesia (Federated States of), Monaco, Mongolia, Montenegro, Morocco, Mozambique, Myanmar, Namibia, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Niger, Nigeria, 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, Senegal, Serbia, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Slovakia, Slovenia, Solomon Islands, Somalia, South Africa, Spain, Sudan, Suriname, Sweden, Switzerland, Thailand, Timor-Leste, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Uganda, Ukraine, United Arab Emirates, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United Republic of Tanzania, United States of America, Uruguay, Vanuatu, Zambia, Zimbabwe

*Against:*

none

*Abstaining:*

Algeria, Armenia, Belarus, Bhutan, Bolivia (Plurinational State of), Cuba, Egypt, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Israel, Kuwait,

Libya, Nicaragua, Oman, Qatar, Russian Federation, Saudi Arabia, Sri Lanka, Syrian Arab Republic, Türkiye, Yemen

*The sixteenth preambular paragraph was retained by 152 votes to none, with 22 abstentions.*

**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 will take it that the Committee wishes to act accordingly.

*Draft resolution A/C.1/77/L.76, as a whole, was adopted.*

**The Chair:** I now give the floor to delegations wishing to explain their vote or position after the voting.

**Ms. Kristanti** (Indonesia): My delegation takes the floor to explain our position on the draft resolutions relating to small arms and light weapons submitted under cluster 4.

Indonesia abstained in the voting on all draft resolutions that referred to the Arms Trade Treaty, including draft resolution A/C.1/77/L.39, entitled “The Arms Trade Treaty”. Our position on the Treaty is well known. We support the Treaty’s spirit and goal to regulate the trade of conventional weapons for the purpose of contributing to international peace and security. Our position is based on the view that the Treaty should not create obstacles or generate potential restrictions, especially for developing countries, in the development of their capabilities.

With regard to resolution A/C.1/77/L.50, entitled “The illicit trade in small arms and light weapons in all its aspects”, Indonesia welcomes the inclusion of operative paragraph 23, on the decision to establish a standing dedicated fellowship training programme on small arms and light weapons. The training fellowship is much needed for strengthening knowledge and expertise for the implementation of the Programme of Action to Prevent, Combat and Eradicate the Illicit Trade in Small Arms and Light Weapons in All Its Aspects and the International Tracing Instrument, particularly for developing countries. Indonesia also welcomed the successful conclusion of the eighth Biennial Meeting of States on the Programme of Action and looks forward to the fourth Review Conference, to be held in 2024.

**Mr. Damico** (Brazil): I would like to explain Brazil’s abstention in the voting on draft resolution A/C.1/77/L.68, entitled “Implementation of the



Convention on Cluster Munitions". Brazil has supported efforts to address cluster munitions within the United Nations, in particular the discussions related to the adoption of a protocol to the Convention on Certain Conventional Weapons (CCW). We participated actively in the negotiations within the framework of the Group of Governmental Experts on Lethal Autonomous Weapons Systems, whose objective was the adoption of a legally binding instrument that would lead to the gradual banning of cluster munitions.

Brazil did not participate in the so-called Oslo process. In our view, the establishment of a parallel negotiating process to the CCW was consistent neither with the objective of strengthening that Convention nor with the goal of promoting the adoption of a balanced, effective and non-discriminatory arms-control instrument. Brazil believes that there are serious loopholes in the Oslo Convention. For instance, it allows the use of cluster munitions equipped with technologically sophisticated mechanisms for an indefinite period of time. Such mechanisms are present only in munitions manufactured in a small number of countries with more advanced defence industries. The effectiveness of the Convention is also undermined by its article 21, known as the interoperability clause.

Brazil has never used cluster munitions and is a State party to all protocols to the CCW, including its Protocol V, on explosive remnants of war. As such, it is committed to ensuring that any possible use of cluster munitions is in line with its obligations under applicable international humanitarian law.

**Mr. Margaryan** (Armenia): I take the floor to explain the position of the delegation of Armenia on draft resolution A/C.1/77/L.39, entitled "The Arms Trade Treaty".

Armenia strongly advocates for a robust and legally binding conventional arms-control regime at the regional and international levels that can enable the effective regulation of the trade in conventional arms and prevent and eradicate their diversion into illicit markets or their use for illegitimate purposes, in particular serious violations of human rights. We acknowledge the role of the Arms Trade Treaty (ATT) in establishing common international standards in that regard. However, Armenia reiterates its concerns about the preamble and principles sections of the Arms Trade Treaty. We have always stressed the need for balanced, non-restrictive references to the principles of

international law, including the principles of the equal rights and self-determination of peoples, in accordance with Article 1 of the Charter of the United Nations.

We reaffirm our position that in its current form, the Treaty could be interpreted as limiting the exercise of the sovereign right to self-defence, as well as hindering legitimate access to relevant technologies. The Treaty's key objective, which is the encouragement and enforcement of the regulation of the conventional arms trade through strong national control systems, could have been upheld more strongly. Armenia abstained in the voting on resolution A/C.1/77/L.39. Its position on the ATT is applicable to all other resolutions of the First Committee containing a reference to the Treaty. We therefore dissociate ourselves from those paragraphs.

**Mr. Kim Sunghoon** (Republic of Korea): My delegation would like to explain its abstention in the voting on two draft resolutions — draft resolutions A/C.1/77/L.40, on the implementation of the Convention on the Prohibition of the Use, Stockpiling, Production and Transfer of Anti-Personnel Mines and on Their Destruction, and A/C.1/77/L.68, on the implementation of the Convention on Cluster Munitions.

First, with regard to anti-personnel mines, the Republic of Korea sincerely supports the objectives and purposes of the Ottawa Convention. However, due to the unique security situation on the Korean peninsula, we are currently not a party to the Convention and therefore abstained in the voting on the draft resolution. That does not mean that we are less concerned about the severe challenges associated with the indiscriminate use of anti-personnel mines. We are committed to mitigating the suffering caused by their use. In that respect, the Korean Government is exercising tight control over anti-personnel landmines and has been maintaining an indefinite extension of its moratorium on their export since 1997. In addition, the Republic of Korea is a party to the Convention on Certain Conventional Weapons and its Protocol II, under which we participate in a range of discussions and activities to ensure only limited and responsible use.

On the domestic front, my Government is continuing its efforts in the areas of mine clearance and rehabilitation. In 2021 alone, we cleared 292 mines, including 291 anti-personnel mines, over an area of approximately 600,336 square metres. We have also provided assistance to mine victims and bereaved family members through the Special Act on the Support for

Mine Victims. Moreover, since 1993 my Government has also contributed more than \$40 million to relevant United Nations programmes for demining and victim assistance, including the United Nations Voluntary Trust Fund for Assistance in Mine Action and the International Trust Fund for Demining and Mine Victims Assistance. In addition, as a follow-up to our pledges at the 2021 Seoul-United Nations peacekeeping ministerial meeting, we plan to provide technical assistance, including demining courses and equipment support to other Member States. The Republic of Korea will continue to contribute to international efforts on mine clearance and victim assistance.

Turning now to the draft resolution on the Convention on Cluster Munitions, the Government of the Republic of Korea fully shares the concerns of the international community about the humanitarian impact of cluster munitions and supports its efforts to address the humanitarian problems arising from their use. However, due to the unique situation on the Korean peninsula, my Government is currently not a party to the Convention on Cluster Munitions and therefore abstained in the voting on that draft resolution.

My delegation would like to take this opportunity to share with Member States that in 2008 the Republic of Korea's Ministry of National Defence adopted a directive on cluster munitions that includes measures on the limited and responsible use of cluster munitions. According to the directive, only cluster munitions equipped with self-deactivation devices and with a failure rate of less than 1 per cent can be included in the acquisition plans. The directive also recommends developing alternatives for weapon systems to replace cluster munitions in the long term. While it is regrettable that we are unable to support the draft resolution at the moment, the Republic of Korea will continue its constructive efforts to mitigate the humanitarian problems associated with the use of cluster munitions.

**Ms. Narayanan** (India): With regard to draft resolution A/C.1/77/L.48, "Transparency in armaments", India believes that transparency is a necessary tool for confidence-building and for enhancing mutual trust among States. In order to secure the widest possible participation of States and contribute effectively to the process of confidence-building, measures to promote transparency in armaments should be mutually agreed on by all States. Measures to enhance transparency in armaments should also respect States' inherent right to self-defence, as enshrined in the Charter of the United

Nations. They should not restrict or prejudice States' legitimate right to acquire or produce arms for self-defence and in pursuit of their national security interests.

With respect to conventional weapons, India has supported the United Nations Register of Conventional Arms and has regularly submitted national reports to the Register. We have participated actively in the three-yearly reviews of the Register and support efforts to further improve it, along with efforts towards universalizing participation. We are pleased that the Group of Governmental Experts on the United Nations Register of Conventional Arms, chaired by India, adopted a consensus report this year. We encourage all States Members of the United Nations to participate in reporting their international transfers of conventional arms to the Register, which is a valuable voluntary transparency and confidence-building mechanism.

India also contributed to the work of the Group of Governmental Experts reviewing the standardized instrument for reporting military expenditures, conducted in 2011. India has regularly submitted its national reports to the United Nations Programme of Action to Prevent, Combat and Eradicate the Illicit Trade in Small Arms and Light Weapons in All Its Aspects, as well as the Convention on Certain Conventional Weapons and its Protocols. India has also been a member of the Wassenaar Arrangement since 2017.

**Ms. Kritikou** (Cyprus): I take the floor in explanation of our abstention in the voting on draft resolution A/C.1/77/L.68, entitled "Implementation of the Convention on Cluster Munitions".

Cyprus attaches great importance to the application of restrictions and prohibitions of weapons that are deemed excessively injurious or that may have indiscriminate effects. In that regard, Cyprus is a State party to all the protocols to the Convention on Certain Conventional Weapons. Furthermore, national policy and legislation is in full compliance with European Union standards and regulations. Cyprus signed the Convention on Cluster Munitions in 2009 and relevant legislation for its ratification was forwarded to Parliament in 2011. However, the ratification process is still ongoing owing to considerations related to the abnormal security situation in the island. We remain hopeful that those issues will be resolved, which would enable us to ratify the Convention and vote in favour of future iterations of draft resolution A/C.1/77/L.68.

**Mr. Sánchez Kiesslich** (Mexico) (*spoke in Spanish*): The Mexican delegation voted in favour of draft resolution A/C.1/77/L.39, entitled “The Arms Trade Treaty”. We wish to express our wholehearted support for the consolidation of the Arms Trade Treaty (ATT) regime, and we acknowledge the work of the chairpersonship, in which we have full confidence, with regard to the process of the ninth Conference of States Parties to the ATT. Mexico hoped that the text would have included an appeal to companies that produce and trade in arms to support the efforts of States to combat the diversion and illicit trafficking of arms, in accordance with the scope of the ATT. In the run-up to the ninth Conference of the States Parties to the ATT, Mexico will insist on affording such an appeal the prioritization it deserves.

**Mr. Timmins** (United States of America): The United States abstained in the voting on draft resolution A/C.1/77/L.40, entitled “Implementation of the Convention on the Prohibition of the Use, Stockpiling, Production and Transfer of Anti-Personnel Mines and on Their Destruction”. We consider the draft resolution to be applicable only to States parties to that Convention. However, as announced by President Biden in June, changes to the United States’ policy on anti-personnel landmines will align United States policy outside the Korean peninsula with the key requirements of the Ottawa Convention. Under that policy, the United States will not develop, produce or acquire anti-personnel landmines; it will not export or transfer anti-personnel landmines, except when necessary for activities related to mine destruction or removal and for the purpose of destruction; it will not use anti-personnel landmines outside the Korean peninsula; it will not assist, encourage or induce anyone outside the context of the Korean peninsula to engage in activity that would be prohibited by the Ottawa Convention; and it will undertake to destroy anti-personnel landmine stockpiles not required for the defence of the Korean peninsula.

The United States is also undertaking diligent efforts to pursue material and operational solutions to assist in adhering and ultimately acceding to the Ottawa Convention, while ensuring our ability to respond to contingencies and meet our alliance commitments. The United States is committed to mitigating the harmful consequences of landmines and explosive remnants of war around the world, including by supporting land clearance and medical rehabilitation and vocational

training for those injured by those weapons. We have provided more than \$4.7 billion in aid to support those efforts in more than 100 countries.

**Mr. Sarwani** (Pakistan): I take the floor in explanation of Pakistan’s vote on draft resolutions A/C.1/77/L.39, A/C.1/77/L.40 and A/C.1/77/L.68.

Pakistan has consistently supported the previous iterations of draft resolution A/C.1/77/L.39, entitled “The Arms Trade Treaty”, in line with our support for the adoption of the Treaty and as a demonstration of our solidarity with the States negatively affected by the unregulated and illicit trade in conventional arms, in particular small arms and light weapons. We voted in favour of the draft resolution this year as well.

Although we endorse the objectives embodied in the Treaty, we have also continued to draw attention to certain shortcomings, including its tilt in favour of exporting States, as underscored by the lack of an effective accountability mechanism and clear definitions. Our concerns on the omission of the issue of excessive production, which is an inseparable component of the entire chain of the international trade in conventional arms, continue to be justified. The trade and transfer aspect of conventional arms cannot be divorced from their production or political and commercial drivers. That omission continues to impact the Treaty’s effectiveness.

We wish to register our concerns on the clear gaps in the enforcement of the Treaty’s objectives. There is a pressing need for a deep examination of ongoing arms transfers and their serious impact, including the severe human suffering caused by the use of such weapons, in particular in territories under illegal occupation. Unless its central objectives are upheld and a responsive accountability mechanism evolves, the credibility of the Treaty will continue to erode. Unfortunately, the peoples of the countries and territories that suffer the most from the excessive availability of small arms and light weapons will be the worst affected. We hope that future iterations of the draft resolution will factor in and address some of the enforcement gaps that my delegation has highlighted.

My delegation abstained in the voting on draft resolution A/C.1/77/L.40, entitled “Implementation of the Convention on the Prohibition of the Use, Stockpiling, Production and Transfer of Anti-Personnel Mines and on Their Destruction”. Pakistan is a party to amended Protocol II of the Convention on Certain

Conventional Weapons, which regulates the use of landmines to protect civilians from their indiscriminate and lethal effects. There are no uncleared mines on Pakistan's territory, and we remain committed to ensuring that mines in our military inventory will never become a source of civilian casualties. Landmines continue to play a significant role in meeting the military needs of many States. Reliance on landmines is an integral part of Pakistan's defence in view of our security need to guard long borders that are not protected by any natural obstacle. As one of the largest troop-contributing countries to United Nations peacekeeping operations, Pakistan has successfully undertaken demining operations in various parts of the world. We stand ready to provide further assistance to advance global humanitarian demining efforts.

Lastly, my delegation also abstained in the voting on draft resolution A/C.1/77/L.68, entitled "Implementation of the Convention on Cluster Munitions". As a matter of principle, Pakistan does not support the conclusion of important international treaties — especially those related to arms control and disarmament, such as the Convention on Cluster Munitions — outside the United Nations framework. Pakistan considers the multilateral framework of the Convention on Certain Conventional Weapons (CCW) to be the most appropriate forum in which to address the issue of cluster munitions. The strength of the CCW lies in its legal framework, which strikes a delicate balance between the need to minimize human suffering and the need to avoid compromising the legitimate security interests of States. Pakistan supports international efforts to address the irresponsible and indiscriminate use of cluster munitions and condemns the use of cluster munitions against civilian populations and peoples under illegal occupation.

**Mr. Balouji** (Islamic Republic of Iran): I take the floor in explanation of vote on draft resolution A/C.1/77/L.40, entitled "Implementation of the Convention on the Prohibition of the Use, Stockpiling, Production and Transfer of Anti-Personnel Mines and on Their Destruction".

Anti-personnel mines have been used irresponsibly during civil wars in a number of regions of the world and consequently have claimed a great number of innocent lives, particularly among women and children. We welcome every effort to stop that trend. However, the Anti-Personnel Mine Ban Convention focuses mainly on humanitarian concerns and does not adequately take into account the legitimate military requirements

of many countries — particularly those with long land borders — for the responsible and limited use of mines to defend their territories. Because of the difficulties related to monitoring extensive sensitive areas by means of established and permanent guarding posts or effective warning systems, it is unfortunate that anti-personnel mines continue to be an effective means for those countries to ensure the minimum security requirements of their borders. While those defensive devices should be used strictly in accordance with established rules to protect civilians, more national and international efforts should also be made to explore new alternatives to the use of such mines. My delegation appreciates the objective of draft resolution A/C.1/77/L.40. However, owing to our particular concerns and considerations, we abstained in the voting on the draft resolution.

With regard to draft resolution A/C.1/77/L.41, entitled "Countering the threat posed by improvised explosive devices", Iran supports the measures to counter the threat posed by the use of improvised explosive devices (IEDs) by illegal armed groups and terrorists. For that reason, my delegation joined the consensus in adopting draft resolution A/C.1/77/L.41. In our view, preventing and combating the use of IEDs by terrorists and illegal armed groups is the exclusive purpose of that draft resolution. Therefore, any interpretation of its provisions should be consistent with that purpose. Moreover, since it is almost impossible to define the scope of the items used in manufacturing IEDs, many of which have civilian applications, any interpretation beyond the exclusive purpose of draft resolution A/C.1/77/L.41 that could restrict the free access to and trade in such equipment and goods for civilian uses is unacceptable.

With regard to draft resolution A/C.1/77/L.68, entitled "Implementation of the Convention on Cluster Munitions", my delegation abstained in the voting for the following reasons. First, my delegation did not participate in the negotiation of that Convention and is neither a signatory nor a party thereto. Secondly, we cannot support an instrument negotiated outside the United Nations that disregards the security concerns and interests of many States. As a general principle, we believe that negotiations on disarmament subjects, which, owing to their nature, address vital issues such as States' security concerns and interests, require not only a balanced and comprehensive approach but also a progressive, transparent and all-inclusive process that incorporates consensual decision-making procedures. That is essential in order to ensure the right of each State to security and



to ensure that no individual State or group of States may obtain advantages over others at any stage, as stressed in the final document of the tenth special session of the General Assembly. We continue to share the view of many delegations that the Convention on Cluster Munitions was negotiated and concluded in an exclusive process outside the United Nations disarmament machinery in disregard of the interests of many States. Therefore, circumventing the United Nations disarmament machinery should not be allowed, and such a process should not be encouraged or promoted by the General Assembly.

**The Chair:** A delegation has asked to speak in exercise of the right of reply.

I now call on the representative of the Syrian Arab Republic.

**Ms. Mustafa** (Syrian Arab Republic) (*spoke in Arabic*): My country's delegation takes the floor in exercise of the right of reply in response to the statements made by a number of countries in explanation of vote after the voting on the resolutions adopted under cluster 2.

It is ironic that we listened to the representative of Israel, the occupying Power, lecturing the General Assembly about abiding by international conventions. That was a truly ridiculous and ironic scene. Would it not be better for his country to join those conventions that he is calling others to abide by, and to destroy its nuclear, chemical and biological arsenals? The representative of the Israeli entity failed in his futile attempt to cover up his entity's huge arsenals of all kinds of weapons of mass destruction, while refusing to subject any of them to international oversight. That representative also failed to cover up his entity's continuous violations of international legitimacy and United Nations resolutions through the commission of endless crimes against our people in the occupied Syrian Golan. It occupies others' territories, has for decades rejected the implementation of the relevant Security Council resolutions and provides all forms of support to armed terrorist groups, including the Al-Nusrah Front and Da'esh terrorist organization. That scene is enough to show the true hypocrisy and malicious arrogance of Israel, as well as the inability of its representatives to earn the least bit of credibility.

My country's delegation categorically rejects all the accusations made by the representative of the United States of America. We would like to note that the reports on which he based his allegations lack credibility. Those teams that he mentioned applied erroneous methods, and their results cannot be accepted. That is why the Security

Council rejected the Joint Investigative Mechanism and terminated its mandate in 2017, in addition to the so-called Investigation and Identification Team, whose establishment exceeds the mandate set forth in the Chemical Weapons Convention. As a permanent member of the Security Council, the United States should set an example for other countries in fulfilling its international commitments and in fact should destroy its arsenal of chemical weapons before requesting others to do so.

My country's delegation also rejects the allegations made by the representative of Türkiye. In that connection, I would like to mention several messages addressed from my country's delegation to the Security Council Committee established pursuant to resolution 1540 (2004) and the Technical Secretariat of the Organization for the Prohibition of Chemical Weapons, which included information on the efforts of terrorists of Da'esh and the Al-Nusrah Front, along with their affiliated entities, to obtain chemical weapons and other chemical toxic materials to use against the Syrians, such as the fabrication of events involving chemical attacks for the purpose of accusing the Arab Syrian Army of launching them. They also included information about the Al-Nusrah Front/Hayat Tahrir Al-Sham obtaining chemical toxic material and modified missiles to transport them in the governorate of Idlib, in coordination with Turkish forces.

I also would like to refer to the reports of the United Nations, including the Security Council Analytical Support and Sanctions Monitoring Team, which noted that tens of thousands of foreign terrorist fighters had arrived in my country, Syria, through Türkiye. They did not come to Syria by parachute. They crossed the Syrian-Turkish borders, supervised and facilitated by Türkiye, which must meet its obligations pursuant to resolution 1540 (2004). It must stop transferring chemical materials to terrorists, abide by international laws, respect the Charter of the United Nations, withdraw its forces from Syrian territories and stop using water as a tool of war against Syrians.

In conclusion, we have listened to several delegations referring to my country with the term "regime". That arrogant behaviour reflects their aggressive, fierce and systematic approach towards my country over 10 decades, until today. It is strange that, for 10 decades, those countries have not understood that their aggressive policies and plans towards my country have failed. The representatives of those delegations should learn the principles of politics and diplomatic courtesy when addressing other delegations.

**Mr. Vorontsov** (Russian Federation) (*spoke in Russian*): The Russian Federation rejects any accusation in connection with our country's conduct of the special military operation in Ukraine as unfounded. The special operation is being carried out in full compliance with international law, including international humanitarian law.

Moreover, we wish to respond to the brazen attempts by a group of NATO countries, led by the United States and its allies, to accuse the Russian Federation of involvement in the use of nerve agents. Such attempts seem particularly cynical, given the fact that those Western countries themselves refuse to fulfil their international legal obligations under both the Chemical Weapons Convention (CWC) and the European Convention on Mutual Assistance in Criminal Matters. We categorically reject those unfounded insinuations. We are determined to establish the truth about such incidents and will continue to demand that the British and German authorities provide comprehensive answers to all the questions that we raised in that regard.

It is not surprising that the United Kingdom, the United States and France, whose outcries about Russian disinformation are the loudest, twice committed acts of aggression against Syria, in 2017 and in 2018, under false pretences. The targets of those missile strikes were allegedly some military chemical facilities in Damascus. I would like to ask when the notification to the Organization for the Prohibition of Chemical Weapons regarding those facilities is planned, or if the five years that have passed since 2017 are not sufficient for them. Do they think that, in that time, everyone has already forgotten everything and they will get away with their lies?

Unlike that group of countries, Russia shares the available facts about possible violations of the CWC and impending provocations with the use of toxic substances.

In our view, the so-called fighters against impunity would be well advised to demonstrate their lofty ideals in practice. For example, why not fight against United States impunity for the assassination of Qasem Soleimani, a high-ranking official of a State Member of the United Nations, during a diplomatic visit to another State Member of the United Nations? The question is of course rhetorical. The only fight of which the European Union countries and other United States allies are capable is fighting for Washington's impunity in the context of its illegal actions.

All Russia's actions in outer space are carried out in strict compliance with international law, including the 1967 Outer Space Treaty, and are not confrontational in nature. Unlike Washington, Russia did not enshrine the objective

of achieving military superiority in space in its doctrinal documents. On the contrary, since the very beginning of the exploration of outer space, we have maintained a consistent position in support of the prevention of an arms race in outer space and the preservation of outer space for peaceful purposes.

In that regard, we believe that it is necessary to begin negotiations on an international legally binding instrument on the prevention of an arms race in outer space as soon as possible. There is a basis for such work: the Russian-Chinese 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. The treaty that we propose could include a ban on the deployment of any type of weapon in outer space, as well as the threat or use of force in, from or against outer space.

We are aware of the Western States' criticism of that initiative. However, during this session, the overwhelming majority of States reaffirmed that an approach based on a legally binding agreement was a priority. We propose that, together, we consider agreeing on the definition of weapons in outer space and developing verification mechanisms for a future treaty. To date, the international community has not seen any alternative proposals from those who criticize the Russian-Chinese proposal. We call on Western countries not to torpedo the process, but to join the constructive efforts of other States to preserve outer space as an area for peaceful cooperation.

**The Chair:** We have exhausted the time available to us this afternoon. The next meeting of the Committee will be held tomorrow, Wednesday, 2 November, at 10 a.m. in this conference room. We will continue to hear statements in explanation of vote after the voting on clusters 3 and 4 and take action on the remaining draft resolutions and draft decisions contained in informal paper 2, Rev.3. At the end of the day, we will try and accommodate the rights of reply.

I now give the floor to the representative of the United States of America on a point of order.

**Mr. Turner** (United States of America): I would like to make my right of reply first thing tomorrow morning, as part of the discussion that just took place.

**The Chair:** We would love to hear the representative of the United States of America, but, at the same time, we decided that we would take those rights of reply tomorrow at the end of the day. I therefore ask that he bear with us because we are running against time. I thank him for his understanding.

*The meeting rose at 6.10 p.m.*