



General Assembly

Seventy-eighth session

First Committee

28th meeting

Wednesday, 1 November 2023, 10 a.m.
New York

Official Records

Chair: Mr.Paulauskas (Lithuania)

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

Agenda items 90 to 106 (continued)

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

The Chair: We will be guided by the same procedure agreed upon at our meeting on 27 October (see A/C.1/78/PV.25). We will begin by listening to delegations who wish to speak in explanation of position or vote before action is taken on the draft proposals under cluster 4, “Conventional weapons”, as provided in informal paper No.2/Rev.3. Immediately thereafter, the Committee will take action on the draft resolutions and decisions under cluster 4.

The Secretariat has informed me that the statement on the financial implications of draft resolution A/C.1/78/L.41 has been issued and uploaded to the edeleGATE portal. Accordingly, action on the draft resolution will be taken today under cluster 4.

Mr. Belousov (Russian Federation) (*spoke in Russian*): My delegation takes the floor in explanation of vote with regard to the Russian Federation’s position on draft resolution A/C.1/78/L.56, on lethal autonomous weapons systems.

Russia will vote against the draft resolution, its sixth and seventh preambular paragraphs and paragraphs 3 and 4, and will abstain in the voting on the other paragraphs put to the vote. We believe that the document is aimed at undermining the activities within the Group of Governmental Experts on Emerging

Technologies in the Area of Lethal Autonomous Weapons System (LAWS) established within the framework of the Inhumane Weapons Convention, also known as the Convention on Certain Conventional Weapons, which has been successfully operating and adopting substantive reports, including this year. We believe that the Group of Governmental Experts is the only and best forum for discussing all issues concerning lethal autonomous weapons systems. That understanding has been reaffirmed in the 11 guiding principles on LAWS, which were adopted by consensus, as well as the outcome document of the sixth Review Conference of the Convention on Certain Conventional Weapons, held in Geneva in December 2021.

The language in the draft resolution clearly indicates the intention to move the discussion on the topic of LAWS to the United Nations. We emphasize that it would be counterproductive to shift the subject of LAWS to any other international forum, including the United Nations. We note that all the key States involved in active scientific research and practical activities in the area are participating in the work of the Group of Governmental Experts. The forum effectively strikes a reasonable balance between humanitarian concerns and the legitimate defence interests of countries with regard to those weapons systems. We believe that it is necessary to continue work in that forum, based on the discussion mandate of the Group, the agreed agenda and the principle of consensus. We note that the draft resolution is one-sidedly and unjustifiably focused on the exceptional risks and challenges posed by lethal autonomous weapons systems. At previous sessions of the Group of Governmental Experts on LAWS, a number

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



of presentations using concrete examples convincingly showed that such weapons play an important role in addressing the challenges related to, inter alia, defence, combating terrorist threats and mines.

We believe that lethal autonomous weapons systems can demonstrate greater efficiency than human operators in carrying out the tasks at hand by reducing the likelihood of error. In addition to their technological advantages, such weapons reduce the risks associated with the human factor. However, that understanding is not reflected in the draft resolution. We also note the draft resolution's undue focus on the role of human rights and ethical aspects in relation to lethal autonomous weapons systems. There is no reason to assert that the principles of humanity, the demands of public conscience, as well as the human rights component, could be regarded as the absolute and sole condition for the imposition of restrictively prohibitive regimes on specific types of weapons. We believe that international law, including international humanitarian law, fully applies to LAWS and does not need to be updated because of, or adapted to, the specific nature of such weapons. We oppose the establishment of any international legally binding instrument on lethal autonomous systems and the imposition of a moratorium on the development and use of such systems and the technologies used to create them. Our position is unequivocal: it is unacceptable to dilute the activities of the Group of Governmental Experts within the framework of the Convention on Certain Conventional Weapons. The draft resolution will not contribute to unifying the international community but will only lead to dividing the discussion on one of the key issues on the arms control, disarmament and non-proliferation agenda. We are prepared to consider further modalities for applying existing international legal restrictions and the norms of international humanitarian law to those means within the framework of the specialized Group of Governmental Experts on the basis of the Convention on Certain Conventional Weapons. Addressing concerns about so-called lethal autonomous weapons systems lies in ensuring the faithful implementation of existing obligations.

Mr. García Moré (Cuba) (*spoke in Spanish*): The Cuban delegation will abstain in the voting on draft resolutions A/C.1/78/L.39, "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.1/78/L.42, "The Arms Trade Treaty".

With regard to draft resolution A/C.1/78/L.39, we reiterate that, as long as the more than 60-year policy of hostility and aggression of the United States continues to be implemented against Cuba, our country cannot abandon the 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 the use of mines, booby traps and other devices and strictly complies with the prohibitions and restrictions on the use of mines established by those instruments. We reaffirm our commitment to the implementation of a strict policy aimed at guaranteeing the responsible use of anti-personnel mines, with an exclusively defensive character in line with Cuba's national security needs. We fully share the legitimate humanitarian concerns related to the indiscriminate and irresponsible use of anti-personnel mines. We support all legitimate efforts that, while maintaining the necessary balance between humanitarian and national security issues related to the possession and use of mines, are aimed at eliminating the terrible effects resulting from the indiscriminate and responsible use of anti-personnel mines on the civilian population and many countries' economies.

With regard to draft resolution A/C.1/78/L.42, we recall that the Arms Trade Treaty (ATT) was adopted through a premature vote when the negotiations had not yet been concluded and is not based on an international consensus. The ATT is an unbalanced treaty that favours arms-exporting States. The parameters it established for those States to evaluate and decide on the approval and denial of arms 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 arms transfers to unauthorized non-State actors, thereby ultimately legitimizing such transfers, in spite of the fact that such transfers are the primary source of illicit arms trafficking. A treaty cannot be effective if it is riddled with ambiguities, inconsistencies, vagueness and loopholes that undermine its effectiveness. We also reject attempts to establish synergies between the Treaty and other instruments that are not universally accepted and have differing legal natures, membership,

scope and categorizations for regulated weapons. Our delegation disassociates itself from all the paragraphs that refer to the ATT contained in the various draft resolutions on which the First Committee will take action.

Ms. Quintero Correa (Colombia) (*spoke in Spanish*): This is not an explanation of position or vote but a general statement — is it possible to make one?

The Chair: We are hearing explanations of position or vote before action is taken on draft proposals under cluster 4. My intent would therefore be to hear how Member States would like to explain their position or vote — and not to hear a general statement.

Ms. Quintero Correa (Colombia) (*spoke in Spanish*): Excuse me, Mr. Chair, may I or may I not make my statement? I do not understand. Can I make my statement? When we concluded yesterday's meeting (see A/C.1/78/PV.27), it was not very clear to me whether we would be continuing today with explanations of vote or with general statements. I would therefore like to know if I could make my statement, because Colombia is a co-sponsor of two draft resolutions under this cluster.

The Chair: I think that, as of yesterday, we concluded with general statements. We basically had only 25 minutes left, and because we were not in agreement on how to proceed with the explanation of votes, I adjourned the meeting as such. I therefore consider that we concluded the time for the general statements and the introduction of draft resolutions yesterday. That is my conclusion.

Ms. Quintero Correa (Colombia): So — no? Does that mean no or yes? I apologize, I must be too late.

The Chair: That is exactly what I mean — this puts me in a rather uncomfortable position because the representative of Colombia missed the opportunity to make her statement yesterday. But I will make an exception for her to do that today, for five minutes.

Ms. Quintero Correa (Colombia) (*spoke in Spanish*): I thank you very much, Mr. Chair, you are very kind.

The Chair: I now call on the representative of the Russian Federation on a point of order.

Mr. Belousov (Russian Federation) (*spoke in Russian*): I would like to raise a point of order. In view of the situation that has arisen, first of all, Mr. Chair, our delegation respects your opinion with regard to giving

the floor to the representative of Colombia to make a general statement. However, we believe that you should have consulted with the delegations first on changing the order of our work. As a matter of principle, we are prepared to make an exception and agree to allow the representative of Colombia to take the floor. But I would ask you, next time, Mr. Chair, to consult the delegations ahead of time before taking such decisions.

The Chair: I thank the Russian delegation for the flexibility it has shown. Yes, I usually I do consult with the Committee on such issues, and I sense that the Committee is in line with my decision to make an exception for the representative of Colombia to make a general statement during the explanations of position or vote.

Ms. Quintero Correa (Colombia) (*spoke in Spanish*): I reiterate my thanks to the Chair and to all the delegations.

Colombia, as one of the sponsors, along with Japan and South Africa, of draft resolution A/C.1/78/L.40, “The illicit trade in small arms and light weapons in all its aspects”, thanks Japan for introducing the draft resolution and for its leadership. The illicit trade in small arms and light weapons and their ammunition, the accumulation of their stockpiles in surplus and their diversion to unauthorized recipients continue to be a cause for concern and threat to global peace, security, sustainable development and stability. That is because those activities intensify conflicts and prolong them, amplifying their humanitarian and socioeconomic effects and their linkage with violence, including gender-based violence, organized crime and other crimes. Looking at the scope of that problem, we can see that it is the result of both national realities and regional and global trends and variables, which is why it is essential to strengthen the coordination of actions at each of those levels. The draft resolution seeks to continue strengthening collective efforts and international cooperation in combating that scourge, to which no country is immune. Colombia encourages all delegations to once again adopt draft resolution A/C.1/78/L.40 by consensus.

Colombia, as one of the sponsors, together with Germany and Cambodia, of draft resolution A/C.1/78/L.39, “Implementation of the Convention on the Prohibition of the Use, Stockpiling, Production and Transfer of Anti-Personnel Mines and on Their Destruction” thanks Germany for introducing the draft

resolution. We are aware of the impact that antipersonnel mines have on people's lives, on communities and on sustainable development. Twenty-five years after its opening for signature in December 1997, the Convention continues to face challenges, and it is imperative that we to continue our joint efforts to achieve the collective goal of a world free of anti-personnel mines. We encourage all States to continue to support the draft resolution and to co-sponsor it this year. We recall that the goal of the United Nations Programme of Action to Prevent, Combat and Eradicate the Illicit Trade in Small Arms and Light Weapons in All Its Aspects, as well as the Anti-Personnel Landmines Convention, is to save lives.

Mr. Sher (India): India will abstain in the voting on draft resolution A/C.1/78/L.39. My country supports the vision of a world free of anti-personnel landmines and is committed to their eventual elimination. We also highlight the availability of militarily effective alternative technologies that can perform cost-effectively. The legitimate defensive role of anti-personnel landmines will facilitate the goal of the complete elimination of anti-personnel mines.

India is a high contracting party to the Amended Protocol II of the Convention on 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 the Amended Protocol II, including, *inter alia*, 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 the 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 Meeting of States Parties to the Convention on the Prohibition of the Use, Stockpiling, Production and Transfer of Anti-Personnel Mines and on Their Destruction.

With regard to draft resolution A/C.1/78/L.42, "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 on 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.1/78/L.42.

Mr. Ghourbanpour (Islamic Republic of Iran): I take the floor to explain my delegation's vote regarding draft resolution A/C.1/78/L.41, entitled "Through-life conventional ammunition management". In that regard, while my delegation will vote in favour of the draft resolution, I would like to emphasize our reservations and observations as follows.

First, our position as expressed during the final meeting of the open-ended working group (OWEG) on conventional ammunition on 9 June 2023 remains valid, as both the Global Framework for Through-life Conventional Ammunition Management and the procedural report of the OEWG (see A/78/111) have explicitly stated that all conclusions, recommendations and suggested actions within that framework are entirely voluntary and subject to the discretion of member States. Therefore, it is crucial to underline that the document and all its provisions are purely voluntary and do not entail any binding obligations.

Secondly, considering the voluntary and non-binding nature of that outcome document, my delegation wishes to reiterate our agreement with only those non-contentious provisions that align with our country's domestic policies, laws, regulations, priorities and values.

Thirdly, it is worth noting that the standard language typically used when considering any document submitted by the subordinate organs of the General Assembly is endorsement rather than adoption. Therefore, the use of the term "adopt" in paragraph 2 of A/C.1/78/L.42 should not be construed in any way to alter the status of the document approved by the General Assembly.

My delegation will also abstain in the voting on draft resolution A/C.1/78/L.56, “Lethal autonomous weapons systems”, for the following reasons.

First, the definition and scope of the terminology “lethal autonomous weapons” in the draft resolution are not clearly defined.

Secondly, while we are committed to addressing each topic and issue in its appropriate specialized forum, we believe it is inappropriate to include the issue of human rights, although we support human rights in principle as referred to in the sixth preambular paragraph of the draft resolution. That position applies to all similar issues in all First Committee documents.

Thirdly, regarding the seventh preambular paragraph, we do not support referencing an event that intentionally excludes certain member States from participation. Furthermore, including acknowledgements of regional events in a global document is not factually consistent.

Lastly, similarly, we believe that the Group of Governmental Experts operating under the scope of the Convention on Certain Conventional Weapons should focus on member States of the Convention. Attempting to broaden its reach beyond its limited scope is inconsistent with the necessary multilateral diplomacy standards.

Ms. Storsve (United States of America): We are pleased to support draft resolution A/C.1/78/L.41, “Through-life conventional ammunition management”. The draft resolution adopts the final report of the open-ended working group on ammunition, which includes the Global Framework for Through-life Conventional Ammunition Management. Among other things, the Global Framework recognizes the important role of international cooperation among States and other relevant stakeholders on through-life conventional ammunition management.

Cooperation in the oversight of commercial sales is an important tool to help mitigate post-transfer diversion risk for conventional ammunition, including through end-use monitoring, based on end-user certificates and functionally equivalent documents, established by national regulatory authorities, where an originating State has determined which end user and end-use restrictions apply to the sale.

As the rationale for objective 9 explains, end-user certification is based on the originating State’s

risk assessment and determination of appropriate restrictions. It is not limited to areas of joint concern with a receiving State or dependent on a receiving State’s assent.

Regarding draft resolution A/C.1/78/L.56, “Lethal autonomous weapons systems”, although we believe that there are aspects of the draft resolution that could be further refined, the United States is pleased to support the draft resolution. We recognize the contribution that the Secretary-General’s report could make to the work of the Group of Governmental Experts (GGE) on Emerging Technologies in the Area of Lethal Autonomous Weapons Systems under the Convention on Certain Conventional Weapons (CCW).

The report should be balanced and inclusive of the views of all States Members of the United Nations and take a pragmatic perspective on opportunities for progress by consensus. We also welcome the opportunity for civil society to provide its views to the Secretary-General.

The CCW is a uniquely appropriate forum for multilateral discussion on lethal autonomous weapons systems (LAWS), because it benefits from contributions by diplomatic, military, legal, technical and policy experts from all interested States, as well as civil society. That expertise has resulted in a significant body of work, including consensus on guiding principles, and the GGE continues to provide the best opportunity to advance international efforts on LAWS. The United States does not support the creation of a parallel process on LAWS or any other efforts that would seek to undermine the centrality of the CCW Group of Governmental Experts in making progress on that issue.

Over the past two years, more than 15 substantive proposals have been submitted by delegations to the GGE, ranging from legally binding instruments to non-binding instruments to working papers. While the United States believes that the time is not right to begin negotiating a legally binding instrument on LAWS, we have supported mandates that allow for the consideration of all proposals and have encouraged constructive engagement on all proposals.

In our view, the draft articles on autonomous weapons systems, submitted to the Convention’s GGE in March of this year by the United States, along with Australia, Canada, Japan, Poland, the Republic of Korea and the United Kingdom, remain the best

vehicle for progress on the issue. This proposal focuses on clarifying how international humanitarian law principles and rules apply with respect to autonomous weapons systems and on articulating measures to effectively implement international humanitarian law. That is work that must be done before a legally binding instrument could be responsibly negotiated.

We look forward to working with the CCW High Contracting Parties at the annual meeting to be held in Geneva next month to reach consensus on a strong mandate for the Group of Governmental Experts in 2024, which will allow its participants to continue making substantive progress.

Mr. Hegaz (Egypt): I take the floor to explain my delegation's vote before the voting on draft resolutions A/C.1/78/L.39, A/C.1/78/L.42 and A/C.1/78/L.20.

On the draft resolution contained in document A/C.1/78/L.39, "Implementation of the Convention on the Prohibition of the Use, Stockpiling, Production and Transfer of Anti-Personnel Mines and on Their Destruction", Egypt has expressed its reservations on several occasions about the imbalanced nature of that instrument, which was developed and concluded outside the framework of the United Nations. Mindful of the humanitarian considerations associated with landmines, Egypt imposed a moratorium on its capacity to produce and/or export land mines since the 1980s, long before the conclusion of the Convention. We believe that the Convention lacks balance between the humanitarian concerns related to anti-personnel landmines and their possible legitimate military uses, especially in countries with long borders that face extraordinary security challenges.

Furthermore, the Convention does not establish any legal obligation on States to remove the anti-personnel mines they placed on the territory of other States, making it almost impossible for many States to meet demining requirements on their own. That is particularly true in the case of Egypt, which is one of the most affected countries, as it still has millions of landmines that were placed on its territory during the Second World War. For those reasons, Egypt will abstain in the voting on draft resolution A/C.1/78/L.39.

With regard to draft resolution A/C.1/78/L.42, "The Arms Trade Treaty", and the references to that Arms Trade Treaty (ATT) and other proposals presented to the First Committee, Egypt has always been and continues to be at the forefront of any genuine effort

aimed at combating the illicit trafficking in arms and at eradicating any arms transfers to terrorist and illegal armed groups. We also actively and constructively participated in the negotiations leading to the adoption of the ATT. Nevertheless, motivations related to the desire of some States to manipulate and politicize a legitimate arms trade led to several shortcomings and loopholes in the Treaty, especially its deliberate lack of several necessary definitions and clear criteria, making the implementation of the Treaty selective and subjective and allowing the 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 terrorist and illegal armed groups, which represents the real main threat in that domain. Therefore, my delegation will continue to abstain in the voting on draft resolution A/C.1/78/L.39, as well as on the paragraphs that refer to the Treaty in draft resolutions A/C.1/78/L.40 and A/C.1/78/L.61.

On draft resolution A/C.1/78/L.20, "Implementation of the Convention on Cluster Munitions", Egypt will abstain in the voting on the draft resolution in the light of the selective and imbalanced nature of that instrument, which was developed and concluded outside the framework of the United Nations and which also lacks an equitable and clear definition of cluster munitions in a manner that was deliberately designed to fit the specific production requirements of some States.

The Chair: The Committee will now proceed to take action on draft resolution A/C.1/78/L.20, 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.1/78/L.20 was submitted on 6 October by the representative of Iraq on behalf of States members of the Coordination Committee of the Convention on Cluster Munitions. The sponsors of the draft resolution are contained in document A/C.1/78/L.20.

The Chair: A recorded vote has been requested.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour:

Albania, Algeria, Andorra, Angola, Armenia, Australia, Austria, Azerbaijan, Bahamas, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belgium, Belize, Benin,

Bhutan, Bolivia (Plurinational State of), Bosnia and Herzegovina, Botswana, Brunei Darussalam, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Burundi, Cabo Verde, Cameroon, Canada, 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, France, Gabon, Germany, Ghana, Guatemala, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Honduras, Hungary, Iceland, Indonesia, Iraq, Ireland, Italy, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Kazakhstan, Kenya, 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 (Kingdom of the), New Zealand, Nicaragua, 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, South Sudan, 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.1/78/L.20 was adopted by 139 votes to 1, with 35 abstentions.

[Subsequently, the delegations of the Gambia and Haiti informed the Secretariat that they had

intended to vote in favour; the delegation of the Niger informed the Secretariat that it had intended to abstain.]

The Chair: The Committee will now proceed to take action on draft resolution A/C.1/78/L.39, 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. Elliott (Secretary of the Committee): Draft resolution A/C.1/78/L.39 was submitted on 10 October by the representatives of Germany, Cambodia and Colombia. The sponsors of the draft resolution are contained in document A/C.1/78/L.39. The additional sponsors are listed on the e-deleGATE portal of the First Committee.

The Chair: A recorded vote has been requested.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour:

Albania, Algeria, Andorra, Angola, Argentina, Armenia, Australia, Austria, 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, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Croatia, Cyprus, Czechia, Denmark, Djibouti, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, El Salvador, Equatorial Guinea, Eritrea, Estonia, Eswatini, Ethiopia, Finland, France, Gabon, Georgia, Germany, Ghana, Greece, Guatemala, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Honduras, Hungary, Iceland, Indonesia, Iraq, Ireland, Italy, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Kazakhstan, Kenya, 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 (Kingdom of the), New Zealand, Nicaragua, 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, South Sudan, Spain, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Sweden, Switzerland, Tajikistan, Thailand, Timor-Leste, Togo, Tonga, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Türkiye, Turkmenistan, Uganda, Ukraine, United Arab Emirates, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United Republic of Tanzania, Uruguay, Vanuatu, Yemen, Zambia, Zimbabwe

Against:

Russian Federation

Abstaining:

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

Draft resolution A/C.1/78/L.39 was adopted by 161 votes to 1, with 16 abstentions.

The Chair: The Committee will now proceed to take action on draft resolution A/C.1/78/L.40, 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.1/78/L.40 was submitted on 10 October by the representative of Japan, also on behalf of Colombia and South Africa. The sponsors of the draft resolution are contained in document A/C.1/78/L.40. The additional sponsors are listed on the e-deleGATE portal of the First Committee. Burundi, the Congo, Guinea and Uganda have also become sponsors of the draft resolution.

The Chair: Separate votes have been requested on the twenty-second and twenty-fourth preambular paragraphs of draft resolution A/C.1/78/L.40. I shall therefore first put those paragraphs to the vote, one by one.

I shall first put to the vote the twenty-second preambular paragraph.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour:

Albania, Algeria, Andorra, Angola, Argentina, Australia, Austria, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belgium, Belize, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Burundi, Cambodia, Cameroon, Canada, Central African Republic, Chad, Chile, China, Colombia, Congo, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Croatia, Cyprus, Czechia, Denmark, Djibouti, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, El Salvador, Eritrea, Estonia, Eswatini, Ethiopia, Finland, France, Gabon, Georgia, Germany, Ghana, Greece, Guatemala, Guinea, Guyana, Honduras, Hungary, Iceland, Iraq, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Kazakhstan, Kenya, Kuwait, 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 (Kingdom of the), New Zealand, Nigeria, North Macedonia, Norway, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Qatar, Republic of Korea, Republic of Moldova, Romania, Rwanda, Saint Kitts and Nevis, Saint Lucia, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, Samoa, San Marino, Senegal, Serbia, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Slovakia, Slovenia, South Africa, South Sudan, Spain, Suriname, Sweden, Switzerland, Thailand, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Türkiye, Uganda, Ukraine, United Arab Emirates, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United Republic of Tanzania, United States of America, Uruguay, Zambia, Zimbabwe

Against:

None

Abstaining:

Armenia, Belarus, Bhutan, Bolivia (Plurinational State of), Cuba, Egypt, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Nicaragua, Russian Federation, Saudi Arabia, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Syrian Arab Republic, Tajikistan, Timor-Leste, Yemen

The twenty-second preambular paragraph was retained by 143 votes to none, with 18 abstentions.

The Chair: I shall now put to the vote the twenty-fourth preambular paragraph.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour:

Albania, Andorra, Angola, Argentina, Armenia, Australia, Austria, Bahamas, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belgium, Belize, Bolivia (Plurinational State of), Bosnia and Herzegovina, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Burundi, Cambodia, Cameroon, Canada, Central African Republic, Chad, Chile, China, Colombia, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Croatia, Cuba, Cyprus, Czechia, Denmark, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, El Salvador, Eritrea, Estonia, Eswatini, Ethiopia, Finland, France, Georgia, Germany, Ghana, Greece, Guatemala, Guinea, Guyana, Honduras, Hungary, Iceland, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Ireland, Israel, Italy, Jamaica, Japan, Kazakhstan, Kenya, 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 (Kingdom of the), New Zealand, Nicaragua, 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, South Sudan, Spain, Sri Lanka, Suriname, Sweden, Switzerland, Thailand, Timor-Leste, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Türkiye, Uganda, Ukraine, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United Republic of Tanzania, United States of America, Uruguay, Viet Nam, Zambia, Zimbabwe

Against:

None

Abstaining:

Algeria, Bahrain, Belarus, Bhutan, Comoros, Congo, Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Djibouti, Egypt, Iraq, Jordan, Kuwait, Lebanon, Libya, Mauritania, Morocco, Oman, Qatar, Russian Federation, Saudi Arabia, Somalia, Sudan, Syrian Arab Republic, Tunisia, United Arab Emirates, Yemen

The twenty-fourth preambular paragraph was retained by 138 votes to none, with 26 abstentions.

The Chair: The sponsors of draft resolution A/C.1/78/L.40 have expressed the wish that the draft resolution be adopted by the Committee without a vote. If I hear no objection, I will take it that the Committee wishes to act accordingly.

Draft resolution A/C.1/78/L.40 was adopted.

The Chair: The Committee will now proceed to take action on draft resolution A/C.1/78/L.41, entitled "Through-life conventional ammunition management".

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

Ms. Elliot (Secretary of the Committee): Draft resolution A/C.1/78/L.41 was submitted by the representatives of Germany and France on 10 October. The sponsors of the draft resolution are listed in document A/C.1/78/L.41.

The present oral statement is made in the context of rule 153 of the rules of procedure of the General Assembly. The present statement has also been distributed to Member States.

Under the terms of paragraphs 6 to 12 and 18 of the draft resolution, the General Assembly would

"Request the Secretary-General to implement the new mandates assigned to the Secretariat in the Global Framework as contained in section IV, paragraphs 22 and 26, and section V, paragraphs 29, 34 and 37, thereof, and to strengthen the SaferGuard programme to implement the assigned mandates as contained in section IV, paragraph 23 and in section V, paragraph 36, thereof and to present the respective budgetary requirements in his next proposed programme budget;

"Decide to convene a meeting of States in 2027 for two weeks (20 meetings), in New York, to review the implementation of the Global Framework, in line with section V, paragraph 31, thereof, with the participation, as observers, of relevant international and regional organizations and other relevant stakeholders, including non-governmental organizations and civil society, academia, research institutions and industry, and further decides that the Chair may hold informal consultations ahead of the Meeting of States;

“Also decide to convene a preparatory meeting of States in 2025 for five days (10 meetings), in New York, to explore possible options for the development of the process and modalities for the effective implementation of the Global Framework and to prepare for the Meeting of States in 2027, with the participation, as observers, of relevant international and regional organizations and other relevant stakeholders, including non-governmental organizations and civil society, academia, research institutions and industry;

“Request the Secretary-General to provide the support necessary to convene the preparatory meeting of States and the Meeting of States;

“Encourage States to provide voluntary information, in line with section V, paragraphs 30 and 34 of the Global Framework, on steps taken to implement the Global Framework, and requests the Secretary-General to receive and circulate such information;

“Decide to establish a new standing dedicated fellowship training programme on through-life conventional ammunition management in order to strengthen the technical and practical knowledge and expertise of government officials directly responsible for the implementation of the Global Framework for Through-life Conventional Ammunition Management, particularly in developing countries, to be substantively developed and designed in 2025 and implemented annually starting in 2026 for duration of four weeks in person in four regions, respectively, preceded by a preparatory self-paced online course, with the participation of 15 fellows from each of the four regions, Africa, Asia Pacific, Latin America and the Caribbean and other regions, ensuring the full, equal, meaningful and effective participation of women and equitable geographic representation, and requests the Secretary-General to present the budgetary requirements in his next proposed programme budget to operationalize this decision and to report thereon to the General Assembly at its eightieth session and periodically thereafter for follow-up;

“Request the Secretary-General to strengthen the SaferGuard programme, which serves as the custodian of the International Ammunition Technical Guidelines, and to include the budgetary

requirements in his next proposed programme budget and, in this regard, also requests the Secretary-General to review, update and translate into other official languages the International Ammunition Technical Guidelines, on an ongoing basis, and to develop voluntary operational guidelines related to security aspects of the through-life management of conventional ammunition in the framework of the International Ammunition Technical Guidelines under the SaferGuard programme, with the assistance of technical experts from interested States, while ensuring the full, equal, meaningful and effective participation of women and equitable geographic representation and taking into account and complementing relevant existing standards, guidelines and good practices, without duplicating them;

“Request the Secretary-General to report to the General Assembly at its eightieth session on the implementation of the present resolution, including on the implementation of the global framework.”

The requests contained in paragraphs 6, 12 and 18 of the draft resolution would constitute an additional workload for section 2, “Department for General Assembly and Conference Management”, section 4, “Office for Disarmament Affairs”, section 28, “Department for Global Communications, section 29C, “Office of Information and Communications Technology” and section 29E, “Administration Geneva”, and would require the following: for section 2, “Department for General Assembly and Conference Management”, the amounts of \$228,100 in 2025, \$30,800 in 2026 and \$324,900 in 2027, as well as \$30,800 in 2028 and subsequent years; for section 4, “Office for Disarmament Affairs”, the amount of \$2,146,400 in 2025, with the estimated requirements in 2026 and subsequent years ranging from \$3.2 million to \$3.6 million; for section 28, “Department of Global Communications”, the amounts of \$3,000 in 2025 and \$5,900 in 2027; for section 29C, “Office of Information and Communications Technology”, the amounts of \$14,500 in 2025 and \$28,900 in 2027; and for section 29E, “Administration Geneva”, the amount of \$31,000 in 2025 and subsequent years.

In addition, resource requirements estimated in the amount of \$140,400 in 2025 would be required under section 36, “Staff assessment”, which would be offset by an equivalent increase in the income section 1, “Income from staff assessment”, for the respective years. The

estimated requirements in 2026 and subsequent years would range from \$0.1 million to \$0.3 million. The 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.1/78/L.41, additional resource requirements reflected in paragraphs 3 and 4, as outlined above, would be included in the proposed programme budget for 2025, 2026, 2027, 2028 and subsequent years for the consideration of the General Assembly.

The additional co-sponsors of draft resolution A/C.1/78/L.41 are listed on the e-DeleGATE portal of the First Committee. Belize, Congo and Guinea have also become additional co-sponsors of the draft resolution.

The Chair: A separate vote has been requested on the thirteenth preambular paragraph of draft resolution A/C.1/78/L.41.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour:

Albania, Andorra, Angola, Argentina, Australia, Austria, Bahamas, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belgium, Belize, Bhutan, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Burundi, Cambodia, Canada, Central African Republic, Chad, Chile, China, Colombia, Congo, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Croatia, Cyprus, Czechia, Denmark, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, El Salvador, Eritrea, Estonia, Eswatini, Ethiopia, Finland, France, Georgia, Germany, Ghana, Greece, Guatemala, Guinea, Guyana, Honduras, Hungary, Iceland, India, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Jamaica, Japan, Kazakhstan, Kenya, Kiribati, 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 (Kingdom of the), New Zealand, Nigeria, North Macedonia, Norway, Pakistan, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Republic of Korea, Republic of Moldova, Romania, Saint Kitts and Nevis, Saint Lucia, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, San Marino, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Slovakia, Slovenia, South

Africa, South Sudan, Spain, Sri Lanka, Suriname, Sweden, Switzerland, Thailand, Timor-Leste, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Türkiye, Ukraine, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United Republic of Tanzania, United States of America, Uruguay, Zambia, Zimbabwe

Against:

None

Abstaining:

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

The thirteenth preambular paragraph was retained by 128 votes to 0, with 29 abstentions.

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

The Chair: The Committee will now take action on draft resolution A/C.1/78/L.41, as a whole. A recorded vote has been requested.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour:

Albania, Algeria, Andorra, Angola, Argentina, Armenia, Australia, Austria, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, 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, Eritrea, Estonia, Eswatini, Ethiopia, Finland, France, Gabon, Georgia, Germany, Ghana, Greece, Guatemala, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Honduras, Hungary, Iceland, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), 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 (Kingdom of the), 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 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, South Sudan, Spain, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Sweden, Switzerland, Thailand, Timor-Leste, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Türkiye, Uganda, Ukraine, United Arab Emirates, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United Republic of Tanzania, United States of America, Uruguay, Uzbekistan, Vanuatu, Viet Nam, Yemen, Zambia, Zimbabwe

Against:

None

Abstaining:

Belarus, Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Russian Federation, Saudi Arabia, Syrian Arab Republic

Draft resolution A/C.1/78/L.41, as a whole, was adopted by 169 votes to 0, with 5 abstentions.

[Subsequently, the delegations of the Gambia and Haiti informed the Secretariat that they had intended to vote in favour; the delegation of the Niger informed the Secretariat that it had intended to abstain.]

The Chair: The Committee will now proceed to take action on draft resolution A/C.1/78/L.42, entitled "The Arms Trade Treaty".

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

Ms. Elliott (Secretary of the Committee): Draft resolution A/C.1/78/L.42 was submitted by the representative of Romania on 11 October. The sponsors of the draft resolution are listed in document A/C.1/78/L.42.

The additional sponsors are listed on the e-deleGATE portal of the First Committee. Saint Vincent and the Grenadines and Spain have also become sponsors.

The Chair: A separate vote has been requested on the eleventh preambular paragraph of draft resolution A/C.1/78/L.42.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour:

Albania, Algeria, Andorra, Angola, Argentina, Australia, Austria, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, 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, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Croatia, Cuba, Cyprus, Czechia, Democratic Republic of the Congo, Denmark, Djibouti, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, El Salvador, Eritrea, Estonia, Eswatini, Ethiopia, Finland, France, Georgia, Germany, Ghana, Greece, Guatemala, Guinea, Guyana, Honduras, Hungary, Iceland, India, Indonesia, Iraq, Ireland, Italy, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Kazakhstan, Kiribati, 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 (Kingdom of the), 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, Saint Kitts and Nevis, Saint Lucia, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, Samoa, San Marino, Senegal, Serbia, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Slovakia, Slovenia, Somalia, South Africa, South Sudan, 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 Republic of Tanzania, United States of America, Uruguay, Zambia, Zimbabwe

Against:

None

Abstaining:

Belarus, Congo, Egypt, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Israel, Kenya, Kuwait, Oman, Qatar, Russian Federation, Saudi Arabia, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Syrian Arab Republic, Tajikistan, Yemen

The eleventh preambular paragraph was retained by 148 votes to 0, with 16 abstentions.

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

The Chair: The Committee will now take action on draft resolution A/C.1/78/L.42, as a whole. A recorded vote has been requested.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour:

Albania, Algeria, Andorra, Angola, Argentina, Australia, Austria, Bahamas, Bahrain, 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, Democratic Republic of the Congo, Denmark, Djibouti, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, El Salvador, Equatorial Guinea, Eritrea, Estonia, Eswatini, Ethiopia, Finland, France, Gabon, Georgia, Germany, Ghana, Greece, Guatemala, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Honduras, Hungary, Iceland, Iraq, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Kazakhstan, 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 (Kingdom of the), 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, South Sudan, Spain, Suriname, Sweden, Switzerland, Thailand, Timor-Leste, Togo, Tonga, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Türkiye, Turkmenistan, 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, Bolivia (Plurinational State of), Cuba, Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Egypt, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Kenya, 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.1/78/L.42, as a whole, was adopted by 155 votes to 0, with 23 abstentions.

[Subsequently, the delegations of the Gambia and Haiti 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.1/78/L.44, 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.1/78/L.44 was submitted by the representative of Poland on 13 October. The sponsors of the draft resolution are listed in document A/C.1/78/L.44.

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.1/78/L.44 was adopted.

The Chair: The Committee will now proceed to take action on draft resolution A/C.1/78/L.56, entitled "Lethal autonomous weapons systems".

I give the floor to the Secretary of the Committee.

Ms. Elliot (Secretary of the Committee): Draft resolution A/C.1/78/L.56 was submitted on 11 October by the representative of Austria. The sponsors of the draft resolution are listed in document A/C.1/78/L.56. A statement on the programme budget implications of the draft resolution has been issued as document A/C.1/78/L.66 and is available on the e-deleGATE portal of the First Committee. The additional sponsors in the e-deleGATE portal of the First Committee are currently reflected on the screen.

The Chair: Separate votes have been requested on the first, third, fourth, sixth, seventh, eighth and ninth preambular paragraph and on paragraphs 1, 2, 3 and 4 of draft resolution A/C.1/78/L.56. We shall now begin the voting process. I shall put those paragraphs to the vote, one by one. I now put to the vote the first preambular paragraph.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour:

Albania, Algeria, Andorra, Angola, Argentina, Australia, Austria, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belgium, Belize, Bhutan, Bolivia (Plurinational State of), Bosnia and Herzegovina, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Cambodia, Cameroon, Canada, Central African Republic, Chad, Chile, Colombia, Comoros, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Croatia, Cuba, Cyprus, Czechia, Democratic Republic of the Congo, Denmark, Djibouti, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Eritrea, Estonia, Eswatini, Ethiopia, Finland, France, Gabon, Georgia, Germany, Ghana, Greece, Guatemala, Guinea, Guyana, Honduras, Hungary, Iceland, Indonesia, Iraq, Ireland, Italy, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Kazakhstan, Kenya, Kiribati, Kuwait, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Latvia, Lebanon, Lesotho, Liberia, Libya, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Madagascar, Malawi, Malaysia, Maldives, Malta, Marshall Islands, Mauritania, Mexico, Monaco, Mongolia, Montenegro, Morocco, Mozambique, Myanmar, Namibia, Nepal, Netherlands (Kingdom of the), New Zealand, Nicaragua, Nigeria, North Macedonia, Norway, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Qatar, Republic of Korea, Republic of Moldova, Romania, Rwanda, Saint Kitts and Nevis, Saint

Lucia, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, Samoa, San Marino, Senegal, Serbia, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Slovakia, Slovenia, South Africa, South Sudan, Spain, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Sweden, Switzerland, Thailand, Timor-Leste, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Ukraine, United Arab Emirates, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United Republic of Tanzania, United States of America, Uruguay, Uzbekistan, Yemen, Zambia

Against:

India

Abstaining:

Belarus, China, Congo, Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Israel, Mali, Niger, Russian Federation, Saudi Arabia, Syrian Arab Republic, Türkiye

The first preambular paragraph was retained by 148 votes to 1, with 12 abstentions.

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

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour:

Albania, Algeria, Andorra, Angola, Argentina, Australia, Austria, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belgium, Belize, Bhutan, Bolivia (Plurinational State of), Bosnia and Herzegovina, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Burundi, Cambodia, Cameroon, Canada, Central African Republic, Chad, Chile, China, Colombia, Comoros, Congo, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Croatia, Cuba, Cyprus, Czechia, Democratic Republic of the Congo, Denmark, Djibouti, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Eritrea, Estonia, Eswatini, Ethiopia, Finland, France, Georgia, Germany, Ghana, Greece, Guatemala, Guinea, Guyana, Honduras, Hungary, Iceland, India, Indonesia, Iraq, Ireland, Italy, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Kazakhstan, Kenya, Kiribati, Kuwait, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Latvia, Lebanon, Lesotho, Liberia, Libya, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Madagascar, Malawi, Malaysia, Maldives, Malta, Marshall Islands, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mexico, Monaco, Mongolia, Montenegro, Morocco, Mozambique, Myanmar, Namibia, Nepal,

Netherlands (Kingdom of the), New Zealand, Nicaragua, Nigeria, North Macedonia, Norway, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Portugal, Qatar, Republic of Korea, Republic of Moldova, Romania, Saint Kitts and Nevis, Saint Lucia, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, Samoa, San Marino, Senegal, Serbia, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Slovakia, Slovenia, South Africa, South Sudan, Spain, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Sweden, Switzerland, Thailand, Timor-Leste, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Uganda, Ukraine, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United Republic of Tanzania, United States of America, Uruguay, Uzbekistan, Viet Nam, Yemen, Zambia

Against:

None

Abstaining:

Belarus, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Israel, Mali, Niger, Poland, Russian Federation, Saudi Arabia, Syrian Arab Republic, Türkiye, United Arab Emirates

The third preambular paragraph was retained by 151 votes to none, with 11 abstentions.

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

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour:

Albania, Algeria, Andorra, Angola, Argentina, Australia, Austria, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belgium, Belize, Bhutan, Bolivia (Plurinational State of), Bosnia and Herzegovina, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Cambodia, Cameroon, Canada, Central African Republic, Chad, Chile, Colombia, Comoros, Congo, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Croatia, Cuba, Cyprus, Czechia, Democratic Republic of the Congo, Denmark, Djibouti, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Eritrea, Estonia, Eswatini, Ethiopia, Finland, France, Georgia, Germany, Ghana, Greece, Guatemala, Guinea, Guyana, Haiti, Honduras, Hungary, Iceland, Indonesia, Iraq, Ireland, Italy, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Kazakhstan, Kenya, Kiribati, Kuwait, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Latvia, Lebanon, Lesotho, Liberia, Libya, Liechtenstein,

Lithuania, Luxembourg, Madagascar, Malawi, Malaysia, Maldives, Malta, Marshall Islands, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mexico, Monaco, Mongolia, Montenegro, Morocco, Mozambique, Myanmar, Namibia, Nepal, Netherlands (Kingdom of the), New Zealand, Nicaragua, Nigeria, North Macedonia, Norway, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Portugal, Qatar, Republic of Korea, Republic of Moldova, Romania, Saint Kitts and Nevis, Saint Lucia, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, Samoa, San Marino, Senegal, Serbia, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Slovakia, Slovenia, South Africa, South Sudan, Spain, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Sweden, Switzerland, Thailand, Timor-Leste, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Uganda, Ukraine, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United Republic of Tanzania, United States of America, Uruguay, Uzbekistan, Viet Nam, Yemen, Zambia

Against:

India

Abstaining:

Belarus, China, Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Israel, Mali, Niger, Poland, Russian Federation, Saudi Arabia, Syrian Arab Republic, Türkiye, United Arab Emirates

The fourth preambular paragraph was retained by 149 votes to 1, with 13 abstentions.

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

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour:

Albania, Algeria, Andorra, Angola, Argentina, Australia, Austria, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belgium, Belize, Bhutan, Bolivia (Plurinational State of), Bosnia and Herzegovina, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Bulgaria, Cambodia, Cameroon, Canada, Central African Republic, Chad, Chile, Colombia, Comoros, Congo, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Croatia, Cuba, Cyprus, Czechia, Democratic Republic of the Congo, Denmark, Djibouti, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Eritrea, Estonia, Eswatini, Ethiopia, Finland, France, Georgia, Germany,

Ghana, Greece, Guatemala, Guinea, Guyana, Haiti, Honduras, Hungary, Iceland, Indonesia, Iraq, Ireland, Italy, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Kazakhstan, Kenya, Kiribati, Kuwait, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Latvia, Lebanon, Lesotho, Liberia, Libya, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Madagascar, Malawi, Malaysia, Maldives, Malta, Marshall Islands, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mexico, Monaco, Mongolia, Montenegro, Morocco, Mozambique, Myanmar, Namibia, Nepal, Netherlands (Kingdom of the), New Zealand, Nigeria, North Macedonia, Norway, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Qatar, Republic of Korea, Republic of Moldova, Romania, Rwanda, Saint Kitts and Nevis, Saint Lucia, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, Samoa, San Marino, Senegal, Serbia, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Slovakia, Slovenia, South Africa, South Sudan, Spain, Sri Lanka, 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, Uzbekistan, Yemen

Against:

Belarus, Democratic People's Republic of Korea, India, Mali, Russian Federation

Abstaining:

China, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Israel, Nicaragua, Niger, Saudi Arabia, Syrian Arab Republic, Türkiye

The sixth preambular paragraph was retained by 148 votes to 5, with 8 abstentions.

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

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour:

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

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

Against:

Belarus, Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Mali, Russian Federation

Abstaining:

China, Cuba, India, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Israel, Nicaragua, Niger, Saudi Arabia, Syrian Arab Republic, Türkiye, United Arab Emirates

The seventh preambular paragraph was retained by 147 votes to 4, with 11 abstentions.

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

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour:

Albania, Algeria, Andorra, Angola, Argentina, Australia, Austria, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belgium, Belize, Bhutan, Bolivia (Plurinational State of), Bosnia and Herzegovina, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Bulgaria,

Burkina Faso, Burundi, Cambodia, Cameroon, Canada, Central African Republic, Chad, Chile, Colombia, Comoros, Congo, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Croatia, Cuba, Cyprus, Czechia, Democratic Republic of the Congo, Denmark, Djibouti, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Eritrea, Estonia, Eswatini, Ethiopia, Finland, France, Gabon, Georgia, Germany, Ghana, Greece, Guatemala, Guinea, Guyana, Haiti, Honduras, Hungary, Iceland, Indonesia, Iraq, Ireland, Italy, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Kazakhstan, Kenya, Kiribati, Kuwait, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Latvia, Lebanon, Lesotho, Liberia, Libya, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Madagascar, Malawi, Malaysia, Maldives, Malta, Marshall Islands, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mexico, Monaco, Mongolia, Montenegro, Morocco, Mozambique, Myanmar, Namibia, Nepal, Netherlands (Kingdom of the), New Zealand, Nicaragua, Nigeria, North Macedonia, Norway, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Qatar, Republic of Korea, Republic of Moldova, Romania, Rwanda, Saint Kitts and Nevis, Saint Lucia, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, Samoa, San Marino, Senegal, Serbia, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Slovakia, Slovenia, South Africa, South Sudan, Spain, Sri Lanka, 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, Uzbekistan, Yemen

Against:

None

Abstaining:

Belarus, China, Democratic People's Republic of Korea, India, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Israel, Mali, Niger, Russian Federation, Saudi Arabia, Syrian Arab Republic, Türkiye

The eighth preambular paragraph was retained by 152 votes to none, with 12 abstentions.

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

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour:

Albania, Algeria, Andorra, Angola, Argentina, Australia, Austria, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belgium, Belize, Bhutan, Bolivia (Plurinational State of), Bosnia and Herzegovina, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Burundi, Cambodia, Cameroon, Canada, Central African Republic, Chad, Chile, Colombia, Comoros, Congo, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Croatia, Cuba, Cyprus, Czechia, Democratic Republic of the Congo, Denmark, Djibouti, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Eritrea, Estonia, Eswatini, Ethiopia, Finland, France, Gabon, Georgia, Germany, Ghana, Greece, Guatemala, Guinea, Guyana, Haiti, Honduras, Hungary, Iceland, Indonesia, Iraq, Ireland, Italy, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Kazakhstan, Kenya, Kiribati, Kuwait, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Latvia, Lebanon, Lesotho, Liberia, Libya, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Madagascar, Malawi, Malaysia, Maldives, Malta, Marshall Islands, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mexico, Monaco, Mongolia, Montenegro, Morocco, Mozambique, Myanmar, Namibia, Nepal, Netherlands (Kingdom of the), New Zealand, Nicaragua, Nigeria, North Macedonia, Norway, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Portugal, Qatar, 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, South Sudan, Spain, Sri Lanka, 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, Uzbekistan, Viet Nam, Yemen

Against:

None

Abstaining:

Belarus, China, Democratic People's Republic of Korea, India, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Israel, Mali, Niger, Poland, Russian Federation, Saudi Arabia, Syrian Arab Republic, Türkiye

The ninth preambular paragraph was retained by 152 to none, with 13 abstentions.

The Chair: I shall now put to the vote operative paragraph 1.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour:

Albania, Algeria, Andorra, Angola, Argentina, Australia, Austria, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belgium, Belize, Bhutan, Bolivia (Plurinational State of), Bosnia and Herzegovina, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Burundi, Cambodia, Cameroon, Canada, Central African Republic, Chad, Chile, Colombia, Comoros, Congo, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Croatia, Cuba, Cyprus, Czechia, Democratic Republic of the Congo, Denmark, Djibouti, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Eritrea, Estonia, Eswatini, Ethiopia, Finland, France, Gabon, Georgia, Germany, Ghana, Greece, Guatemala, Guinea, Guyana, Haiti, Honduras, Hungary, Iceland, Indonesia, Iraq, Ireland, Italy, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Kazakhstan, Kenya, Kiribati, Kuwait, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Latvia, Lebanon, Lesotho, Liberia, Libya, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Madagascar, Malawi, Malaysia, Maldives, Malta, Marshall Islands, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mexico, Monaco, Mongolia, Montenegro, Morocco, Mozambique, Myanmar, Namibia, Nepal, Netherlands (Kingdom of the), New Zealand, Nicaragua, Nigeria, North Macedonia, Norway, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Qatar, Republic of Korea, Republic of Moldova, Romania, Rwanda, Saint Kitts and Nevis, Saint Lucia, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, Samoa, San Marino, Senegal, Serbia, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Slovakia, Slovenia, South Africa, South Sudan, Spain, Sri Lanka, 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, Uzbekistan, Viet Nam, Yemen, Zambia

Against:

None

Abstaining:

Belarus, China, Democratic People's Republic of Korea, India, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Israel, Mali, Niger, Russian Federation, Saudi Arabia, Syrian Arab Republic, Türkiye

Operative paragraph 1 was retained by 154 votes to none, with 12 abstentions.

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

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour:

Albania, Algeria, Andorra, Angola, Argentina, Australia, Austria, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belgium, Belize, Bhutan, Bolivia (Plurinational State of), Bosnia and Herzegovina, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Burundi, Cambodia, Cameroon, Canada, Central African Republic, Chad, Chile, Colombia, Comoros, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Croatia, Cuba, Cyprus, Czechia, Democratic Republic of the Congo, Denmark, Djibouti, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Eritrea, Estonia, Eswatini, Ethiopia, Finland, France, Gabon, Georgia, Germany, Ghana, Greece, Guatemala, Guinea, Guyana, Haiti, Honduras, Hungary, Iceland, Indonesia, Iraq, Ireland, Italy, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Kazakhstan, Kenya, Kiribati, Kuwait, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Latvia, Lebanon, Liberia, Libya, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Madagascar, Malawi, Malaysia, Maldives, Malta, Marshall Islands, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mexico, Monaco, Mongolia, Montenegro, Morocco, Mozambique, Myanmar, Nepal, Netherlands (Kingdom of the), New Zealand, Nicaragua, Nigeria, North Macedonia, Norway, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Qatar, Republic of Korea, Republic of Moldova, Romania, Rwanda, Saint Kitts and Nevis, Saint Lucia, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, Samoa, San Marino, Senegal, Serbia, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Slovakia, Slovenia, South Sudan, Spain, Sri Lanka, 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, Uzbekistan, Viet Nam, Yemen, Zambia

Against:

None

Abstaining:

Belarus, China, Congo, Democratic People's Republic of Korea, India, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Israel, Lesotho, Mali, Namibia, Niger, Russian Federation, Saudi Arabia, South Africa, Syrian Arab Republic, Türkiye

Operative paragraph 2 was retained by 150 votes to none, with 16 abstentions.

The Chair: I shall now put to the vote operative paragraph 3.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour:

Albania, Algeria, Andorra, Angola, Argentina, Australia, Austria, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belgium, Belize, Bhutan, Bolivia (Plurinational State of), Bosnia and Herzegovina, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Burundi, Cambodia, Cameroon, Canada, Central African Republic, Chad, Chile, Colombia, Comoros, Congo, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Croatia, Cuba, Cyprus, Czechia, Democratic Republic of the Congo, Denmark, Djibouti, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Eritrea, Estonia, Eswatini, Ethiopia, Finland, France, Georgia, Germany, Ghana, Greece, Guatemala, Guinea, Guyana, Haiti, Honduras, Hungary, Iceland, Indonesia, Iraq, Ireland, Italy, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Kazakhstan, Kenya, Kiribati, Kuwait, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Latvia, Lebanon, Lesotho, Liberia, Libya, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Madagascar, Malawi, Malaysia, Maldives, Malta, Marshall Islands, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mexico, Monaco, Mongolia, Montenegro, Morocco, Mozambique, Myanmar, Namibia, Nepal, Netherlands (Kingdom of the), New Zealand, Nicaragua, Nigeria, North Macedonia, Norway, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Qatar, Republic of Korea, Republic of Moldova, Romania, Rwanda, Saint Kitts and Nevis, Saint Lucia, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, Samoa,

San Marino, Senegal, Serbia, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Slovakia, Slovenia, South Africa, South Sudan, Spain, Sri Lanka, 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, Uzbekistan, Yemen, Zambia

Against:

Belarus, Mali, Russian Federation

Abstaining:

China, Democratic People's Republic of Korea, India, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Israel, Niger, Saudi Arabia, Syrian Arab Republic, Türkiye

Operative paragraph 3 was retained by 152 votes to 3, with 9 abstentions.

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

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour:

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

Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Qatar, Republic of Korea, Republic of Moldova, Romania, Rwanda, Saint Kitts and Nevis, Saint Lucia, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, Samoa, San Marino, Senegal, Serbia, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Slovakia, Slovenia, South Africa, South Sudan, Spain, Sri Lanka, 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, Uzbekistan, Viet Nam, Yemen, Zambia

Against:

Belarus, Mali, Russian Federation

Abstaining:

China, Democratic People's Republic of Korea, India, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Israel, Niger, Saudi Arabia, Syrian Arab Republic, Türkiye

Operative paragraph 4 was retained by 154 votes to 3, with 9 abstentions.

The Chair: The Committee will now proceed to take action on draft resolution A/C.1/78/L.56, as a whole. A recorded vote has been requested.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour:

Albania, Algeria, Andorra, Angola, Argentina, Armenia, Australia, Austria, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, 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, Colombia, Comoros, Congo, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Croatia, Cuba, Cyprus, Czechia, Democratic Republic of the Congo, Denmark, Djibouti, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Equatorial Guinea, Eritrea, Estonia, Eswatini, Ethiopia, Finland, France, Gabon, 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, Malta, Marshall Islands, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mexico, Micronesia (Federated States of), Monaco, Mongolia, Montenegro, Morocco, Mozambique, Myanmar, Namibia, Nepal, Netherlands (Kingdom of the), New Zealand, Nicaragua, 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, Senegal, Serbia, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Slovakia, Slovenia, Solomon Islands, South Africa, South Sudan, Spain, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Sweden, Switzerland, Tajikistan, Thailand, Timor-Leste, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Uganda, Ukraine, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United Republic of Tanzania, United States of America, Uruguay, Uzbekistan, Vanuatu, Viet Nam, Yemen, Zambia, Zimbabwe

Against:

Belarus, India, Mali, Niger, Russian Federation

Abstaining:

China, Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Israel, Saudi Arabia, Syrian Arab Republic, Türkiye, United Arab Emirates

Draft resolution A/C.1/78/L.56, as a whole, was adopted by 164 votes to 5, with 8 abstentions.

[Subsequently, the delegation of the Gambia 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.1/78/L.61, 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. Elliot (Secretary of the Committee): Draft resolution A/C.1/78/L.61 was submitted on 12 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 contained in document A/C.1/78/L.61. The additional sponsors are

listed in the e-deleGATE portal of the First Committee. Congo, Kiribati, Spain and Uganda have also become sponsors of the draft resolution.

The Chair: A separate vote has been requested on the sixteenth preambular paragraph of draft resolution A/C.1/77/L.61. I shall now put to the vote the sixteenth preambular paragraph.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour:

Albania, Algeria, Andorra, Angola, Argentina, Australia, Austria, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belgium, Belize, Benin, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Burundi, Cambodia, Cameroon, Canada, Central African Republic, Chad, Chile, China, Colombia, Comoros, Congo, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Croatia, Cyprus, Czechia, Democratic Republic of the Congo, Denmark, Djibouti, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, El Salvador, Equatorial Guinea, Eritrea, Estonia, Eswatini, Ethiopia, Finland, France, Gabon, Georgia, Germany, Ghana, Greece, Guatemala, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Haiti, Honduras, Hungary, Iceland, Iraq, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Kazakhstan, Kenya, Kiribati, Kuwait, 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 (Kingdom of the), 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, Somalia, South Africa, South Sudan, Spain, Suriname, Sweden, Switzerland, Thailand, Timor-Leste, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Türkiye, Uganda, Ukraine, United Arab Emirates, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United Republic of Tanzania, United States of America, Uruguay, Zambia

Against:

None

Abstaining:

Armenia, Belarus, Bhutan, Bolivia (Plurinational State of), Cuba, Egypt, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Nicaragua, Oman, Qatar, Russian Federation, Saudi Arabia, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Syrian Arab Republic, Yemen

The sixteenth preambular paragraph was retained by 150 votes to none, with 18 abstentions.

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

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.1/78/L.61, as a whole, was adopted.

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

Mr. Grigoryan (Armenia): I take the floor to explain the position of the delegation of Armenia on draft resolution A/C.1/78/L.42, entitled "The Arms Trade Treaty". Armenia strongly advocates a robust and legally binding conventional arms control regime, at regional and international levels, that would enable the efficient regulation of trade in conventional arms and prevent and eradicate their diversion into illicit markets, where they are used 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 regarding the preamble and principal sections of the Treaty. We have continuously stressed the need for balanced and non-restrictive references to the principles of international law. We reaffirm our position that the Treaty, in its current shape, may be interpreted as limiting the exercise of the sovereign right of self-defence and hinder legitimate access to relevant technologies. The key objective of the Treaty — the encouragement and the enforcement of regulation of the conventional arms trade through strong national control systems — could have been upheld more strongly.

Armenia will abstain in the voting on draft resolution A/C.1/78/L.42, and our position concerning the ATT is applicable to all other resolutions of the First Committee containing a reference to the Treaty. We therefore disassociate from those paragraphs.

Mr. Guerra (Argentina) (*spoke in Spanish*): My delegation wishes to take the floor in explanation of vote on draft resolution A/C.1/78/L.56, entitled “Lethal autonomous weapons systems”, for which we voted in favour.

The Republic of Argentina shares the goal and the spirit of this draft resolution on lethal autonomous weapons system, with a view to giving greater visibility to the issue and renewing the impetus of current discussions. We also recognize its inclusive nature and share the importance of including the views of all Members and other interested parties that do not typically participate in discussions on the Convention on Certain Conventional Weapons. That notwithstanding, we highlight the work of the Group of Governmental Experts on Emerging Technologies in the Area of Lethal Autonomous Weapons Systems, chaired by Brazil, and the progress achieved there. In that regard, we recall that Argentina, along with other countries, has submitted a proposal for a legally binding instrument as an additional protocol to the Convention on Certain Conventional Weapons, with a view to establishing prohibitions and regulations on emerging technologies in the area of lethal autonomous weapons. The Convention and its Protocols are key tools in the framework of disarmament, arms control and international humanitarian law.

Mr. Alqaisi (Jordan) (*spoke in Arabic*): I would like to deliver this statement on behalf of the Group of Arab States in explanation of its members’ vote concerning draft resolution A/C.1/78/L.40, entitled “The illicit trade in small arms and light weapons in all its aspects” and draft resolution A/C.1/78/L.41, entitled “Through-life conventional ammunition management”.

At the outset, the Arab Group expresses its commitment to engage constructively with the 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 Open-ended Working Group on Conventional Ammunition in line with promoting disarmament in general and supporting multilateral work, in addition to addressing the challenges emanating from the proliferation of conventional

weapons and ammunition that affect international peace and security, the continued international conflicts and the phenomenon of terrorism.

The Arab Group underscores the right of States to manage conventional weapons and ammunition according to their security and defence needs, including protection of their national borders while taking all necessary measures to maintain their national security under Article 51 of the Charter of the United Nations, which enshrines each State’s legitimate right to self-defence.

Throughout the Programme of Action to Prevent, Combat and Eradicate the Illicit Trade in Small Arms and Light Weapons in All Its Aspects and from the beginning of the consultations on resolution 76/233, which established the Open-ended Working Group on Conventional Ammunition, the Arab Group has stressed the voluntary and independent nature of those two paths and has emphasized the need to not get them confused for various reasons related to technological disparity, frameworks and legislations at the national level. Certain parties continue to include texts in the two above-mentioned draft resolutions that confuse conventional weapons and conventional ammunition.

For those reasons, the members of the Arab Group abstained in the voting on the twenty-fourth preambular paragraph of draft resolution A/C.1/78/L.40 and operative paragraph 13 of draft resolution A/C.1/78/L.41. The States of the Arab Group hope that non-consensual language and other problematic aspects will not be introduced again because that could undermine the relevant consultations and lead to more division among States.

In conclusion and on behalf of the Arab Group, I reiterate our sincere condolences to the families of the martyrs of the ongoing Israeli aggression in the occupied Palestinian territories and in the Gaza Strip. We underscore our condemnation of the Israeli brutal aggression and reiterate our call to end the war, provide humanitarian assistance to the Palestinians and stop their forced displacement.

Mr. Kim Sunghoon (Republic of Korea): First, with regard to draft resolution A/C.1/78/L.20, on the implementation of the Convention on Cluster Munitions, 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 concerns arising from their

use. However, due to the unique security situation on the Korean peninsula, my Government is currently not party to the Convention on Cluster Munitions and therefore abstained in the voting on the draft resolution. My delegation would like to inform Member States that the Ministry of National Defence of the Republic of Korea adopted a directive on cluster munitions in 2008, which includes measures for their limited and responsible use. According to the directive, only cluster munitions that are equipped with the self-deactivation devices and a failure rate of less than 1 per cent can be included in the acquisition plans. The directive also recommends developing alternative weapons systems to replace cluster munitions in the long term. While it is regrettable that we are currently unable to support draft resolution A/C.1/78/L.20, the Republic of Korea will continue its efforts to mitigate the humanitarian concerns associated with the use of cluster munitions in a constructive manner.

Secondly, with regard to draft resolution A/C.1/78/L.39, on the implementation of the Convention on the Prohibition of the Use, Stockpiling, Production and Transfer of Anti-Personnel Mines and on Their Destruction, the Republic of Korea sincerely supports the objective and purposes of the Ottawa Convention. However, due to the unique security situation on the Korean Peninsula, we are currently not a party to that Convention either and we 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, and we are committed to mitigating the suffering caused by their use. In that respect, the Korean Government is exercising tight control over anti-personnel mines and has maintained its indefinite extension of the moratorium on their exports since 1997. In addition, the Republic of Korea is a party to the Convention on Certain Conventional Weapons and its amended Protocol II, under which we participate in a range of discussions and activities to ensure only limited and responsible use. On the domestic front, Korea is continuing its efforts in the areas of mine clearance and rehabilitation. In 2020 alone, we cleared 824 mines, including 822 anti-personnel mines, in one area of approximately 377,384 square metres. We have also provided assistance to mine victims and their bereaved family members through the Special Act on the Support for Mine Victims. Moreover, my Government has contributed more than \$50 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 since 1993. Korea will continue to contribute to international efforts for mine clearance and victim assistance.

Thirdly and lastly, with regard to draft resolution A/C.1/78/L.56, on lethal autonomous weapons systems (LAWS), the Republic of Korea voted in favour of it. We join others in thanking Australia and the other sponsors for their efforts in preparing the draft resolution. The Republic of Korea places great importance on the issue and appreciates the progress made in recent years, as well as the constructive proposals made within the Group of Governmental Experts (GGE) on Emerging Technologies in the Area of Lethal Autonomous Weapons within the CCW framework. Like other First Committee members, Korea underscores that the GGE should continue to serve as the central and unique forum to address various issues pertaining to LAWS, with a focus on the effective implementation of international humanitarian law. As such, my delegation is of the view that the international community should be careful not to undermine that ongoing endeavour. Setting an arbitrary deadline would not be helpful, especially in the light of the fact that the mandate of the next GGE is under discussion. We would also like to add that we should maintain a balanced approach between the benefits and risks when we consider the possible ramifications of new and emerging technologies. Having said that, as the host of the second summit on Responsible Artificial Intelligence in the Military Domain (REAIM), to be held in the coming year, the Republic of Korea will continue to play its due part to contribute to forging a broad consensus on the topic of the responsible use of artificial intelligence and autonomy in the military domain, building on the excellent outcome of the first REAIM summit held in The Hague earlier this year.

Mr. Lagardien (South Africa): With regard to draft resolution A/C.1/78/L.56, entitled “Lethal autonomous weapons systems”, South Africa abstained in the voting on its paragraph 2, which calls on the Secretary-General to seek the views of Member States on the issue of lethal autonomous weapons systems and to submit a substantive report to the General Assembly on that matter at its seventy-ninth session for further consideration. Since there is an ongoing process under way in the Group of Governmental Experts on Emerging Technologies in the Area of

Lethal Autonomous Weapons within the Convention on Certain Conventional Weapons (CCW) framework, we believe both that the integrity of that process should be respected and that the high contracting parties to the CCW have already made their views clearly known on the principle and substantive elements of the issue. South Africa therefore believes that, given its understanding that such a report by the Secretary-General will entail a substantial programme budget implication, it is unfortunately not in a position to support the adoption of paragraph 2 of draft resolution A/C.1/78/L.56.

It has been abundantly clear that the issue of lethal autonomous weapons systems has been in need of being addressed in a comprehensive and meaningful manner for some years now, and as such South Africa supports the adoption of draft resolution A/C.1/78/L.56 as a whole.

Mr. Sirie (Indonesia): With regard to Indonesia's position on the draft resolutions adopted under cluster 4, Indonesia abstained in the voting to any proposals containing references to the Arms Trade Treaty, as reflected in draft resolutions A/C.1/78/L.40, A/C.1/78/L.41, A/C.1/78/L.42 and A/C.1/78/L.61. Our position on the Treaty is well recorded. We support the Treaty's principles and objectives, as it aims to manage the trade of conventional weapons, while contributing to global peace and stability. However, we believe that the Treaty should not impose unnecessary limitations, conditionalities and restrictions on developing countries' capabilities. Indonesia is committed to ensuring the agenda preventing, combating and eradicating the illicit trade in small arms and light weapons, in that it can be achieved effectively by enhancing the capacity of our border management controls in mitigating the risks of illegal arms and weapons. In that regard, we welcome the inclusion of the decision to establish the Fellowship Training Programme on Small Arms and Light Weapons Control, which is a much-needed programme to strengthen knowledge and the expertise for 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.

With regard to draft resolution A/C.1/78/L.41, on through-life conventional ammunition management, Indonesia voted in favour of it and welcomes the adoption of the Global Framework for Through-life Conventional Ammunition Management by consensus,

as well as the standing dedicated fellowship training programme in the field.

With regard to draft resolution A/C.1/78/L.56, on lethal autonomous weapons systems, Indonesia voted in favour of it, as it attempts to set guidelines that should effectively address the threat and challenges posed by such weapons from humanitarian, legal, security, technology and ethical perspectives. Indonesia is of the view that draft resolution A/C.1/78/L.56 is a crucial step for a comprehensive dialogue involving States that are not party to the Convention on Certain Conventional Weapons Member States in an inclusive manner. Rest assured of Indonesia's contribution to that process.

Mr. Hegaz (Egypt): With regard to draft resolution A/C.1/78/L.56, entitled "Lethal autonomous weapons systems", Egypt attaches great importance to advancing the efforts of the United Nations on addressing the risks associated with lethal autonomous weapons systems. Fully autonomous weapons pose a threat to international peace and security and raise a number of legal, humanitarian and ethical concerns that must be addressed. The United Nations disarmament machinery must actively address the increasing threats and risks associated with the emerging category of weapons that could be able to activate itself, select its targets and take human life. Even if we assume that an algorithm can determine what is legal under international humanitarian law, it can never determine what is ethical. Therefore, an algorithm must not be in full control of decisions that involve killing or harming humans. The principle of human responsibility and accountability for any use of lethal force must be preserved, regardless of the type of weapons system involved in delivering that force. Furthermore, Egypt supports pursuing a two-tiered approach that includes the prohibition of fully autonomous weapons and regulating other military applications of artificial intelligence (AI) that could pose security or humanitarian risks. Moreover, we welcome the attention paid to that issue in the Secretary-General's policy brief on the New Agenda for Peace, and we look forward to the report that the Secretary-General will issue pursuant to the adoption of the draft resolution. We also encourage the inclusion of this topic in the agenda of the forthcoming cycle of the United Nations Disarmament Commission, as it is one of the most appropriate and inclusive platforms to carry forward the discussions on the relevant principles and rules and to make realistic recommendations on the next steps.

Moreover, while we acknowledge the importance of the discussions taking place within the Group of Governmental Experts on Emerging Technologies in the Area of Lethal Autonomous Weapons Systems, it is regrettable that progress is quite minimal and that no tangible results have been reached owing to the continued misguided belief by some States that an absolute dominance in such domains can be maintained, and on that basis they resist any efforts towards the development of equitable legal multilateral regimes to prohibit the malicious uses and weaponization of such technologies. We take note of the multiple international initiatives on the development of guidelines and rules for the military applications of AI, and we underscore that the outcomes of such initiatives should explicitly stress that any guidelines on the military applications of AI should be without prejudice to efforts aimed at prohibiting fully autonomous weapons. We also stress that the relevant endeavours and deliberations need to be conducted under the auspices of the United Nations, as it is the most inclusive, equitable and effective platform for the development of international rules in that domain. For those reasons, Egypt supported draft resolution A/C.1/78/L.56 and all of its paragraphs, and we look forward to its adoption and implementation as a step towards intensifying the United Nations efforts on that important topic.

In addition, Egypt abstained in the voting on the twenty-fourth preambular paragraph of draft resolution A/C.1/78/L.40 and in the voting on the thirteenth preambular paragraph of draft resolution A/C.1/78/L.41, for the reasons explained in the explanation of vote delivered by the representative of Jordan on behalf of the Group of Arab States under cluster 4, and while we appreciate the efforts of the interpreters to interpret information for us regarding those documents, we would call on all delegations to rely on the versions of those statements that have been uploaded to the eDeleGATE portal, which clarify the position of the Group of Arab States in that regard.

Mr. Ghourbanpour (Islamic Republic of Iran): While extending our best wishes of success to our brotherly nation, Iraq, as it assumes the Chair of the eleventh Meeting of States Parties to the Convention on Cluster Munitions, I would like to clarify that my delegation chose to abstain in the voting on draft resolution A/C.1/78/L.20, entitled “Implementation of the Convention on Cluster Munitions”, for the following reasons.

First, my delegation did not participate in the Convention’s negotiations and is neither a signatory nor a party thereto.

Secondly, we cannot support an instrument negotiated outside of the United Nations that disregards the security concerns and interests of many States.

With regard to draft resolution A/C.1/78/L.39, entitled “Implementation of the Convention on the Prohibition of the Use, Stockpiling, Production and Transfer of Anti-Personnel Mines and on Their Destruction”, my delegation would like to express that anti-personnel mines have been used irresponsibly during the civil wars in certain 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 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. My delegation appreciates the objectives of draft resolution A/C.1/78/L.39. However, owing to the particular concerns and considerations I have just explained, we abstained in the voting on the draft resolution.

With regard to draft resolution A/C.1/78/L.42, entitled “The Arms Trade Treaty”, my delegation abstained in the voting for the following reasons.

First, in the Arms Trade Treaty (ATT), the political and commercial interests of certain arms-exporting countries have a higher priority than the observance of the fundamentals of international law.

Secondly, we have strong reservations about the notion of complementarity with other instruments, as mentioned in draft resolution A/C.1/78/L.42. In addition, the draft resolution calls upon all States that have not yet done so to accede to the Treaty. Such a call for the universalization of the ATT is unacceptable, because the Treaty was not adopted by consensus due to its substantive flaws, as well as its disregard for the concerns and interests of some States participating in the negotiation process. Furthermore, some of its States parties are committing major violations of its provisions as well.

In conclusion, I would like to put on the record that our position on the ATT applies to all paragraphs in the draft resolutions and decisions that are adopted or will

be adopted by the Committee in that regard this year, and my delegation therefore disassociates itself from all such references. I should also like to mention that, although we joined the consensus on draft resolution A/C.1/78/L.61, entitled “Assistance to States for curbing the illicit traffic in small arms and light weapons and collecting them”, our position on the ATT in that draft resolution or any other draft resolution in that regard is the same as the position we already explained with regard to draft resolution A/C.1/78/L.42.

Mr. Moharram (Saudi Arabia): With regard to draft resolution A/C.1/78/L.41, entitled “Through-life conventional ammunition management”, I would first like to align my statement with that delivered by the representative of the Hashemite Kingdom of Jordan on behalf of the Group of Arab States.

The Kingdom of Saudi Arabia abstained in the voting on the thirteenth preambular paragraph of draft resolution A/C.1/78/L.41. We also abstained in the voting on draft resolution A/C.1/78/L.41 as a whole. That position is based on the Kingdom of Saudi Arabia’s rejection of any kind of correlation between conventional ammunition and small arms and light weapons. Despite the fact that the First Committee adopted draft resolution A/C.1/78/L.41, the Kingdom of Saudi Arabia would like to reiterate that the management of conventional ammunition is a matter that relates to the national security of each individual State, and it must respect the concept of sovereignty of the States. Since the Global Framework for Through-life Conventional Ammunition Management is on a voluntary basis, the Kingdom of Saudi Arabia emphasizes that the adoption of draft resolution A/C.1/78/L.41 is neither binding nor obligatory for our country. The Kingdom of Saudi Arabia once again confirms that it will interpret and apply the Global Framework and adhere to the national laws and rules, in respect of the sovereignty of States and with a view to preventing interference in the national affairs of others. Having said that, the Kingdom of Saudi Arabia calls for a continued focus on the main issues related to the Global Framework and for any issues of contradiction or disagreement to be avoided.

Ms. Carr (Australia): With regard to draft resolution A/C.1/78/L.56, entitled “Lethal autonomous weapons systems”, while we think that the text could have benefited from certain modifications, Australia voted in favour of it. We take this opportunity to explain our broad position on the way forward. We remain of

the view that the Convention on Certain Conventional Weapons (CCW) is the most appropriate forum for multilateral discussions on lethal autonomous weapons systems (LAWS). The CCW brings together States with diverse security interests and it benefits from the inputs of a wide range of experts. We recognize that a Secretary-General’s report could lend additional impetus to the discussions under way in the CCW’s Group of Governmental Experts (GGE) on Emerging Technologies in the Area of Lethal Autonomous Weapons Systems by eliciting the views of a broader range of stakeholders. As others before me have said, the report should be balanced and inclusive of the views of all States Members of the United Nations and should take a pragmatic approach to opportunities for progress in the CCW that can achieve consensus. We value the contributions made by civil society to the GGE process and also welcome opportunities for civil society to submit views to the Secretary-General’s report.

The CCW’s GGE members have produced a significant number and breadth of proposals that provide an excellent basis for our future work. Those proposals have enhanced our collective understanding of the characteristics of autonomous weapons systems and of concrete measures to strengthen compliance with international humanitarian law. Australia has constructively engaged with all proposals, from legally binding instruments to non-legally binding proposals, and will continue to do so. Australia continues to believe that the draft articles proposal, which was submitted by a group of seven countries, remains the best vehicle for progress in the CCW by elaborating with granularity how the rules and principles of international humanitarian law apply to LAWS. While we remain of the view that the time is not yet right for negotiating a new legally binding instrument on LAWS, clarification of how existing international humanitarian law applies is work that can and must be done before a new legally binding instrument can be negotiated. We do not support the creation of parallel processes that would be detrimental to our collective efforts in the CCW framework. Now is the time to redouble our efforts in the CCW GGE. To that end, Australia will continue to work constructively with the CCW high contracting parties. We hope the November meeting will agree a strong mandate for 2024 that will allow for further substantive progress next year.

Mr. Sarwani (Pakistan): My delegation abstained in the voting on draft resolution A/C.1/78/L.20,

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) as the most appropriate forum to address the issue of cluster munitions. The strength of the CCW lies in its legal framework, which strikes a delicate balance by recognizing the need to minimize human suffering without 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 the civilian population and people under illegal occupation.

My delegation also abstained in the voting on draft resolution A/C.1/78/L.39, 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 to 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. 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 needs to guard long borders that are not protected by any natural obstacle. As one of the largest troop contributors to United Nations peacekeeping operations, Pakistan has been successfully undertaking demining operations in many parts of the world. We stand ready to provide further assistance to advance global humanitarian demining efforts.

With regard to draft resolution A/C.1/78/L.56, entitled “Lethal autonomous weapons systems”, we have been discussing the legal, humanitarian, technical and security aspects of lethal autonomous weapons systems for almost a decade within the ambit of the Convention on Certain Conventional Weapons. We believe that the discussion on lethal autonomous weapons systems (LAWS) should continue in the Group of Governmental Experts of the CCW with a view to

developing international rules through a new protocol spelling out prohibitions and regulations. We also appreciate the submission of the draft resolution for the first time in the First Committee, as it provides a platform through which to seek the views of the broader United Nations membership on LAWS. Along with the work of the CCW on LAWS, other disarmament bodies can and should concurrently play a complementary role in addressing the broader issues of artificial intelligence (AI) and military application in a way that builds positive synergies, while avoiding duplication. The scale of the challenges resulting from the use of AI for military purposes, including in weapons systems, necessitates a multifaceted and holistic multilateral response within the United Nations machinery. For that reason, my delegation voted in favour of draft resolution A/C.1/78/L.56 and its operative and preambular paragraphs.

Mr. Zhang Junjie (China) (*spoke in Chinese*): China abstained in the voting on draft resolution A/C.1/78/L.56, entitled “Lethal autonomous weapons systems”, as a whole, and in the voting on separate paragraphs of the draft resolution, except for the third preambular paragraph, and would like to explain its reasons for doing so. China attaches great importance to the security, humanitarian, legal and ethical issues emanating from lethal autonomous weapons systems. In recent years, China has constructively participated in the discussions of the Group of Governmental Experts (GGE) on Emerging Technologies in the Area of Lethal Autonomous Weapons Systems under the framework of the Convention on Certain Conventional Weapons. We submitted our position paper on regulating the military applications of artificial intelligence. China welcomes the 11 guiding principles of the GGE on lethal autonomous weapons systems and supports the negotiation of a legally binding instrument to prohibit fully autonomous weapons systems when the conditions are right, after a common understanding has been reached on a number of issues, such as the definition of the characteristics of lethal autonomous weapons systems. With regard to draft resolution A/C.1/78/L.56, China has two main concerns.

First, China believes that the CCW is the proper venue for discussions on lethal autonomous weapons systems. Initiating new discussions in the General Assembly will have a negative impact on the existing process. I would like to point out that many countries have expressed the same position.

Secondly, the draft resolution overlooks the term “lethal” as a key factor, thereby confusing the term “lethal autonomous weapons systems” with the term “autonomous weapons systems”, which are two different concepts. Such confusion will only complicate issues and will not help with consensus-building.

As draft resolution A/C.1/78/L.56 fails to address those two concerns, China abstained in the voting on it.

Mr. Namekawa (Japan): With regard to draft resolution A/C.1/78/L.56, “Lethal autonomous weapons systems”, with the rapid development of technology, Japan recognizes the importance of the lethal autonomous weapons systems (LAWS) discussion. In that context, Japan welcomes the draft resolution, which was prepared under the leadership of Austria. In the current challenging security environment, Japan recognizes the increasing value of the Convention on Certain Conventional Weapons (CCW) as a multilateral regulatory framework for conventional weapons and international humanitarian law. While the discussion on lethal autonomous weapons systems may involve some sensitivities, it is important to build on the common recognition among stakeholders within the framework of the CCW. In that regard, Japan welcomes this year’s report of the Group of Governmental Experts (GGE) on Emerging Technologies in the Area of Lethal Autonomous Weapons systems (CCW/GGE.1/2023/2) and its substantive progress. It is meaningful that we have reached consensus that LAWS must not be used if they are incapable of being used in compliance with international humanitarian law.

In addition, Japan continues to believe that the draft articles on autonomous weapons systems, submitted by Australia, Canada, Japan, Poland, the Republic of Korea, the United Kingdom and the United States, will be one of the best foundations for further achievements in the GGE. We reiterate our belief that the GGE remains the most appropriate forum for international rule-making and hope that the November meeting of the high contracting parties to the CCW will adapt a mandate for 2024 to maintain and strengthen the GGE, while enabling substantial progress to be made next year. Japan will continue to participate constructively in discussions to clarify the normative and operational framework and international rule-making on LAWS. In conclusion, Japan hopes that the report of the Secretary-General to be prepared under draft resolution A/C.1/78/L.56 will provide new inputs to the ongoing discussions on LAWS in the framework of the CCW.

Mr. Göbel (Germany): The First Committee has just adopted draft resolution A/C.1/78/L.41, entitled “Through-life Conventional Ammunition Management”, which essentially serves as a vehicle to turn the global framework of through-life conventional ammunition management into a reality, as recommended in June by the open-ended working group to elaborate a set of political commitments as a new global framework that will address existing gaps in through-life ammunition management, which was established pursuant to General Assembly resolution 76/233. On behalf of my Government and our co-penholder, France, I would like to thank delegations for their constructive contributions to the process and I would like to take this opportunity to underline the significance of that decision, in particular from an arms control perspective.

The Chair: My apologies to the representative of Germany, but as the main sponsor of the draft resolution, you should refrain from explaining your own position on your own draft resolution.

Mr. Göbel (Germany): My statement is not intended as an explanation of vote but rather to underline what is, in our view, a very historic moment. I believe this is the first time in 10 years that the United Nations has successfully concluded a new instrument of conventional arms control, and therefore I consider it worthwhile to take a step back and reflect on that.

After more than three decades of deliberations on the issue of ammunition management, the orphan of conventional arms control has finally found a home under the rule of the United Nations. That is a tremendous achievement in our collective efforts to reduce the risks and human costs of the illicit trafficking and diversion of conventional ammunition, as well as to prevent and mitigate unplanned explosions at munitions sites. Today’s decision will save lives. Throughout the negotiation process, delegations have shown remarkable dedication and collaboration and a true spirit of multilateralism and compromise, which allowed the open-ended working group to reach a remarkable milestone without a vote. That should remind us that, even against the background of a challenging political environment, progress, compromise, goodwill and multilateral cooperation is possible when there is a political will to succeed.

The Global Framework for Through-life Conventional Ammunition Management is a collective

step forward in solidifying through-life conventional ammunition management as an issue of stand-alone concern and responses, which requires dedicated and sustained attention from the international community. It closes the gap of a dedicated regulatory instrument on conventional ammunition at the international level, while complementing and reinforcing relevant existing international and regional instruments on conventional arms control. The implementation of the Global Framework will make an essential contribution to countering the diversion of conventional ammunition, which continues to instigate and fuel armed violence, conflict and instability across the world. It will promote efforts to prevent unplanned explosions at munitions sites, which have caused devastating damage and destruction to communities, lives and the environment.

With the adoption by the First Committee of the Global Framework, the States Members of the United Nations have made a collective contribution to reducing the human cost of weapons and ammunition, saving lives and sparing the suffering of future generations. Collectively, working together and in the spirit of cooperation laid out by the Global Framework and shown by States in its elaboration, we must now take the necessary steps and implement our commitments. Let us collectively ensure that the elaboration and adoption of the Global Framework is not the end of our common journey but a crucial first step towards achieving through-life conventional ammunition security and safety for lasting peace and security and sustainable development.

Ms. Joniec (Poland): With regard to draft resolution A/C.1/78/L.56, on lethal autonomous weapons systems (LAWS), we strongly support the overarching affirmation contained in the draft resolution that international law, in particular international humanitarian law and the Charter of the United Nations, apply to autonomous weapons systems. It is crucial that we retain language that binds the topic of emerging technologies in the area of LAWS with the Group of Governmental Experts (GGE) on Emerging Technologies in the Area of Lethal Autonomous Weapons Systems in the framework of the Convention on Certain Conventional Weapons (CCW). The draft resolution does that in a satisfactory manner. At the same time, we consider the CCW as the most appropriate forum for discussions on LAWS. The GGE is where we should make progress in identifying challenges, as well as the opportunities, that emerging technologies offer. Other international forums are not

equally fit for that important topic. They often lack technical and diplomatic capacity and do not address the significant balance between humanitarian aspects and military necessity. We are looking forward to inclusive discussions in the GGE on its future mandate, including with respect to how we can apply the principles of international humanitarian law to autonomous weapons systems.

Mr. Belousov (Russian Federation) (*spoke in Russian*): Our delegation has requested the floor to explain its vote on draft resolution A/C.1/78/L.20, entitled “Implementation of the Convention on Cluster Munitions”. The Russian Federation respects the efforts of the proponents of and the parties to the Convention on Cluster Munitions to mitigate the adverse impact of the use of that type of weapon on the civilian population both during and after armed conflicts. Having said that, Russia’s position on that ambiguous document, which was hastily prepared outside the framework of the United Nations, remains unchanged. We did not participate in the drafting of the Convention on Cluster Munitions, since it was initially aimed at introducing discriminatory limitations that run counter to Russia’s defensive and security interests. The Convention merely declares a complete ban on cluster munitions, whereas in fact a line is being drawn to divide the market into so-called bad munitions, which are banned, and certain types of high-technology cluster munitions, which are allowed. Such an approach benefits a particular group of States producers of such weapons, and we see that as a manifestation of double standards. Moreover, another of the document’s shortcomings is that it allows all States, without any justification, to participate in the use of such munitions in military operations that are conducted jointly with States that have not acceded to the Convention.

The Convention has been further discredited this year — we refer to the ongoing pumping of cluster munitions into Ukraine. Such actions by the United States serve only to escalate the conflict and delay its resolution. As one of the major producers of those weapons, the United States is not only finding a new market for its military-industrial complex and reaping financial gains but also getting a chance to replace older weapons with high-technology cluster munitions in its national armed forces. Moreover, we have seen a steady increase in the number of incidents in which those weapons have been used against civilian objects and the civilian population, as confirmed as well by

non-governmental organizations. Despite the fact that Ukraine and the United States are not parties to the Convention on Cluster Munitions, they are subject to the imperative of international humanitarian law, which prohibits the use of any weapons against civilians and civilian objects. In that connection, we believe that the Russian Federation's accession to the Convention on Cluster Munitions is currently inadvisable. For all those reasons, my delegation voted against draft resolution A/C.1/78/L.20.

Mr. Wazima Szatmari (Brazil): Brazil abstained in the voting on draft resolution A/C.1/78/L.20, 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 negotiations in the framework of the Group of Governmental Experts for that Convention, 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 Oslo process. In our view, the establishment of a parallel negotiating process to the CCW was not consistent with the objective of strengthening the Convention or with the goal of promoting the adoption of a balanced, effective and non-discriminatory arms-control instrument. Brazil considers 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 those 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 of the CCW, including Protocol V on Explosive Remnants of War. Brazil is therefore committed to ensuring that any possible use of cluster munitions is in line with its obligations under applicable international humanitarian law.

With regard to draft resolution A/C.1/78/L.56, entitled "Lethal autonomous weapon systems", Brazil voted in favour of it on the understanding that the process carried out under the Group of Governmental Experts (GGE) on Emerging Technologies in the Area of Lethal Autonomous Weapons Systems of the CCW might benefit from fresher views coming from a wider

audience. Although discussions in Geneva are carried out under a so-called Group of Experts, it is indeed a process that operates, in practice, as an open-ended working group in whose deliberations not only States parties to the Convention but also observer States, the International Committee of the Red Cross and non-governmental organizations play an active part. Brazil had the privilege of presiding over the GGE for the sessions held in 2022 and 2023 and believes that good progress was achieved thanks to the active participation of many delegations — separately or in groups— that put together a wide array of proposals.

The notion of developing an arms control and humanitarian framework to regulate an emerging weapons system is a daunting one, with very few precedents. It is no surprise that the membership is divided as to the best pace for the deliberations. Those who believe that the innovations will outpace the legal, diplomatic discussions would prefer a more direct route towards a legally binding instrument. Others entertaining ambitions to develop those capabilities would prefer to understand better the possibilities of the systems before committing unequivocally to restrictive rules. In any event, it is no small achievement that, in the current challenging international climate, we were able to agree by consensus on a framework combining prohibitions and regulations, while fully respecting international humanitarian law and having in mind ethical perspectives. The question before us is clear: what is next? Without trying to be overly prescriptive, Brazil believes that we should wait for the deliberations in the November meeting of the CCW, under the able chairmanship of Argentina, before defining the upcoming mandate of the Group of Governmental Experts so that we are in a position to extract the full potential from the deliberations of that body.

Mr. Çetin (Türkiye): With regard to draft resolution A/C.1/78/L.56, entitled "Lethal autonomous weapon systems", my delegation abstained in the voting on the draft resolution and its related paragraphs as the final version of the draft resolution does not fully address some of our concerns. Türkiye believes that the development and use of lethal autonomous weapon systems (LAWS) that are not under meaningful human control are undesirable and are in conflict with international humanitarian law. The development, production and the use of LAWS, which by nature are indiscriminate, are already prohibited by the 1949 Geneva Convention. International humanitarian law

applies to lethal autonomous weapons, as it does to all weapons. Therefore, international law and international humanitarian law would be sufficient to alleviate concerns regarding the use of LAWS.

We believe that, given the extensive technical military and diplomatic expertise it entails, the Convention on Certain Conventional Weapons (CCW) is the right forum in which to address the matters related to emerging technologies and LAWS. Although we appreciate the amendments made to the draft resolution to emphasize the role of the CCW, we still see a risk of creating a parallel and competing process. Moreover, rapid technological developments make it more challenging to arrive at a universal definition. Even after years of debate, we have not agreed on a definition of LAWS. The draft resolution in various instances uses terms other than the term LAWS — a term that was agreed upon by consensus. The absence of shared terminology also raises questions about the way forward. Emerging technologies related to LAWS would likely be dual-use in nature, such as artificial intelligence, sensor technology, robotics, computer vision and even the Internet of Things.

It is of the utmost importance that our efforts should not hamper progress in our access to civilian research developments and the use of those technologies. We believe in the importance of considering the potential implications and impacts of emerging technologies on society and ensuring that they are developed and used responsibly, ethically and transparently. On the other hand, a legally binding document developed in the absence of an agreed definition would not serve its intended purpose and might be open to abuse. We believe that reaching an agreement on a working definition and relevant characteristics for LAWS will enable us to reach a consensus on the other subjects. We should follow a step-by-step approach and, on the basis of the 11 guiding principles adopted in 2019, give priority to a code of conduct, confidence-building measures and mechanisms in order to create a conducive environment to move forward.

Mr. Garcia Moré (Cuba) (*spoke in Spanish*): With regard to draft resolution A/C.1/78/L.41, entitled “Through-life conventional ammunition management”, we abstained in the vote on preambular paragraph 13 as we are not in favour of attempts to establish synergies between the Arms Trade Treaty and other instruments that, despite having universal acceptance, are different

in terms of their legal character, membership and ambit and the category of armaments that they regulate.

We voted in favour of draft resolution A/C.1/78/L.41 as a whole, which contains the new Global Framework for Through-life Conventional Ammunition Management agreed by the open-ended working group to elaborate a set of political commitments as a new global framework that will address existing gaps in through-life ammunition management. Our delegation supported the adoption of the Global Framework on the basis of our firm commitment to preventing and combating illicit trafficking in ammunition and in strict compliance with our relevant national legislation and international obligations. The considerations that we stated following the adoption of the document in that working group continue to hold true. The Global Framework contains voluntary political commitments, which, without prejudice to national legal systems, could be effective if they are implemented in good faith, bearing in mind the need to tailor them to the various national realities and the sovereign prerogatives of every State. We underline the importance of the guiding principle that is set out in the Global Framework, which reaffirms the legitimate right of every State to manufacture, acquire, stockpile, manage and transfer conventional ammunition for the purposes of its self-defence and security. We also underscore that it is the prerogative of every State to determine the needs of its military and security forces for conventional ammunition and equipment — a prerogative that extends to managing and determining national surpluses. The responsibility for the handling, storage, protection, seizure and destruction of conventional ammunition rests with States, whose task is to oversee the safe and proper management of such ammunition. Those national efforts can be complemented by bolstering the international cooperation and assistance needed to effectively prevent and tackle illicit trafficking in conventional ammunition.

The effectiveness of the Global Framework will depend to a large extent on preventing biased reinterpretations of the commitments that it reflects. For that reason, we stress that in our view it is essential to ensure that subjective or easily manipulated risk assessment criteria for transfers are not selectively applied with the aim of limiting, directly or indirectly, the legitimate right of States to acquire conventional ammunition for their security needs. The Cuban delegation would have preferred the Global Framework

to have been a more straightforward and concise document in terms of its structure and content, so that the annex, which does not set forth any agreed commitments, could have been dispensed with. We hope that that new Global Framework will lead to a more effective management of through-life conventional ammunition and that it will be an effective contribution to combating illicit trafficking in ammunition.

Ms. Jiamin Liu (Singapore): With regard to votes in favour of draft resolution A/C.1/78/L.39, entitled “Implementation of the Convention on the Prohibition of the Use, Stockpiling, Production and Transfer of Anti-Personnel Mines and on Their Destruction”, and draft resolution A/C.1/78/L.20, entitled “Implementation of the Convention on Cluster Munitions”, Singapore has a long-standing and clear position on those two draft resolutions. We have traditionally voted in favour of the draft resolution on the implementation of the Convention on the Prohibition of the Use, Stockpiling, Production and Transfer of Anti-Personnel Mines and on Their Destruction. We support all initiatives against the indiscriminate use of anti-personnel landmines. In May 1996, Singapore declared a two-year moratorium on the export of anti-personnel landmines without self-neutralizing mechanisms. In February 1998, Singapore expanded the moratorium to include all manner of anti-personnel landmines and extended the moratorium indefinitely. Singapore also voted in favour of the draft resolution on the implementation of the Convention on Cluster Munitions. Singapore supports initiatives against the indiscriminate use of cluster munitions, especially when directed at innocent civilians. It was for that reason that Singapore declared an indefinite moratorium on the export of cluster munitions in November 2008.

Singapore also supports the work of the two Conventions I mentioned by regularly attending the meetings of the States parties to those Conventions. For instance, we will be participating in the twenty-first meeting of States parties to the Anti-Personnel Mine Ban Convention to be held in November. At the same time, as a small State, Singapore firmly believes that the legitimate security concerns and the right to self-defence of any State cannot be disregarded. A blanket ban on all types of cluster munitions and anti-personnel landmines may therefore be counterproductive. Singapore has worked and will continue to work with the international community towards a comprehensive and durable solution that addresses humanitarian

concerns about the use of anti-personnel landmines and cluster munitions.

Mr. Sharoni (Israel): With regard to draft resolution A/C.1/78/L.56, on lethal autonomous weapons systems, Israel attaches great importance to the Convention on Certain Conventional Weapons (CCW) and recognizes its uniqueness as the main forum with the ability to strike the appropriate balance between military and humanitarian considerations. Such an approach is cardinal when we discuss lethal autonomous weapons systems (LAWS), and it renders the CCW’s achievements in that regard those with the greatest practical effects on the ground. With regard to LAWS, the progress that has been made in the framework of the CCW, especially this past year under the skilful leadership of Ambassador Damico, should be recognized, as well as the need for further in-depth discussion in the Group of Governmental Experts (GGE) on Emerging Technologies in the Area of Lethal Autonomous Weapons Systems, which could lead to tangible consensual outcomes. The constructive atmosphere of the discussion reaffirms our conviction that the CCW remains the most suitable forum for addressing the challenges and opportunities presented by emerging technologies in the area of LAWS. For those reasons, Israel believes that it is important to continue our deliberations with regard to LAWS in the CCW in a substantive and meaningful way, focusing on informed discussions that allow us to further our mutual understandings and to continue to examine the topics that have been raised to date. Israel calls for the important work done in the CCW not to be undermined by the creation of a parallel forum for that subject matter.

In addition, it is Israel’s position that any characterization of the topic must continue to focus on lethal autonomous weapons systems, as has been the focus of the GGE since the beginning. We know that if the element of lethality is removed, that would lead to a broadening of the debate in a manner that could overcomplicate our discussions and significantly slow down any progress we wish to make. We would also like to stress that international humanitarian law fully applies to lethal autonomous weapons systems and, in our view, is a sufficient legal framework for any future use of LAWS. And finally, considering the continuous evolution of the technology, it is important to recognize that our understanding and expectations of emerging technologies in the area of lethal autonomous weapons

systems can shift over time. Therefore, in order to conduct a serious and responsible discussion on LAWS, there is a need to approach the matter in a prudent and measured manner.

Finally, with regard to draft resolution A/C.1/78/L.40, entitled “The illicit trade in small arms and light weapons in all its aspects”, and draft resolution A/C.1/78/L.42, entitled “The Arms Trade Treaty”, Israel voted in favour of them. Nevertheless, Israel would like to reiterate its position on ammunition. We recall our statement that the United Nations Programme of Action to Prevent, Combat and Eradicate the Illicit Trade in Small Arms and Light Weapons in All Its Aspects does not contain a mandate on ammunition, for which another venue has been chosen — the new Global Framework for Through-life Conventional Ammunition Management.

Mr. Ray (India): With regard to India’s vote on draft resolution A/C.1/78/L.56 on lethal autonomous weapons systems, India believes that the Convention on Certain Conventional Weapons (CCW) is the appropriate forum to discuss issues relating to lethal autonomous weapons systems, with a view to striking a balance between military necessity and humanitarian imperatives. A substantial body of work has been done and continues to be done by the CCW’s Group of Governmental Experts on Emerging Technologies in the Area of Lethal Autonomous Weapons Systems. That work needs to be built upon in the direction of developing common understandings, particularly on definitions and on the characterization of lethal autonomous weapons systems. Broadening the scope of possible understandings at this stage beyond emerging technologies in the area of lethal autonomous weapons systems, with an emphasis on the term “lethal”, including by referencing concepts on which there is no agreement let alone consensus, such as regional stability, will not help that process. Parallel mandates and processes on lethal autonomous weapons systems also amount to a duplication of efforts and resources. India therefore voted against draft resolution A/C.1/78/L.56.

Mr. Al Ashkar (Syrian Arab Republic) (*spoke in Arabic*): With regard to draft resolutions A/C.1/78/L.41, entitled “Through-life conventional ammunition management”, since the start of the work of the open-ended working group to elaborate a set of political commitments as a new global framework that will address existing gaps in through-life ammunition management, my delegation has called for a focus on

establishing political commitments that would serve as guidelines, in line with the mandate of the open-ended working group. Although the draft text went beyond that, in a spirit of flexibility and compromise we engaged constructively in the negotiations to improve the text, with the aim of adding a more voluntary aspect to it and avoiding any linkage to non-consensual or non-universal frameworks and agreements. Again, although the text of the open-ended working group’s final report (see A/78/111) did not adequately address our main concerns, we nonetheless went along with it. During the open-ended working group’s deliberations, my delegation stressed that no measures should prejudice the exclusively national ownership of ammunition management and that any measures taken in that regard should be able to be implemented within the legal system of States. We emphasized the need to refrain from referring to specific types of ammunition in a way that exceeds the scope of the open-ended working group’s mandate.

My delegation reaffirms its position that it has reservations about terms with binding legal connotations. It expresses concern about concepts that are not based on international standards and about their misuse, including terms and mechanisms stemming from treaties that are not universal that could be used as obstacles or conditions that adversely affect the legitimate right of States to supply their needs of conventional ammunition, in accordance with Article 51 of the Charter of the United Nations. The wording of the draft resolution does not reflect a balanced text and has shortcomings, and the concerns and priorities were not taken into consideration. Therefore, my delegation abstained in the voting on draft resolution A/C.1/78/L.41.

With regard to draft resolution A/C.1/78/L.42, my delegation would like to reiterate that Syria attaches great importance to the regulation of the arms trade, given the dangers that it poses to international peace and security. An example of that is what my country has suffered as a result of the terrorist acts perpetrated by groups that managed to acquire all types of non-conventional weapons and ammunition with all kinds of military equipment.

In the Middle East, Israel continues to pursue an aggressive arms policy based on maintaining a huge arsenal of all types of conventional and non-conventional weapons, along with weapons of mass destruction, foremost of which are nuclear weapons.

My delegation has worked diligently and in good faith to achieve a genuine arms trade treaty that is not used to pressure only one group of countries, as is the case with other international instruments. Syria would never have been against the Arms Trade Treaty if it had been drafted in a duly consensual manner. Unfortunately, the Treaty has shortcomings that cannot be overlooked.

We are fully committed to the international obligations contained in the final document of the first special session of the General Assembly devoted to disarmament (resolution S-10/2) and to nuclear disarmament as a priority leading to general and complete disarmament. We stress that any arms control measures must be adopted by consensus or they will not achieve the desired objectives. Accordingly, my delegation abstained in the voting on draft resolution A/C.1/78/L.42. I emphasize that my delegation disassociates itself from all resolutions that contain a reference to the Arms Trade Treaty that have been or will subsequently be adopted by consensus in the First Committee.

The Chair: We have heard from the last speaker in explanation of vote after the voting on cluster 4, “Conventional weapons”. The Committee will now turn to cluster 5, “Other disarmament measures and international security”.

I shall give the floor to the delegations wishing to make either a general statement or to introduce a new or revised draft resolution under cluster 5, “Other disarmament measures and international security”.

Also, given the time left and the requests to exercise the right of reply at this meeting and given the provisions of rule 108 of the rules of procedure of the General Assembly, the Committee will proceed with the voting on the draft proposals contained in cluster 5 at 3 p.m. tomorrow afternoon, beginning our deliberations with explanations of vote before the voting.

I now give the floor to the representative of France to introduce draft resolution A/C.1/78/L.60/Rev.1.

Mrs. Petit (France) (*spoke in French*): France, Colombia and the United States have the honour to introduce to the First Committee draft resolution A/C.1/78/L.60/Rev.1 on the programme of action to advance responsible State behaviour in the use of information and communications technologies in the context of international security.

Last year, resolution 77/37 welcoming the proposal to establish a programme of action, received overwhelming support, with 156 votes in favour and co-sponsorship from a cross-regional group of 74 States, clearly demonstrating the common aspiration of the vast majority of States to promote peace, security and stability in cyberspace, through a permanent, inclusive and action-oriented mechanism.

This year’s draft resolution, submitted by France, Colombia and the United States is an important step forward, and is aimed at achieving the following objectives.

First, it is aimed at welcoming the work of the Open-ended Working Group (OEWG) on Security of and in the Use of Information and Communications Technologies 2021–2025, in particular its second annual progress report (see A/78/265), which refers to an agreement on common elements of a future mechanism for regular institutional dialogue, and calls for continued discussions on the scope, structure and content of the programme of action at the Working Group’s sixth, seventh and eighth sessions.

The second objective of the draft resolution is to reaffirm the agreed normative framework for promoting responsible State behaviour in cyberspace, which was developed iteratively by the six successive Groups of Governmental Experts (GGEs) and the first OEWG — the Open-ended Working Group on Developments in the Field of Information and Telecommunications in the Context of International Security — and endorsed by the General Assembly in a series of consensus resolutions, the most recent being resolution 76/19 adopted by consensus in 2021.

Thirdly, the draft resolution is aimed at supporting capacity-building to implement this consensual normative framework and bridge the digital divide.

Fourthly, the draft resolution is aimed at establishing a permanent, inclusive and action-oriented mechanism to build the capacity of States to implement this normative framework on a voluntary basis and, if necessary, to examine the need to elaborate additional standards or legally binding obligations. The mechanism will be put in place only after the conclusion of the OEWG in 2025 and before the end of 2026. This timetable guarantees a smooth transition. It avoids the creation of a parallel track and any duplication.

The draft resolution reaffirms the key role of the OEWG. Indeed, the scope, content, structure and modalities of the mechanism will be based on the group's consensus results. To reflect that dimension, operative paragraph 4 has been significantly modified to anchor discussions within the OEWG and avoid prejudging the substance of the future mechanism.

The text has evolved significantly to reflect comments made during open and transparent consultations. We were keen to adopt an inclusive and compromise-based approach to gain the broadest possible support and to ensure that our discussions on cybersecurity would continue in a way that benefits all States.

States have been discussing cybersecurity issues within the United Nations for 25 years now. In recent years, there has been considerable alignment in their calls to accelerate the shift to a more action-oriented approach, towards the implementation of the normative framework and cybercapacity-building, particularly for developing countries.

The proposal to establish this mechanism, within the United Nations, was introduced by France and a cross-regional group of States in 2020. It is now familiar to all States participating in the OEWG and features consistently in several consensus reports of the OEWGs and GGEs in 2021, 2022 and 2023, including those of the current OEWG.

Taking a decision now on the establishment of the future mechanism will ensure continuity in this essential work, especially since the precedent of the establishment of the Programme of Action to Prevent, Combat and Eradicate the Illicit Trade in Small Arms and Light Weapons in All Its Aspects, launched in 2001, required four years of preparatory work. We therefore encourage all States to support draft resolution A/C.1/78/L.60/Rev.1 and its operative paragraph 4.

The Chair: I now give the floor to the representative of Russian Federation to introduce draft resolution A/C.1/78/L.11.

Mr. Belousov (Russian Federation) (*spoke in Russian*): We would like to deliver a general statement and introduce once again draft resolution A/C.1/78L.11 on developments in the field of information and telecommunications in the context of international security.

The Russian Federation has consistently advocated the formation of a system of international information security on a sound legal basis, founded on the principles of sovereign equality of States and non-intervention in their internal affairs. We believe that only through the collective efforts of the entire international community can we ensure peace and stability in the global information space and effectively counter the entire range of existing and potential threats in this area.

To that end, every year for 25 years, we have submitted a draft resolution on the developments in the field of information and telecommunications in the context of international security. The aim of Russia's proposed draft resolution A/C.1/78/L.11 is to preserve the Open-ended Working Group (OEWG) on Security of and in the Use of Information and Communications Technologies 2021–2025 as the sole mechanism for decision-making on the security and in the use of information and communication technologies (ICTs) under United Nations auspices and to ensure strict fulfilment of its mandate, as set out in resolution 75/240. Our document states the need to take decisions on future regular institutional dialogue on ICT security on a genuinely universal basis. That is in the context of the existing OEWG. It also contains a request for the Secretary-General to prepare a report summarizing the opinions of all States about how they view the format for negotiations on information security upon the conclusion of the Group's mandate, in 2025. The draft resolution is unifying and non-politicized in nature. It is based on what was achieved previously in the OEWG, that is, the agreements, as well as General Assembly resolutions. It also complements and develops the draft decisions submitted by Singapore, which Russia fully supports, to endorse the Group's second annual reports.

Any attempt to present our initiative as undermining the work of the OEWG and its Chair are simply untenable. Those assertions are at odds with reality. If anything undermines the Group's work, it is the attempts to prejudice its outcomes and to pull apart ICT security issues into parallel and duplicative formats, a practice that runs counter to the interests of the majority of the international community.

In that context, we are concerned about steps taken by Western countries, which are publicly declaring their full support for the OEWG while promoting their own draft resolution on a programme of action aimed at replacing that group with an alternative format that is beneficial only for them. At the same time, they

are doing their utmost to counter the adoption of the Russian document that has been put to the vote. They are obviously doing that for purely political purposes. That includes one of its key preambular paragraphs, the third preambular paragraph, on the prevention of conflicts in the information space.

We regret that the agenda for international information security is becoming increasingly politicized every year. As is evident, we can certainly not be blamed for that. When decisions are made, it is important to rely on the long-term national security interests of States rather than being guided by short-term geopolitical circumstances. We encourage all Member States to support the Russian draft resolution A/C.1/78/L.11, both as a whole and, separately, its disputed paragraph.

A vote in favour of our draft resolution is a vote in support of the Open-ended Working Group as a unified negotiation mechanism for information security in the United Nations, which operates on the basis of the consensus principle, while ensuring that the interests of absolutely all States are taken into account. Now, as when the Group was created, it is important to rally to the defence of this mechanism, which is an asset for the entire international community.

The Chair: I now give the floor to the representative of the Republic of Korea to introduce draft resolution A/C.1/78/L.19.

Ms. Lee (Republic of Korea): I have the honour of taking the floor today to introduce draft resolution A/C.1/78/L.19, on youth, disarmament and non-proliferation.

As a strong champion of action 38 of the Secretary-General's Agenda for Disarmament, the Republic of Korea is proudly submitting this resolution for the third time in the First Committee. Considering that the original and fresh perspectives of youth can help spur greater diversity and ensure sustainability in the relevant discussions, we place great significance on the international community's joint efforts to empower, engage and educate youth in the field of disarmament and non-proliferation. The strong support and high hopes of the Member States on this initiative, we believe, have been duly expressed throughout the First Committee, including at the side event on youth and disarmament, held on 13 October.

This year's draft resolution contains a few minor and technical amendments, mainly to reflect the updated circumstances of the past two years. As this biannual resolution has been adopted by consensus since its inception in 2019, in the light of the inherently consensual nature of the texts, my delegation calls on all Member States to vote yes on the twelfth preambular paragraph and to adopt the draft resolution, as a whole, without a vote. It is this very spirit of consensus and cooperation, instead of division or politicization, that we wish to pass down to future generations. This draft resolution on youth serves as an invaluable opportunity to promote such culture amid this difficult time of heightened geopolitical tensions and conflict.

The fact that over 80 countries have already co-sponsored this draft resolution is yet another indicator that there is strong support for this crucial topic, one which deserves the international community's full support and unified engagement. I take this opportunity to express my delegation's sincere gratitude to the countries that have already co-sponsored this resolution and also encourage other States that have not yet done so to join us as new co-sponsors.

Ms. Romero López (Cuba) (*spoke in Spanish*): The delegation of Cuba would like to make a general statement under cluster 5, "Other disarmament measures and international security. We encourage all delegations to support the draft resolutions put forward by the Movement of Non-Aligned countries under this thematic group, namely, draft resolution A/C.1/78/L.4, entitled "Relationship between disarmament and development", draft resolution A/C.1/78/L.6, entitled "Observance of environmental norms in the drafting and implementation of agreements on disarmament and arms control", and draft resolution A/C.1/78/L.7, entitled "Promotion of multilateralism in the area of disarmament and non-proliferation. The delegation of Cuba also sponsored and will vote in favour of draft resolution A/C.1/78/L.11, entitled "Developments in the field of information and telecommunications in the context of international security". The draft text builds upon previous First Committee resolutions on the same issue, in the framework of 25 years of debates on this topic, under the auspices of the United Nations.

We express our steadfast support for the work of the Open-ended Working Group on Security of and in the Use of Information and Communications Technologies 2021–2025. That is the only inclusive and transparent process that Member States have for

considering, on an equal footing, any issue related to cybersecurity, including proposals on all aspects of the mandate entrusted to the Group, duly noting the views, concerns and legitimate interests of all States. We urge all delegations to vote in favour of draft resolution A/C.1/78/L.11, as well as its third preambular paragraph, for which a separate vote has been requested. This text promotes the use of information and communication technologies for peaceful purposes, with a view to contributing to a common future for humankind in order to benefit all States.

The Chair: I do not see anyone wishing to take the floor to make either the general statement or introduce the new revised draft resolutions.

I will now give the floor to those delegations wishing to exercise the right of reply.

I would like to first remind Members that statements in the exercise of the right of reply are limited to five minutes for the first intervention and three minutes for the second.

Mr. Turner (United States of America): I would like to take the floor briefly to respond to Russia's explanation of vote after the voting on draft resolution A/C.1/78/L.20, on cluster munitions, which contain several charges directed against the United States with respect to cluster munitions.

It is correct that the United States has transferred some cluster munitions to Ukraine. That is in order to help Ukraine defend itself against Russia's invasion of its territory. The United States has transferred those munitions with the understanding that Ukraine will respect international human law and international humanitarian law in their use. What the Russian Federation failed to say is that it itself is using cluster munitions in Ukraine and that it was the first to introduce such munitions in Ukraine and that it has repeatedly used cluster munitions in an indiscriminate manner, in violation of international humanitarian law. I would also note that Russia's use of cluster munitions has not been for defensive purposes in defence of its own territory, but for offensive purposes in pursuit of its aggression against Ukraine.

The Chair: Even though we have not fully exhausted our time for this meeting, for the reasons provided earlier and out of respect for the provisions of rule 128, we will conclude the work for today. The next meeting of the Committee will be held tomorrow afternoon, Thursday 2 November, at 3 p.m., in this conference room. We will continue to hear statements in explanation of vote before the voting for cluster 5 and take action on the remaining draft resolutions and decisions contained in informal paper 2/Rev.3.

The meeting rose at 12.40 p.m.