United Nations A/C.1/68/PV.25

General Assembly
Sixty-eighth session

Official Records

First Committee
25th meeting
Tuesday, 5 November 2013, 3 p.m.
New York

Chair: Mr. Dabbashi . . . . . (Libya)

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

Agenda items 89 to 107 (*continued*)

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

The Chair (*spoke in Arabic*): This afternoon, the Committee will continue to take action on all draft resolutions and decisions submitted under agenda items 89 to 107 by following the procedure used for action in previous meetings, which is summarized in the ground rules that have been distributed in this Conference Room. Today, we will take up the draft resolutions and decisions contained in document A/C.1/68/CRP.4, which has been circulated among delegations and which contains the drafts remaining from document A/C.1/68/CRP.3, as well as the last batch of draft proposals before the Committee. It is my intention that we conclude our work for the sixty-eighth session today. I count on the cooperation of all delegations in that regard.

The Committee will now turn to the draft resolutions and decisions listed under cluster 5, "Other disarmament measures and international security", as contained in document A/C.1/68/CRP.4. Before we proceed to take action on the draft resolutions, I shall first give the floor to delegations that wish to make general statements or to introduce draft resolutions under that cluster.

Mr. Lodding (Sweden): I have the honour to make the following general statement with regard to draft resolution A/C.1/68/L.37, entitled "Developments in the field of information and telecommunications in the context of international security". This statement is made on behalf of Austria, Belgium, Bulgaria, Chile, Croatia, the Czech Republic, Denmark, Estonia, Finland, France, Georgia, Germany, Hungary, Iceland, Ireland, Italy, Japan, Latvia, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Mexico, the Netherlands, New Zealand, Nigeria, Norway, Paraguay, Poland, Portugal, the Republic of Korea, Romania, Slovakia, Slovenia, Switzerland, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, the United Kingdom, the United States, Uruguay and my own country, Sweden. We join the consensus on draft resolution A/C.1/68/L.37. We would, however, like to stress some relevant aspects in that context.

One particularly noteworthy and recent development in that regard was the adoption, on 7 June, of the report by the Group of Governmental Experts on Developments in the Field of Information and Telecommunications in the Context of International security (see A/68/98). We welcome those efforts and the adoption by consensus of its report. The Group of Governmental Experts has made a significant contribution towards building an effective framework for international norms of responsible behaviour by States on the basis of existing international law and practical cooperative measures to address risks and misperceptions in cyberspace.

One fundamental point for our delegations regarding key features of the Internet is that is should remain open, thereby facilitating the free flow of information in cyberspace. For us, one principle is very basic: the same rights that individuals have offline must

13-54801 (E)

also be protected online — in particular the freedom of expression, including the freedom to seek and impart information, and the freedoms of assembly and of association. We therefore welcomed resolution 20/8 at the twentieth session of the Human Rights Council in 2012, which affirmed that basic understanding. We note that that resolution was adopted by consensus in the Human Rights Council, giving it a very broad cross-regional backing. While we would have preferred a direct reference to Human Rights Council resolution 20/8 in draft resolution A/C.1/68/L.37, we note the newly added reference to the importance of respect for human rights in the use of information and communications technologies (ICTs) as an important step in the right direction.

An open, free and secure Internet used for peaceful purposes is to essential economic, social and political development in the twenty-first century. The Internet has developed successfully without Government control. The bottom-up, innovation-driven approach to building the Internet has been key to its success and mirrors the distributed character of the underlying technology. Another fundamental position for our delegations is therefore that discussions with wider implications for the future of the Internet should be based on a multi-stakeholder approach that includes private-sector and civil-society actors.

Our societies' increasing dependence on information technology has brought with it new challenges. Security in an increasingly interconnected world will, to a great extent, revolve around protecting information flows and the integrity of critical ICT infrastructures. Cyberattacks, cyber espionage and cybercrime, as well as the lack of public awareness of the everyday aspects of cyber security, are realities in today's cyber domain, and those risks and vulnerabilities need to be addressed. That also implies challenges, as our traditional tools for addressing such risks have yet to adapt to the global and boundless nature of cyberspace.

It is clear, however, that efforts to counter threats to our freedom and security in cyberspace can be tackled effectively only through global cooperation among States, as well as with the private sector and civil society. In that regard, we welcome the reference made to the role of the private sector and civil society in the report of the Group of Governmental Experts on Developments in the Field of Information and Telecommunications in the Context of International Security. We emphasize the crucial importance of taking all the relevant stakeholders into account on an equal and appropriate footing while advancing that important work.

In addressing cyberchallenges, we must continue to engage in an international discussion on norms and principles of responsible State behaviour consistent with the affirmation by the recent report of the Group of Governmental Experts that international law is applicable in guiding State activities in cyberspace, while also underscoring the key role to be played by confidence-building and transparency measures.

In that regard, we strongly support the Group of Governmental Experts' affirmation that the application of norms relevant to the use of ICTs by States is an essential measure to reduce risks to international peace, security and stability. We also welcome the Group's recommendation on the need for further study of common understandings on how such norms shall apply to State behaviour and the use of ICTs by States.

The 2013 Group of Governmental Experts report underlines that voluntary confidence-building measures can promote trust and assurance among States and help reduce the risk of conflict by increasing predictability and reducing misperceptions. Such measures can make an important contribution to addressing the concerns of States over the use of ICTs by States and could be a significant step towards promoting international security. We support those recommendations and encourage further work along those lines, including in regional security and confidence-building frameworks.

We engage in these discussions on the basis that existing international law is applicable and that our universal values of human rights, democracy and the rule of law guide our deliberations on norms in cyberspace. We call for those crucial aspects to guide further work in the cyberarea, including in the context of addressing international security aspects of the use of ICTs in the format of the United Nations Group of Governmental Experts.

The Chair (*spoke in Arabic*): I now give the floor to the representataive of Trinidad and Tobago to introduce draft resolution A/C.1/68/L.7.

Ms. Roopnarine (Trinidad and Tobago): I have the honour to introduce draft resolution A/C.1/68/L.7, entitled "Women, disarmament, non-proliferation and arms control".

During the sixty-fifth session of the General Assembly, Trinidad and Tobago called on the international community to give consideration to the adoption of a draft resolution on women, disarmament, non-proliferation and arms control. In that year, resolution 65/69 was adopted by the First Committee and by the General Assembly by consensus.

When such a draft resolution was again put before the First Committee at the sixty-seventh session of the General Assembly, Trinidad and Tobago proposed stronger language on the role of women in disarmament, non-proliferation and arms control. After a series of informal consultations to ensure that the text represented a reasonable balance of the views and comments submitted by Member States, resolution 67/48 was adopted, again, by consensus.

During the present session of the First Committee, technical amendments were introduced to the text, and paragraph 2 was redrafted to welcome the report of the Secretary-General on measures taken by Member States to implement resolution 67/48, of 3 December 2012.

Like resolutions 65/69 and 67/48, the draft resolution contained in document A/C.1/68/L.7 has garnered the sponsorship of many delegations.

Moving forward, Trinidad and Tobago will continue to further strengthen the resolution on women, disarmament, non-proliferation and arms control in an effort to create greater awareness among members of the international community of the need to renew their efforts, among other things, to accord high priority to the equal representation of women in all decision-making processes, including matters related to disarmament, non-proliferation and arms control.

Finally, as in 2010 and 2012, Trinidad and Tobago requests that the draft resolution be adopted by consensus.

Mrs. Ledesma Hernández (Cuba) (*spoke in Spanish*): I would like to make a general statement on behalf of my delegation on draft resolution A/C.1/68/L.37, entitled "Developments in the field of information and telecommunications in the context of international security", which addresses issues of great relevance.

We believe that the hostile use of information and communications technology, either openly or covertly, to subvert legal and political order of countries is a violation of international norms and standards recognized in this area, which can generate tensions and undermine international peace and security, thereby undermining the purposes and principles enshrined in the Charter of the United Nations. Cuba fully shares the concern expressed in the draft resolution regarding the uses of information technology and media for purposes that are incompatible with international peace and security and have a negative impact on the integrity of States to the detriment of their security, in both civilian and military areas.

The draft resolution also puts appropriate emphasis on the importance of preventing the use of information resources or technologies for criminal or terrorist purposes. In that context, my delegation feels once again obliged to denounce the aggression via television and radio by the Government of the United States, which has targeted Cuba for several decades and violates the principles of international law and international standards in place regulating the radioelectric spectrum. That aggression has been carried out without consideration for the potential damage to international peace and security, thereby creating dangerous situations that include the use of a military aircraft to broadcast television signals to the country without the consent of the Republic of Cuba. As of the end of 2012, an average of 2,074.15 hours weekly of illegal and subversive broadcasts had been transmitted to Cuba from the territory of the United States, using approximately 34 frequencies. At the same time, television transmissions have continued from stations aboard United States vessels.

As has been pointed out on previous occasions, a number of those broadcasters are owned by or lend their services to organizations linked to known terrorist elements acting against Cuban interests from United States territory, transmitting programmes that foment sabotage, political attacks, assassination and other acts of radio-terrorism. The illegal radio and television broadcasts against Cuba also falsify and distort information in order to destabilize and subvert, affecting the normal functioning of telecommunications services and interfering to the detriment of services provided by various Cuban broadcasting stations. The Geneva World Radiocommunication Conference has repeatedly denounced those illegal anti-Cuban transmissions, pointing out that they run counter to radiocommunication regulations. Our country will continue to take every measure in its power to repel

such unacceptable and illegal acts of aggression and will continue to denounce them in every international forum and to demand that such violations end.

Moreover, we would like to point out that the potential benefits derived from the use of information and communications technologies for economic development, education, medicine and other areas relevant to modern society are unquestionably immense, but that at the same time their possible use for purposes that contravene the purposes and principles enshrined in the Charter of the United Nations, such as global espionage — and that infringe on human rights and on citizens' right to privacy and information — is, once again, a violation of the principle of State sovereignty and of international law, and therefore deserves to be denounced and rejected. We hope that draft resolution A/C.1/68/L.37 will receive the broad support of all delegations, as has been the case on previous occasions.

If I may, my delegation would also like to make a general statement on other draft resolutions within the same thematic cluster.

I should now like to make a general statement on the draft resolutions introduced by the representative of Indonesia on behalf of the Non-Aligned Movement under this cluster, addressing various issues that are highly relevant not only for States members of the Movement but also for the international community as a whole. Those draft resolutions are A/C.1/68/L.14, entitled "Observance of environmental norms in the drafting and implementation of agreements on disarmament and arms control"; A/C.1/68/L.17, "Promotion of multilateralism in the area of disarmament and non-proliferation"; and A/C.1/68/L.15, entitled "Relationship between disarmament and development".

We believe that full attention should be paid to the relevant environmental standards when negotiating treaties and conventions on disarmament and arms control in international disarmament forums, as stipulated in draft resolution A/C.1/68/L.14. In that regard, all States should contribute to ensuring compliance with those standards when implementing treaties and conventions to which they are parties.

The complex international situation and the importance of working together in order to address the various problems that beset humankind underscore the importance of draft resolution A/C.1/68/L.17, which deals with multilateralism in the areas of disarmament and non-proliferation. We believe the text makes a significant contribution to the debates and the quest for effective and lasting multilateral solutions in the field.

With regard to draft resolution A/C.1/68/L.15, dealing with the relationship between disarmament and development, my delegation feels it is extremely important to reiterate that those are two sides of the same coin — two challenges that humankind must tackle. We insist that it is unacceptable that $1.75 trillion annually is devoted to military expenditure when it could be used to combat extreme poverty and promote development among all nations. Finally, we would like to reiterate the proposal to establish a fund to be managed by the United Nations that would receive a sum equal to at least half the current total of military expenditure in order to address the economic and social development requirements of countries in need.

We urge all delegations to support the proposals submitted by the Non-Aligned Movement under this cluster and trust they will receive the support of the overwhelming majority of Member States, as has been the case on previous occasions.

The Chair (*spoke in Arabic*): Before giving the floor to the next speaker, I would like once again to remind the Committee that we would like to conclude our work today. I therefore ask delegations to be as brief as possible.

Mr. Toro-Carnevali (Bolivarian Republic of Venezuela) (*spoke in Spanish*): I would like to make a general statement on draft resolution A/C.1/68/L.37, entitled "Developments in the field of information and telecommunications in the context of international security".

We would like to highlight the importance of improving the security of information and telecommunications networks at the international level in order to make it possible to ensure the sovereignty of States and the privacy of citizens. I should like to draw the attention of all here present to an article published in *The New York Times* on Sunday, which reveals that Venezuela was one of the six countries most spied on by the Government of the United States, and by its National Security Agency in particular. I would like to quote a document issued by the National Security Agency that was revealed in the *Times* article, outlining the reasons for which Venezuela was singled out as one of those six countries.

(*spoke in English*)

> "F. MISSION: Venezuela: Enabling policymakers in preventing Venezuela from achieving its regional leadership objectives and pursuing policies that negatively impact U.S. global interests.
>
> "Focus Areas: Provide U.S. decision makers with a holistic SIGINT perspective of regional trends and developments, assessing and/or predicting strategic direction, plans, intentions and capabilities that impact U.S. interests. Assess Venezuela's foreign policy trends and leadership intentions that impact U.S. interests or degrade U.S. influence. Assess Chavez' progress in his initiatives to pursue regional power objectives in the political, economic, energy and ideological arenas. Provide indicators of regime stability, particularly in the energy sector." (*The New York Times, 2 November 2013*)

(*spoke in Spanish*)

With that, I would simply like to draw attention to the expansion of the international espionage campaign and to draw attention to the pertinence of that behaviour with regard to friendly relations among nations.

The Chair (*spoke in Arabic*): I shall now give the floor to delegations that wish to speak in explanation of vote or position before taking action on the draft resolutions.

Ms. Crittenberger (United States of America): I have asked for the floor in order to explain our position on A/C.1/68/L.37, entitled "Developments in the field of information and telecommunications in the context of international security".

I am speaking today on behalf of Italy, Japan and my own delegation, the United States. Our delegations will join the consensus and support the draft resolution before the Committee. However, we were disappointed to see the programme budget implications based on a group of governmental experts made up of 20 experts, with a cost nearly twice that made by the previous group. During informal consultations, we made it clear that we did not support a group of governmental experts larger than the standard size of 15. The projection of a group comprising 20 experts is not consistent with the normal practice, according to which such groups are typically set at 15 experts, unless otherwise specified in the resolution establishing the group.

In addition, based on our experience of the work of the past group of governmental experts on this topic, we believe that a group with 15 experts would be the most conducive to efficient and effective work on this topic. While our delegations support a future group of governmental experts on this important topic, we do not support a group of 20 experts conducted within the current budget cycle. We also urge more timely sharing of cost information so that delegations do not receive important information such as this very late in negotiations.

While I have the floor, I would like to speak in my national capacity to explain my delegation's position on draft resolutions A/C.1/68/L.14 and A/C.1/68/L.15.

With respect to draft resolution A/C.1/68/L.14, entitled "Observance of environmental norms in the drafting and implementation of agreements on disarmament and arms control", the United States will not participate in the action. We operate under stringent domestic environmental impact regulations for many activities, including the implementation of arms control and disarmament agreements. We see no direct connection, however, as stated in this draft resolution, between general environmental standards and multilateral arms control, and do not consider this a matter germane to the First Committee. Consequently, we will not participate in action on this draft resolution.

Regarding draft resolution A/C.1/68/L.15, entitled "Relationship between disarmament and development", the United States will also not participate in the Committee's action. Our delegation believes that disarmament and development are two distinct issues. Accordingly, we do not consider ourselves bound by the Final Document of the International Conference on the Relationship between Disarmament and Development, adopted on 11 September 1987.

Mr. Juneau (Canada): I would like to take this opportunity to make an explanation of position with regard to draft resolution A/C.1./68/L.37, entitled "Developments in the field of information and telecommunications in the context of international security".

Canada supports the draft resolution. We recognize the importance of international cooperation in maintaining international stability and security with respect to the use of information and telecommunication technologies. We also associate ourselves with the explanation of position delivered by the representative of Sweden.

Canada is deeply concerned, however, that some Governments fear free expression, that they fear the impact of new ideas and thinking and that, at the heart of it, they fear their own citizens. We reject the notion that the control of information that flows over the Internet is necessary for State security. The freedom of opinion and expression is not a source of insecurity; it is what keeps democracy secure. That is why we insist on a free, open and secure Internet. States must not see security as a pretext for repression. Everyone should be guaranteed the freedom to express themselves and access information and ideas, regardless of frontiers, through any media of choice, including online. States are obliged to respect those fundamental principles, and we should all hold them to account when they do not.

While we support the draft resolution, we know that it creates programme budget implications. Canada has consistently stressed budget discipline at the United Nations. Therefore, the objectives of the draft resolution should be achieved by working within existing budgets.

The Chair (*spoke in Arabic*): The Committee will now take up the draft resolutions and decision under cluster 5, entitled "Other disarmament measures and international security".

(*spoke in English*)

The Committee will now proceed to take action on draft resolution A/C.1/68/L.7, entitled "Women, disarmament, non-proliferation and arms control".

I give the floor to the Secretary of the Committee.

Mr. Nakano (Secretary of the Committee): Draft resolution A/C.1/68/L.7 was just introduced by the representative of Trinidad and Tobago. The sponsors of the draft resolution are listed in A/C.1/68/L.7 and A/C.1/68/CRP.4/Rev.5. In addition, Micronesia has become a sponsor.

The Chair: The sponsors of draft resolution A/C.1/678/L.7 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.1/68/L.7 was adopted.

The Chair: The Committee will now proceed to take action on draft decision A/C.1/68/L.12, entitled "Review of the implementation of the Declaration on the Strengthening of International Security".

I give the floor to the Secretary of the Committee.

Mr. Nakano (Secretary of the Committee): Draft decision A/C.1/68/L.12 was submitted by the representative of Indonesia on behalf of the States Members of the United Nations that are members of the Movement of Non-Aligned Countries. The sponsors of the draft decision are listed in document A/C.1/68/L.12.

The Chair: The sponsors of draft decision A/C.1/68/L.12 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 decision A/C.1/68/L.12 was adopted.

The Chair: The Committee will now proceed to take action on draft resolution A/C.1/68/L.14, entitled "Observance of environmental norms in the drafting and implementation of agreements on disarmament and arms control".

I give the floor to the Secretary of the Committee.

Mr. Nakano (Secretary of the Committee): Draft resolution A/C.1/68/L.14 was introduced by the representative of Indonesia on behalf of the States Members of the United Nations that are members of the Movement of Non-Aligned Countries, at the Committee's 20th meeting, on 30 October. The sponsors of the draft resolution are listed in document A/C.1/68/L.14.

The Chair: The sponsors of draft resolution A/C.1/68/L.14 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.1/68/L.14 was adopted.

The Chair: The Committee will now proceed to take action on draft resolution A/C.1/68/L.15, entitled "Relationship between disarmament and development".

I give the floor to the Secretary of the Committee.

Mr. Nakano (Secretary of the Committee): Draft resolution A/C.1/68/L.15 was introduced by the representative of Indonesia on behalf of the States Members of the United Nations that are members of the Movement of Non-Aligned Countries, at the Committee's 20th meeting, on 30 October. The sponsors of the draft resolution are listed in document A/C.1/68/L.15.

The Chair: The sponsors of draft resolution A/C.1/68/L.15 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.1/68/L.15 was adopted.

The Chair: The Committee will now proceed to take action on draft resolution A/C.1/68/L.17, entitled "Promotion of multilateralism in the area of disarmament and non-proliferation."

I give the floor to the Secretary of the Committee.

Mr. Nakano (Secretary of the Committee): Draft resolution A/C.1/68/L.17 was introduced by the representative of Indonesia on behalf of States Members of the United Nations that are members of the Movement of Non-Aligned of Countries, at the Committee's 20th meeting, on 30 October. The sponsors of the draft resolution are listed in documents A/C.1/68/L.17 and A/C.1/68/CRP.4/Rev.5.

The Chair: A recorded vote has been requested.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour:

Afghanistan, Algeria, Angola, Argentina, Azerbaijan, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belarus, Belize, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia (Plurinational State of), Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Burkina Faso, Cabo Verde, Cambodia, Cameroon, Chile, China, Colombia, Congo, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Cuba, Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Djibouti, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Equatorial Guinea, Ethiopia, Fiji, Gabon, Gambia, Ghana, Grenada, Guatemala, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Haiti, Honduras, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Jamaica, Jordan, Kazakhstan, Kenya, Kuwait, Kyrgyzstan, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lebanon, Lesotho, Liberia, Libya, Madagascar, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Marshall Islands, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Myanmar, Namibia, Nepal, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Qatar, Russian Federation, Rwanda, Saint Kitts and Nevis, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Serbia, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Solomon Islands, South Africa, South Sudan, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Swaziland, Syrian Arab Republic, Tajikistan, Thailand, Timor-Leste, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkmenistan, Tuvalu, Uganda, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Tanzania, Uruguay, Uzbekistan, Vanuatu, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of), Viet Nam, Yemen, Zambia, Zimbabwe

Against:

Israel, Micronesia (Federated States of), Palau, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America

Abstaining:

Albania, Andorra, Armenia, Australia, Austria, Belgium, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Bulgaria, Canada, Croatia, Cyprus, Czech Republic, Denmark, Estonia, Finland, France, Georgia, Germany, Greece, Hungary, Iceland, Ireland, Italy, Japan, Latvia, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Malta, Monaco, Montenegro, Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway, Poland, Portugal, Republic of Korea, Republic of Moldova, Romania, Samoa, San Marino, Slovakia, Slovenia, Spain, Sweden, Switzerland, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Tonga, Turkey, Ukraine

Draft resolution A/C.1/68/L.17 was adopted by 123 to 5, with 50 abstentions.

The Chair: The Committee will now proceed to take action on draft resolution A/C.1/68/L.37, entitled "Developments in the field of information and telecommunications in the context of international security".

I give the floor to the Secretary of the Committee.

Mr. Nakano (Secretary of the Committee): Draft resolution A/C.1/68/L.37, entitled "Developments in the field of information and telecommunications in the context of international security", was introduced by the representative of the Russian Federation at the Committee's 21st meeting, on 30 October. The sponsors of the draft resolution are listed in documents A/C.1/68/L.37 and A/C.1/68/CRP.4/Rev.5. A statement on the programme budget implications of the draft resolution has been issued as document A/C.1/68/L.54 and placed on QuickFirst.

The Chair: The sponsor of the draft resolution has 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.1/68/L.37 was adopted.

The Chair (*spoke in Arabic*): I shall now give the floor to delegations that wish to explain their votes or positions following the adoption of the draft resolutions and decision.

Mr. Hashmi (Pakistan): I take the floor to explain my country's position with regard to the draft resolution just adopted contained in document A/C.1/68/L.37, entitled "Developments in the field of information and telecommunications in the context of international security".

The three groups of governmental experts established under the auspices of the United Nations have adequately framed the issues and challenges linked to the use of information and communications technologies (ICTs). We welcome the consensus report of the latest Group (see A/68/98) and take note of its assessment, conclusions and recommendations. The misuse and unregulated use of ICTs could lead to serious implications for international peace and security in the event of a cyberattack launched against critical infrastructure, such as electricity grids, the disruption of satellites, weather forecasting and so on. In that context, the hostile use of cybertechnologies can indeed be characterized as a weapon of mass destruction and disruption.

Since the proliferation of such technologies is inevitable, it is both useful and essential to regulate their use sooner rather than later. However, in evolving responses to the potential challenges in cyberspace, it is essential to take on board the range of uses and ideas from across regions. The previous composition of groups of governmental experts does not engender much confidence in that context. To ensure the required level of ownership of the products of such groups among the general membership, the composition of future groups needs to be expanded and diversified in strict conformity with the principle of equitable geographic representation. Current financial limitations should not disenfranchise States that have not yet participated in groups of governmental experts and that can make a useful contribution to the work of such groups.

Mr. Seifi Pargou (Islamic Republic of Iran): My delegation joined the consensus in adopting the draft resolution on women, disarmament, non-proliferation and arms control, as contained in document A/C.1/68/L.7. However, for the record, we would like to say that that draft resolution is acceptable to my delegation only in as much as it is in line with our Constitution, laws, regulations and administrative procedures.

Mr. Simon-Michel (France) (*spoke in French*): I would like to make an explanation of position on behalf of the United Kingdom and my own country, France, in connection with draft resolution A/C.1/68/L.15, entitled "Relationship between disarmament and development".

The United Kingdom and France have joined the consensus on the draft resolution. We support the mainstreaming of disarmament issues into development policies, in particular in the field of conventional weapons, small arms and light weapons as well as disarmament, demobilization and reintegration. However, we feel it is necessary to make our position clear on other aspects of the text.

We find the notion of a symbiotic relationship between disarmament and development questionable, as the conditions that could lead to disarmament are not necessarily dependent only on development, as we have seen with the growing military expenditure of some developing countries. There is no automatic link between the two but, rather, a complex relationship, which this notion does not capture accurately. Moreover, the idea that military expenditure diverts from funding for development requirements needs to be nuanced, inasmuch as defence investments are also necessary for peacekeeping, improving natural-disaster response with airborne and maritime equipment and, under certain conditions, improving stability.

Finally, we consider that the report of the Group of Governmental Experts (see A/68/98) did not give sufficient credit to unilateral, bilateral and multilateral actions in the area of disarmament and non-proliferation.

I should also like to make an explanation of position, also on behalf of the United Kingdom and France, in connection with draft resolution A/C.1/68/L.14, entitled "Observance of environmental norms in the drafting and implementation of agreements on disarmament and arms control." Our countries joined the consensus on the draft resolution. We would like to make it clear that our countries operate under strict domestic environmental impact regulations for many activities, including the implementation of arms control and disarmament agreements. We see no direct link, such as that set out in the draft resolution, between general environmental standards and multilateral arms control.

The Chair (*spoke in Arabic*): We will now turn to the draft resolutions under cluster 6, entitled "Regional disarmament and security," as outlined in A/C.1/68/CRP.4.

I shall first give the floor to delegations that wish to make general statements or to introduce draft resolutions.

I give the floor to the representative of Rwanda to introduce draft resolution A/C.1/68/L.53/Rev.1.

Mr. Bagabo (Rwanda): The Rwandan delegation takes the floor in its capacity as the current Chair of the Standing Advisory Committee on Security Questions in Central Africa and on behalf of its following Member States: Angola, Burundi, Cameroon, Chad, the Central African Republic, the Democratic Republic of the Congo, Gabon, Equatorial Guinea, the Republic of the Congo and Sao Tome and Principe.

My delegation would again like to express its appreciation to the Chair of the First Committee, as well as to its secretariat, for their assistance and cooperation prior to the introduction of draft resolution A/C.1/68/L.53/Rev.1, entitled "Regional confidence-building measures: activities of the United Nations Standing Advisory Committee on Security Questions in Central Africa".

Beyond classic disarmament, the draft resolution — put forward by Rwanda in its capacity as Chair of the Standing Advisory Committee — addresses two new security threats that have reached very alarming proportions in recent years. Those issues are maritime piracy in the Gulf of Guinea and poaching, especially in Cameroon, the Central African Republic, Chad and Gabon. In that context, the draft resolution welcomes the adoption of the Code of Conduct concerning the Prevention and Repression of Piracy, Armed Robbery against Ships, and Illegal Maritime Activities in West and Central Africa, as well as the decision to establish an interregional coordination centre in Cameroon that will be responsible for coordinating the implementation of the regional strategy.

It is worth mentioning that another new threat in the region is caused by poachers, as well as armed groups that use sophisticated weapons acquired through the income generated from the illegal trade of ivory. That is why this practice remains a serious security threat to the Central African region. To illustrate how alarming the phenomenon of poaching is, at the thirty-sixth ministerial meeting of the Standing Advisory Committee, held in Kigali this year, the delegation of Gabon revealed that in the past 10 years the Central African region had lost 70 per cent of its elephants, with Gabon as the most affected country, with 30 per cent of its elephants having been killed during that period.

In Central Africa, however, despite remarkable political will and determination, the lack of a regional legally binding framework to combat the proliferation of small arms and light weapons has delayed plans for civilian disarmament. In that regard, the entry into force of the Central African Convention for the Control of Small Arms and Light Weapons, also known as the Kinshasa Convention, remains a priority.

In view of the critical issues that the draft resolution intends to address, we would like to appeal to Member States to adopt it, as it will greatly and positively impact the security situation in Central Africa.

My delegation would like to make an oral revision to paragraph 7: to add "including" before "through the United Nations Regional Centre for Central Africa."

The Chair (*spoke in Arabic*): I now give the floor to the representative of Indonesia to introduce draft resolution A/C.1/68/L.13.

Mr. Primasto (Indonesia): I am pleased to speak on behalf of the Non-Aligned Movement. Once again this year, the Non-Aligned Movement would like to introduce a draft resolution entitled "Implementation of the Declaration of the Indian Ocean as a Zone of Peace," as contained in document A/C.1/68/L.13.

The draft resolution reiterates the importance of the participation of all permanent members of the Security Council and the major maritime users of the Indian Ocean in the work of the Ad Hoc Committee on the Indian Ocean. The Movement believes that such participation would be important in facilitating the progress of a mutually beneficial dialogue to develop conditions of peace, security and stability in the Indian Ocean. In that regard, the Movement seeks the support of all Member States in voting in favour of the draft resolution.

The Chair (*spoke in Arabic*): We will now take action on the draft resolutions under cluster 6.

(*spoke in English*)

The Committee will first take action on draft resolution A/C.1/68/L.13, entitled "Implementation of the Declaration of the Indian Ocean as a Zone of Peace."

I give the floor to the Secretary of the Committee.

Mr. Nakano (Secretary of the Committee): Draft resolution A/C.1/68/L.13 has just been introduced by the representative of Indonesia on behalf of the States Members of the United Nations that are members of the Movement of Non-Aligned Countries. The sponsors of the draft resolution are listed in document A/C.1/68/L.13.

The Chair: A recorded vote has been requested.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour:

Afghanistan, Algeria, Angola, Antigua and Barbuda, Argentina, Armenia, Australia, Azerbaijan, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belarus, Belize, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia (Plurinational State of), Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Burkina Faso, Cabo Verde, Cambodia, Cameroon, Chile, China, Colombia, Congo, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Cuba, Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Djibouti, Dominican Republic, Egypt, El Salvador, Equatorial Guinea, Eritrea, Ethiopia, Fiji, Gambia, Ghana, Grenada, Guatemala, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Haiti, Honduras, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Kazakhstan, Kenya, Kuwait, Kyrgyzstan, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lebanon, Lesotho, Liberia, Libya, Madagascar, Malawi, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Myanmar, Namibia, Nepal, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Qatar, Republic of Korea, Russian Federation, Rwanda, Saint Kitts and Nevis, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, Samoa, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Solomon Islands, South Africa, South Sudan, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Swaziland, Syrian Arab Republic, Tajikistan, Thailand, Timor-Leste, Togo, Tonga, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkmenistan, Uganda, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Tanzania, Uruguay, Uzbekistan, Vanuatu, Viet Nam, Yemen, Zambia, Zimbabwe

Against:

France, Israel, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America

Abstaining:

Albania, Andorra, Austria, Belgium, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Bulgaria, Canada, Croatia, Cyprus, Czech Republic, Denmark, Estonia, Finland, Georgia, Germany, Greece, Hungary, Iceland, Ireland, Italy, Latvia, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Malta, Micronesia (Federated States of), Monaco, Montenegro, Netherlands, Norway, Palau, Poland, Portugal, Republic of Moldova, Romania, San Marino, Serbia, Slovakia, Slovenia, Spain, Sweden, Switzerland, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Turkey, Ukraine

Draft resolution A/C.1/68/L.13 was adopted by 127 votes to 4, with 45 abstentions.

The Chair: The Committee will now proceed to take action on draft resolution A/C.1/68/L.53/Rev.1, entitled "Regional confidence-building measures: activities of the United Nations Standing Advisory Committee on Security Questions in Central Africa."

I give the floor to the Secretary of the Committee.

Mr. Nakano (Secretary of the Committee): Draft resolution A/C.1/68/L.53/Rev.1 was just introduced and orally revised by the representative of Rwanda. The last three lines of paragraph 7 should read as follows:

"and requests the Secretary-General to support the implementation of the outcomes of the Summit, including through the United Nations Regional Office for Central Africa".

The sponsor of the draft resolution is listed in document A/C.1/68/L.53/Rev.1.

The Chair: The sponsor of the draft resolution has 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.1/68/L.53/Rev.1, as orally revised, was adopted.

The Chair (*spoke in Arabic*): The Committee will now turn to the draft resolutions listed under cluster 7, entitled "Disarmament machinery".

I shall first give the floor to delegations that wish to make general statements or to introduce draft resolutions.

I give the floor to the representative of Indonesia to introduce draft resolution A/C.1/68/L.16.

Mr. Primasto (Indonesia): I am pleased once again to speak on behalf of the Non-Aligned Movement. Again this year, the Movement would like to introduce the draft resolution entitled "United Nations regional centres for peace and disarmament", as contained in document A/C.1/68/L.16.

The draft resolution reiterates the importance of United Nations activities at the regional level to advance disarmament and to increase the stability and security of its Member States, which could be promoted in a substantive manner by the maintenance and revitalization of the three regional centres for peace and disarmament. The draft resolution also reaffirms that, in order to achieve positive results in that regard, the three regional centres should carry out dissemination and educational programmes that promote regional peace and security and that are aimed at changing basic attitudes with respect to peace, security and disarmament so as to support the achievement of the purposes and principles of the United Nations.

The Movement would like the draft resolution to be adopted without a vote once again.

Mrs. Ledesma Hernández (Cuba) (*spoke in Spanish*): On behalf of my delegation, I would like to make a general statement with regard to draft resolution A/C.1/68/L.33/Rev.1, entitled "United Nations Regional Centre for Peace, Disarmament and Development in Latin America and the Caribbean".

Cuba recognizes the work and supports the revitalization of the regional centres for peace and disarmament. In particular, we support the role played by the United Nations Regional Centre for Peace, Disarmament and Development in Latin America and the Caribbean. We underscore the work it has carried out for many years in promoting its three areas of competency, namely, disarmament, development and peace. Likewise, we recognize that many States of the region have benefited from assistance provided by the Centre.

Paragraph 6 of the draft resolution encourages the Regional Centre to further develop activities in all countries of the region in the important areas of peace, disarmament and development and to provide, upon request and in accordance with its mandate, support to Member States of the region in the national implementation of the relevant instruments, inter alia, the Programme of Action to Prevent, Combat and Eradicate the Illicit Trade in Small Arms and Light Weapons in All Its Aspects and the Arms Trade Treaty. We would like to put on record that we do not entirely share the interests or positions that have been expressed here regarding the Arms Trade Treaty.

In response to a call by the countries of the region on this matter, our delegation will join in the consensus adoption of the draft resolution. As we have said previously, we believe that the Arms Trade Treaty contains a number of ambiguities, inconsistencies, imprecise definitions and legal loopholes. It is an imbalanced instrument that favours the interests of weapon-exporting countries, for which it establishes privileges that run counter to the legitimate interests of all other States, including interests in the spheres of national defence and security. It promotes the interests of specific exporting States over the humanitarian suffering caused by the unregulated trafficking in arms.

We hope that the Regional Centre will continue to focus its work on the priority areas that have been entrusted to it, that is, peace, disarmament and development.

The Chair (*spoke in Arabic*): The Committee will now proceed to take action on the draft resolutions listed under cluster 7, entitled "Disarmament machinery".

(*spoke in English*)

We will first take action on draft resolution A/C.1/68/L.16, entitled "United Nations regional centres for peace and disarmament".

I give the floor to the Secretary of the Committee.

Mr. Nakano (Secretary of the Committee): Draft resolution A/C.1/68/L.16, entitled "United Nations regional centres for peace and disarmament", was just introduced by the representative of Indonesia on behalf of the States Members of the United Nations that are members of the Movement of Non-Aligned Countries. The sponsors of the draft resolution are listed in documents A/C.1/68/L.16 and A/C.1/68/CRP.4/Rev.5.

With the permission of the Chair, I would like to put on the record the following oral statement in accordance with rule 153 of the rules of procedure of the General Assembly.

Under the terms of paragraph 5 of draft resolution A/C.1/68/L.16, the General Assembly would request

> "the Secretary-General to provide all support necessary, within existing resources, to the regional centres in carrying out their programmes of activities".

The implementation of that request would be carried out within the resources provided under section 4, "Disarmament", of the programme budget for the biennium 2014-2015. The provision contained therein covers the three Director posts, at the P-5 level, the three Political Affairs Officers, at the P-3 level, and three General Service Administrative Assistants, at the GS-7 level, of the Regional Centres, and also includes general operating costs of the Centres. The programmes of activities of the three regional centres would continue to be financed from extrabudgetary resources.

Accordingly, should the General Assembly adopt draft resolution A/C.1/68/L.16, no additional requirements would arise under the programme budget for the biennium 2014-2015.

The attention of the Committee is also drawn to the provisions of section VI of resolution 45/248 B, of 21 December 1990, and subsequent resolutions, the most recent of which is resolution 67/246, of 24 December 2012, in which the Assembly reaffirmed that the Fifth Committee was the appropriate Main Committee of the General Assembly entrusted with responsibilities for administrative and budgetary matters and reaffirmed the role of the Advisory Committee on Administrative and Budgetary Questions.

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

Draft resolution A/C.1/68/L.16 was adopted.

The Chair: The Committee will now proceed to take action on draft resolution A/C.1/68/L.33/Rev.1, entitled "United Nations Regional Centre for Peace, Disarmament and Development in Latin America and the Caribbean".

I give the floor to the Secretary of the Committee.

Mr. Nakano (Secretary of the Committee): Draft resolution A/C.1/86/L.33/Rev.1 was introduced by the representative of Peru at the Committee's 15th meeting, on 23 October. The sponsors of the draft resolution are listed in document A/C.1/68/L.33/Rev.1 and A/C.1/68/CRP.4/Rev.5.

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.1/68/L.33/Rev.1 was adopted.

The Chair (*spoke in Arabic*): The Committee will now proceed to to take action on the draft resolutions listed under cluster 1, entitled "Nuclear weapons", as contained in informal paper 4.

(*spoke in English*)

The Committee will now take action on draft resolution A/C.1/68/L.26, entitled "Follow-up to the advisory opinion of the International Court of Justice on the legality of the threat or use of nuclear weapons".

I give the floor to the Secretary of the Committee.

Mr. Nakano (Secretary of the Committee): Draft resolution A/C.1/68/L.26 was introduced by the representative of Malaysia at the Committee's 13th meeting, on 21 October. The sponsors of the draft resolution are listed in document A/C.1/68/L.26 and A/C.1/68/CRP.4/Rev.5.

The Chair: A recorded vote has been requested.

In favour:

Afghanistan, Algeria, Angola, Antigua and Barbuda, Argentina, Austria, Azerbaijan, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belize, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia (Plurinational State of), Bosnia and Herzegovina, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Burkina Faso, Cabo Verde, Cambodia, Chile, China, Colombia, Congo, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Cuba, Cyprus, Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Democratic Republic of the Congo, Djibouti, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Eritrea, Ethiopia, Fiji, Gambia, Ghana, Grenada, Guatemala, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Haiti, Honduras, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Ireland, Jamaica, Jordan, Kazakhstan, Kenya, Kuwait, Kyrgyzstan, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lebanon, Lesotho, Liberia, Libya, Madagascar, Malawi, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Myanmar, Namibia, Nepal, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Qatar, Rwanda, Saint Kitts and

Nevis, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, Samoa, San Marino, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Solomon Islands, South Africa, South Sudan, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Swaziland, Switzerland, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, Timor-Leste, Tonga, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkmenistan, Tuvalu, Uganda, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Tanzania, Uruguay, Vanuatu, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of), Viet Nam, Yemen, Zambia, Zimbabwe

Against:

Belgium, Bulgaria, Czech Republic, Denmark, Estonia, France, Germany, Greece, Hungary, Israel, Italy, Latvia, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Netherlands, Poland, Portugal, Russian Federation, Slovakia, Slovenia, Spain, Turkey, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America

Abstaining:

Albania, Andorra, Armenia, Australia, Belarus, Canada, Croatia, Finland, Georgia, Iceland, Japan, Liechtenstein, Marshall Islands, Micronesia (Federated States of), Montenegro, Norway, Palau, Republic of Korea, Republic of Moldova, Romania, Serbia, Sweden, Tajikistan, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Togo, Ukraine, Uzbekistan

Draft resolution A/C.1/68/L.26 was adopted by 127 votes to 24, with 27 abstentions.

The Chair: The Committee will now take action on draft resolution A/C.1/68/L.42/Rev.1, entitled "Consolidation of the regime established by the Treaty for the Prohibition of Nuclear Weapons in Latin America and the Caribbean (Treaty of Tlatelolco)".

I give the floor to the Secretary of the Committee.

Mr. Nakano (Secretary of the Committee): Draft resolution A/C.1/68/L.42/Rev.1 was introduced by the representative of Mexico at the Committee's 10th meeting, on 17 October. The sponsors of the draft resolution are listed in document A/C.1/68/L.42/Rev.1 and A/C.1/68/CRP.4/Rev.5.

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.1/68/L.42/Rev.1 was adopted.

The Chair (*spoke in Arabic*): I shall now give the floor to delegations that wish to explain their votes or positions following the adoption of the draft resolutions.

Mr. Sano (Japan): My delegation has asked for the floor to explain Japan's abstention in the voting on draft resolution A/C.1/68/L.26, entitled "Follow-up to the advisory opinion of the International Court of Justice on the legality of the threat or use of nuclear weapons".

Due to the immense destructive power and lethal force of nuclear weapons, Japan believes that their use clearly does not comply with the spirit of humanitarianism, which is the philosophical foundation of international law. Nevertheless, the advisory opinion of the International Court of Justice as it is set out in this draft resolution demonstrates the complexity of the issue.

Japan supports the unanimous conclusion of the judges of the International Court of Justice that there exists an obligation to pursue in good faith and conclude negotiations leading to nuclear disarmament. On the other hand, we are convinced that realistic measures are required in order to achieve steady progress in nuclear disarmament and non-proliferation. It is from that point of view that we consider the conditions not yet ripe enough to call upon all States to immediately fulfil that obligation by commencing multilateral negotiations leading to the early conclusion of a nuclear-weapons convention. Japan will nevertheless continue to exert maximal efforts to bring about such conditions.

Mr. Lodding (Sweden): I take the floor to explain Sweden's position on draft resolution A/C.1/68/L.26, entitled "Follow-up to the advisory opinion of the International Court of Justice on the legality of the threat or use of nuclear weapons".

Sweden remains supportive of the Court's advisory opinion (A/51/218, annex), including its unanimous conclusion that there exists an obligation to pursue in good faith and bring to a conclusion negotiations leading to nuclear disarmament. The reason for our abstention is that we do not believe that the most viable route to nuclear disarmament at this stage is to call for the immediate commencement of multilateral negotiations leading to the early conclusion of a nuclear weapons convention.

In our view, nuclear disarmament is more effectively pursued through the continued construction of an increasingly solid framework of reinforcing treaties

and commitments, or building blocks, an approach that, step by step, brings us closer to a world without nuclear weapons. That path, an agreement on a framework of separate, mutually reinforcing instruments, has also been proposed by the Secretary-General, as reflected in the eighth preambular paragraph of the draft resolution. The Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons, including its 2010 Action Plan, is the cornerstone of those building blocks. In particular, we would like to point to the entry into force of the Comprehensive Nuclear-Test-Ban Treaty and negotiations on a fissile materal cut-off treaty, together with an expanded safeguards and verification monitoring system, not least through the International Atomic Energy Agency. Further actions include reducing the number of strategic and non-strategic nuclear weapons and reducing the role of nuclear weapons in security doctrines.

The Chair (*spoke in Arabic*): We have thus concluded action on the draft resolutions and decisions contained in informal paper 4, and the Committee has thus concluded its action on all the draft resolutions submitted under the agenda items allocated to it.

In accordance with our programme of work, our last order of business is to adopt the programme of work and timetable of the First Committee for 2014, as contained in document A/C.1/68/CRP.5, which has been distributed to all delegations.

Delegations will notice that the document has been prepared based on the practices of the Committee in previous years, especially with regard to the total number of meetings allocated to the general debate and the action stages of the Committee's work next year. Delegations will also notice that 12 meetings, rather than 10, have been allocated to the thematic segment. The extra two meetings assigned to that segment take into account the shortage of time that has affected the Committee at this stage of its work in recent years, when the number of speakers has grown steadily, from 151 three years ago to 183, 191 and then 241 this year. Although 9 or 10 meetings were originally planned for thematic discussions in the programme of work adopted at the preceding session, the Committee ended up holding 11 or 12 meetings for that segment, with the exception of the sixty-seventh session, when we were affected by Hurricane Sandy. It is therefore expected that the allocation of more time for that segment will enable the Committee to provide adequate time for all representatives who wish to participate in the thematic discussions at that stage.

I would like to remind all delegations that the First Committee shares its conference facilities and other resources with the Fourth Committee. Consequently, the work programmes of the two Committees are closely coordinated, with the draft programme of the First Committee for 2014, which the Committee has before it, prepared in consultation with the Chair of the Fourth Committee. The two Committees will continue to coordinate their work and maintain a sequential pattern for conducting their meetings in order to maximize their shared resources.

The draft programme under consideration will of course be finalized and issued in final form before the First Committee starts its substantive work at the next session.

If there are no questions or comments on the draft programme of work and timetable, may I take it that the Committee wishes to adopt the programme of work and timetable of the First Committee for 2014, as contained in document A/C.1/68/CRP.5?

It was so decided.

Statement by the Chair

The Chair (*spoke in Arabic*): Before I adjourn this meeting and close out the main part of the sixty-eighth session of the First Committee, allow me to make some final remarks as Chair.

We have come to the end of the work of the First Committee — the Committee on Disarmament and International Security — at its sixty-eighth session. I can confidently say that it has been successful, thanks to the active participation of delegations in the discussions and their cooperation, which has enabled us to start the Committee's meetings and end its deliberations on time. The Committee held 25 meetings, with seven of those dedicated to the general debate, during which 101 statements were delivered. During the thematic debates, the Committee heard a record-breaking 241 speakers. That reflects the increase in international awareness of the issues of disarmament and international security, as well as the more active participation by delegations at this session.

At the beginning of its work, the Committee was informed of the provisions relevant to the work of the Main Committees, as contained in resolution 67/297, on the revitalization of the work of the General Assembly. Those provisions were reproduced in an information

note contained in document A/C.1/68/INF/4. I encouraged delegations to make comments on our working methods. Several points were raised formally and informally, including the idea of holding informal consultations concerning the Committee's modus operandi. With the support of the Bureau, I intend to call an informal meeting on the working methods of the Committee in the next few days.

Building on the growing momentum for multilateral disarmament, the First Committee has achieved remarkable progress this year in advancing the disarmament and non-proliferation agenda. The Committee squarely addressed pressing challenges to global security and worked collegially to live up to the expectations of the international community.

In the area of nuclear weapons, Member States intensified their efforts to move forward on nuclear disarmament by taking advantage of the momentum created by the initiatives taken last year with a view to pressing ahead with multilateral negotiations on nuclear disarmament, such as the initiative to set up the open-ended working group to develop proposals to take forward multilateral nuclear-disarmament negotiations for the achievement and maintenance of a world without nuclear weapons in Geneva and the high-level meeting of the General Assembly on nuclear disarmament held in New York. The focus on the humanitarian dimension of nuclear disarmament has also provided further impetus to the efforts aimed at achieving nuclear disarmament.

The Committee identified crucial tasks that need to be achieved urgently. Member States underscored the need to speed up nuclear disarmament and to strengthen the non-proliferation regime. Many States stressed the urgency of fully implementing the Action Plan adopted at the 2010 Review Conference of the Parties to the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons. In particular, there were strong calls for urgently convening the conference on the establishment of the Middle East as a nuclear-weapon-free zone and of all other weapons of mass destruction.

In the sphere of chemical weapons, Member States strongly condemned the use of chemical weapons in Syria and welcomed Syria's accession to the Convention on the Prohibition of the Development, Production, Stockpiling and Use of Chemical Weapons and on Their Destruction, as well as the decision by the Organization for the Prohibition of Chemical Weapons and Security Council resolution 2118 (2013), regarding the elimination of Syria's chemical-weapons programmes.

Regarding conventional weapons, the Committee welcomed the adoption by the General Assembly of the Arms Trade Treaty in April, as well as Security Council resolution 2117 (2013), on small arms and light weapons. Member States also stressed the significance of the early entry into force of the Arms Trade Treaty and the implementation of its provisions. Furthermore, the Committee recognized the importance of transparency in armaments and mandated studies by groups of governmental experts on the operation of the United Nations Register of Convention Arms and on military expenditures.

The Committee also discussed other pressing security threats. It welcomed the report of the Group of Governmental Experts on Transparency and Confidence-building Measures in Outer Space Activities (see A/68/189) and encouraged Member States to review and implement the measures contained in the report. The Committee also welcomed the work of the Group of Governmental Experts on Developments in the Field of Information and Telecommunications in the Context of International Security (see A/68/98), and decided to establish another group of experts to continue studying existing and potential threats.

Moreover, Member States identified the significance of addressing the question of emerging weapons systems, such as fully autonomous weapons.

Once again, the First Committee provided a useful forum for discussing a wide range of disarmament and international security issues. It emphasized the urgent need to revitalize the work of the disarmament machinery, especially calling on the Conference on Disarmament to start substantive work, and the United Nations Disarmament Commission to produce substantive, final and objective documents next year.

As the First Committee concludes its work, I wish to take this opportunity to warmly thank all the staff of the secretariat of the Committee and the Office for Disarmament Affairs, as well as the interpreters for their patience and professionalism, without which the Committee could not have concluded its work in such an excellent manner. I also wish also to thank the engineers and technicians who oversaw the sound and voting systems and maintained the normally smooth conditions under which we worked without any issues. Finally, I wish a safe and pleasant flight for all our

colleagues returning to Geneva, with my best regards to all members of the Committee.

The First Committee has thus concluded the main part of its work for the sixty-eighth session of the General Assembly. The Committee will reconvene sometime between May and June 2014 to elect its Chair for the sixty-ninth session of the General Assembly.

I also wish to remind members that I have sent out an invitation to a reception tomorrow at the Libyan Mission to the United Nations. I hope to see members there.

The meeting rose at 4.40 p.m.