General Assembly

Seventieth session

First Committee

21st meeting
Friday, 30 October 2015, 3 p.m.
New York

Chair: Mr. Van Oosterom . . . . (Netherlands)

In the absence of the Chair, Mr. Alajmi (Kuwait), Vice-Chair, took the Chair.

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

Agenda items 88 and 105 (*continued*)

Thematic discussion on item subjects and introduction and consideration of all draft resolutions and decisions submitted under all disarmament and related international security agenda items

The Acting Chair: We will first listen to the remaining speakers on the rolling list of speakers under the cluster "Regional disarmament and security". Thereafter, the Committee will take up the cluster "Other disarmament measures and international security".

Delegations taking the floor are reminded to kindly observe the time limit of five minutes when speaking in a national capacity and seven minutes for a statement on behalf of several delegations.

Ms. Htwe (Myanmar): Myanmar associates itself with the statement delivered by the representative of Indonesia on behalf of the Movement of Non-Aligned Countries (see A/C.1/70/PV.20).

My delegation would like to express its appreciation to the United Nations Office for Disarmament Affairs (UNODA), its Regional Disarmament Branch and the three United Nations regional Centres for their constructive contributions to global disarmament and international peace and security. We would also like to

thank the panellists from the three Regional Centres for their comprehensive briefings at the Committee's previous meeting.

My delegation fully supports and appreciates the role played by the three United Nations Regional Centres, particularly the Regional Centre for Peace and Disarmament in Asia and the Pacific, in the promotion of global disarmament and non-proliferation instruments through national capacity-building in the areas of disarmament, non-proliferation and regional security, as well as their outreach and advocacy initiatives. Therefore, my delegation, together with other like-minded countries in the region, is working to introduce a draft resolution entitled "United Nations Regional Centres for Peace and Disarmament in Asia and the Pacific".

My delegation would like to take this opportunity to express its appreciation to the Regional Centre in Asia and the Pacific, the United Nations Institute for Training and Research and the United Nations Institute for Disarmament Research (UNIDIR) for organizing a training programme on nuclear disarmament for South-East Asia for young diplomats from the region. I had the pleasure and honour of joining the training programme as a participant. The programme provided a good opportunity for us to study global and regional nuclear disarmament and non-proliferation initiatives. We also had a good opportunity to meet with our fellow diplomats from the South-East Asian region who work on disarmament matters. The training programme was very useful. We would therefore like to suggest that UNIDIR organize similar programmes in the future.

Accessible document   Please recycle

My delegation would like to inform the Committee that Myanmar will host a national round table on the implementation of Security Council resolution 1540 (2004) in January 2016, in cooperation with UNODA.

As a State Member of the United Nations active in advocating nuclear disarmament, and as the main sponsor of an annual draft resolution on nuclear disarmament, Myanmar is building capacity in this field. In that regard, we highly commend the Disarmament Fellowship Programme organized annually by the Office for Disarmament Affairs. Myanmar is one of beneficiaries of this year's programme. My delegation would like to suggest that UNODA invite more women participants, especially from least developed countries, in order to promote the participation of women in the areas of peace and disarmament. My country is also looking forward to having more opportunities to participate in the programme in the years to come.

We are very much aware that the Regional Centres' activities rely on voluntary contributions. In order to sustain the activities of the Regional Centres, Member States should continue to contribute to them. Furthermore, the Secretary-General should encourage all Member States, particularly developed countries, to contribute financial resources in support of the programmes of the Regional centres.

My delegation truly believes that maintaining and revitalizing the Regional Centres for peace and disarmament would contribute significantly to regional and international peace and security. We would like to reaffirm our continued support for the Regional Centres in promoting the peace, security and disarmament in their respective regions and beyond.

Mr. Tsymbaliuk (Ukraine): Ukraine is concerned by the accelerated militarization of the Autonomous Republic of Crimea, Ukraine, which further undermines international security and regional stability. Moreover, Ukraine is concerned by Russia's steps towards the deployment of nuclear weapons and their carriers on this temporarily occupied territory of our country. The implementation of those plans would directly infringe on the non-nuclear status of Ukraine and would be a gross violation of fundamental internationally recognized documents. Furthermore, it would indicate ongoing violations of Russia's obligations as a member of the International Atomic Energy Agency.

Russia started reinforcing its military presence in Crimea practically immediately after the illegal annexation of the Ukrainian peninsula. In particular, as of today, the number of troops in Crimea has more than doubled. The number of large-calibre — about 100 millimetres — artillery systems has increased from 24 to 110; of armoured vehicles, from 130 to more than 630 units; and of combat aircraft, from 22 to 124. More than 50 attack helicopters and a number of warships, submarines and mortar launchers have been deployed. A multilevel modern air defence system has been deployed.

We possess confirmed information that, in the next few months, Russia is going to further strengthen its land, air and sea forces in Crimea to the army level and to create a self-sufficient military formation on the territory of the peninsula that will include up to three mechanized infantry brigades, one artillery brigade, two special forces brigades and support troops, up to three regiments of fighter-bombers and ground-attack aircraft, an army aviation brigade, three anti-aircraft missiles regiments, one division of surface ships, several squadrons of missile carriers and petrol ships, a squadron of submarines, up to two marine brigades, a coast artillery brigade and up to two regiments of naval aviation. In order to complete that task, Russia has started preparing the infrastructure at the airport of the urban settlement of Hvardiske in Crimea and for the deployment one regiment of Tu-22-M3 strategic bombers carrying air-to-ground missiles, as well as Iskander-K mobile systems equipped with tactical cruise and sea-based missiles.

Intensive work on the restoration of the former Soviet base complexes in Crimea for nuclear-weapon maintenance are currently under way in order to enable long-term storage of nuclear payloads for Iskander systems and Stardent fissile armaments for the Moscow-guided missile cruiser, with a striking range of 500 kilometres. Militarization is also influencing the ship-building sector of Crimea, as the Russian authorities are trying to turn it into a logistics and maintenance base for its Black Sea fleet.

Taking into account everything I have mentioned, Ukraine again draws the attention of the First Committee to the acts of violence against its sovereignty and territorial integrity. First there was the occupation of the Autonomous Republic of Crimea and the setting up of the Russian military outpost on the peninsula, while later on Russia led a campaign in Donetsk and Luhansk against Ukraine, which brought death to more than 8,000 Ukrainians. Today it is our common

responsibility to take adequate steps to react properly to the violence carried out by the Russian Federation. We urge all delegations to condemn such acts by the Russian Federation. We call on the Russian Federation to stop the militarization of Crimea and to withdraw its military units and capabilities from the Crimean peninsula, which is an integral part of the territory of Ukraine.

The Acting Chair (*spoke in Arabic*): I now give the floor to the representative of Peru to introduce draft resolution A/C.1/70/L.42.

Mr. Meza-Cuadra (Peru) (*spoke in Spanish*): Peru associates itself with the statement delivered by the representative of Indonesia on behalf of the Movement of Non-Aligned Countries and with the statement made by the representative of Uruguay on behalf of the Union of South American Nations (see A/C.1/70/PV.20).

Latin America and the Caribbean is a diverse region with different levels of development, but it is a homogeneous region with regard to the challenges it faces, such as poverty, social exclusion, unemployment, malnutrition and violence, among the many other challenges. To address those challenges, in addition to political will, Governments need technical tools and financial resources. Some of those resources are lost owing to the negative effects of violence, which is the result of the illicit trafficking in weapons, among other factors. Other parts of those resources are ridiculously and excessively spent on weapons. That is why the General Assembly, 29 years ago, called on the United Nations Regional Centre for Peace, Disarmament and Development in Latin America and the Caribbean to consider devoting significant support to the initiatives and activities of countries in the region aimed at implementing measures for peace and disarmament, as well as promoting economic and social development, through an appropriate reallocation of the available resources.

Thanks to the support that the Regional Centre has provided, the States of the region have moved forward in building capacities, training specialized personnel and developing and implementing standards in areas related to disarmament and security. On this occasion, we consider it important to share some of the main achievements and activities of the Regional Centre in the area of peace, disarmament and development — not only to illustrate to the Committee the joint efforts the Centre is carrying out in the region, but also to make an appeal with regard to the need to strengthen international cooperation so as to work towards peace, disarmament and development in Latin America and the Caribbean.

Over the past 12 months, the Regional Centre has launched more than 50 activities in 17 different countries covering a range of technical, legal and standard-setting assistance and aimed at implementing disarmament and non-proliferation instruments, including the Arms Trade Treaty; the Programme of Action to Prevent, Combat and Eradicate the Illicit Trade in Small Arms and Light Weapons in All Its Aspects; the International Tracing Instrument; Security Council resolution 1540 (2004); and General Assembly resolution 65/69. In doing so, the Centre provided training, upon request, to more than 500 security staff members on the control of small arms and light weapons, in particular on the marking, tracing, registration and management of certain types of weapons, as well as on the control of conventional weapons. The Centre provided assistance for capacity-building and the development of voluntary national action plans to several Caribbean States in accordance with resolution 1540 (2004), and organized training courses aimed exclusively at female officials to promote the participation of women in the disarmament, non-proliferation and arms-control processes.

Peru would like to express its appreciation to Member States and other partners that supported the Centre's operations and programmes through financial and in-kind contributions, and urges those in a position to do so to make voluntary contributions to enable the Centre to continue its activities in the face of the growing number of requests for assistance and cooperation.

Identifying the areas in which the Centre should have an impact is a major task that has been carried forward with sound judgement by the Centre's various administrations, in particular the current one, both in Lima and in New York. We extend our special appreciation to all of them.

For the considerations I have mentioned, my delegation again has the honour to present, on behalf of the Group of Latin American and Caribbean States, draft resolution A/C.1/70/L.42, entitled "United Nations Regional Centre for Peace, Disarmament and Development in Latin America and the Caribbean", for consideration by the General Assembly and which reiterates strong support for the role of the Centre in

the promotion of the activities of the United Nations at the regional level to strengthen peace, stability, security and development. We are confident that, as in previous years, we will have the valuable support of all delegations in order to adopt the draft resolution by consensus.

Ms. Ouazzani (Morocco) (*spoke in French*): My delegation aligns itself with the statements made on behalf of the Movement of Non-Aligned Countries, the Group of African States and the Group of Arab States (see A/C.1/70/PV.20).

Morocco believes that regional and subregional cooperation are essential to security and stability and to responding to terrorism, organized crime and separatist movements, which are veritable challenges to the stability, security and development of States, especially in Africa. More than ever, the worrying situation currently prevailing in the Sahelo-Saharan region calls for heightened efforts to bolster cooperation among the States of the region based on an inclusive approach.

The Kingdom of Morocco was among the first States to bring to the attention of the international community the dangerous connections between terrorism and trafficking in drugs, weapons, human beings and the taking of hostages, innocent tourists, aid workers and even United Nations officials. At that time, Morocco called for concerted action by States of the Sahel and the Maghreb regions, urging them to take preventive measures and to curtail the already observable harmful effects of those activities.

The events in northern Mali and the serious attack on its territorial integrity, the spread of the terrorist group Boko Haram, which is expanding its influence in the Sahelo-Saharan region, and the flow of foreign terrorist fighters and criminals have only served confirm our fears and demonstrated that the threat of instability was not speculation, but rather an immediate reality with adverse consequences for the entire region. In that context, in July 2015 Morocco hosted the inaugural conference of the joint United Nations Counter-Terrorism Centre-Global Counterterrorism Forum Border Security Initiative. In the same vein, to fight terrorism and instability, and as part of its responsibility to the brotherly country of Libya, Morocco did not fail to contribute to the peaceful resolution of the situation in that country by hosting the inter-Libyan dialogue, which made it possible to conclude the Skhirat Libyan Political Agreement.

Morocco supports the establishment of nuclear-weapon-free zones, as they contribute to the achievement of the goal of a world free of weapons of mass destruction and to the strengthening of peace and regional and international security. It is in that spirit that Morocco was among the first signatories, in 1996, of the African Nuclear-Weapon-Free Zone Treaty. Morocco remains committed to the objectives of the Treaty, which must be carried out with full respect for international law and the territorial integrity of States.

It should be recalled that Morocco is party to all instruments related to weapons of mass destruction, including the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons (NPT). Morocco concluded its comprehensive Safeguards Agreement with the International Atomic Energy Agency (IAEA) in 1973. In addition, Morocco voluntarily concluded its additional Protocol with the Agency, which entered into force in 2011, as part of its policy of transparency and compliance with its international commitments. There is no doubt that the universality of a treaty as important as the NPT serves the common goal of collective security. Morocco stresses the importance of adherence to the NPT and the conclusion of comprehensive safeguards agreements with the IAEA by all States in the Middle East region, including Israel.

It is regrettable that the NPT Review Conference was not able to make decisions that would advance international efforts to establish a zone free of nuclear weapons and other weapons of mass destruction in the Middle East, in accordance with the 1995 resolution. An international conference on that issue would provide a historic opportunity to initiate a process that would make it possible to rid the region of weapons of mass destruction and strengthen regional peace and security.

Ms. Rahamimoff-Honig (Israel): Israel's policy in the field of regional security and arms control has always been to endorse a pragmatic and realistic approach. That policy is rooted in Israel's belief that the security concerns of all States in the region should be taken into account and realistically addressed within a direct regional dialogue. That engagement must be firmly planted in the regional context if it is to be substantive and meaningful. Thinking that short cuts and detours are possible without attending to the core security challenges our region faces is misleading. That is especially pronounced in an environment of growing instability in the Middle East.

Regrettably, at present the countries of the Middle East have no mechanisms that could foster dialogue. There is no regional forum in which they can all directly communicate with each other and have a dialogue on core issues that affect their individual and collective security. Such forums could contribute to the building of confidence, the de-escalation of tensions and conflict resolution as a whole. Israel continues to believe that a direct dialogue between the parties of the region that addresses the broad range of security challenges is fundamental to any substantive discussions based on the principle of consensus.

For its part, Israel will continue to seek such a meaningful regional discussion, which could lead to a more peaceful and secure Middle East. We hope that our neighbours will adopt a similar approach.

Mr. Jabrayilov (Azerbaijan): Azerbaljan aligns itself with the statement delivered by the representative of Indonesia on behalf of the Movement of Non-Aligned Countries (see A/C.1/70/PV.20). I would like to make a few additional remarks in my national capacity.

Azerbaijan recognizes the vital role of the First Committee in maintaining international, subregional and regional peace and security. We give serious attention to joint efforts to address regional and global issues, with a particular focus on regional security, combating terrorism and the non-proliferation of weapons of mass destruction and ensuring energy security. We strongly advocate for the region of South Caucasus and beyond to be free from weapons of mass destruction.

Each year, small arms and light weapons and their ammunition cause death and injury among hundreds of thousands of people, including women and children. The illicit trade in, and excessive accumulation of, small arms and light weapons adversely affect regional and international security and stability. Azerbaijan values the contribution made by the Programme of Action to Prevent, Combat and Eradicate the Illicit Trade in Small Arms and Light Weapons in All Its Aspects, the International Tracing Instrument and the Firearms Protocol in addressing the challenges arising from the misuse or unauthorized use of those weapons. Azerbaijan welcomes the consensus on the successful outcome of the second United Nations Conference to Review Progress Made in the Implementation of the Programme of Action. International assistance and cooperation remain central to the effective implementation of international mechanisms on small arms and light weapons.

As a participating State of the Organization for Security and Cooperation in Europe (OSCE), Azerbaijan regularly engages in information-sharing, submits reports and receives on-site inspections, evaluation and observation visits under the OSCE's Vienna Document of 2011 on Confidence- and Security-Building Measures, the Code of Conduct on Politico-Military Aspects of Security, the OSCE Document on Small Arms and Light Weapons, the OSCE Document on Principles Governing Conventional Arms Transfers, and so on.

The security of each State and, more broadly, international and regional peace and security depend on whether States observe the norms and principles of international law and use them as a guiding tool to shape their foreign and security policies. Unfortunately, the unlawful use of force has still not been removed from the context of international and regional relations. Today, civilian populations are suffering in many places worldwide due to the manifest failure of individual States to fulfil their most basic and compelling responsibilities. Armed conflicts, military aggression and foreign occupation involving the most serious international crimes are only a few examples from our recent history of the bitter consequences of non-compliance by individual States with the norms and principles of international law.

The most vivid example of a failure to respect the norms and principles of international law is the Armenia-Azerbaijan conflict, which is almost two decades old and still unresolved, and which represents one of the major threats to international and regional peace and security. The conflict has resulted in the occupation of almost one fifth of the territory of Azerbaijan and has made approximately one out of every nine persons in my country an internally displaced person or refugee. We will not surprise anybody by repeating once again that the territories of Azerbaijan occupied as a result of armed aggression by neighbouring Armenia have become a black hole in the zone of application of the Treaty on Conventional Armed Forces in Europe. The international community has tolerated and lived with a situation in which hundreds of pieces of treaty-limited equipment belonging to one State party have been illegally deployed in the occupied territories of Azerbaijan, in gross violation of the provisions of the Treaty.

Armenia intensively builds up its military presence and capability in the Nagorno Karabakh region of the Republic of Azerbaijan and other occupied territories of Azerbaijan. Available data indicates that, since the occupation began, the numbers of unaccounted for and uncontrolled arms in those territories have consistently increased. We are seriously concerned, inter alia, by the fact that the conventional arms control mechanism is not effective in those territories. The accumulation of a great number of armaments and ammunitions therein beyond international control poses serious threats to regional peace and security. In that context, we regret that the international community shows a certain indifference to this problem, which negatively affects the prospects for a speedy peaceful resolution of the conflict. Our particular concern relates to the possibility of the use by terrorist groups of specific weapons, including individual anti-aircraft missile systems.

The strategy of Azerbaijan is aimed at the liberation of all the occupied territories, and thereby the restoration of the State's territorial integrity, the return of forcibly displaced populations to their homes and the establishment of durable peace and stability in the Nagorno Karabakh region of Azerbaijan, as well as in the entire South Caucasus.

In conclusion, I want to say that, as long as Armenia continues to follow its aggressive policy, any talk about peace, stability and all-inclusive cooperation in the region is irrelevant. Armenia should first reflect on the reasons behind this situation.

The Acting Chair (*spoke in Arabic*): I shall now like to give the floor to representatives who have asked to speak in exercise of the right of reply.

Mr. Yermakov (Russian Federation) (*spoke in Russian*): As strange as it may sound, I would like to express sympathy to the Ukrainian delegation. I must say that it is very unfortunate that members of the Ukrainian delegation are forced to read such awful texts. It is clear that everything that was read out has no bearing at all on reality, nor is it in any way relevant to the topic of discussion here in the First Committee.

Of course, we would like to use this opportunity to express our compassion and sympathy for the fraternal people of Ukraine. We have been, are and will always be one big family. Yes, someone brought war into our common home from abroad. There is a civil war going on in the Ukraine. What we heard today from the esteemed Ukrainian colleague is a clear demonstration of what is taking place and what could take place in a State when a military overthrow, civil war, hatred and ultranationalism are brought into a country from abroad, and when, in substance, that destroys the last vestiges of Statehood.

Obviously, that plays to someone's benefit. That is in the interest of someone. We are not going to say whose interest it is, although I think most people know. We do not want to start an exchange of accusations, but we all know who organized the overthrow of the Government in the Ukraine and how it was done, and who spent billions to stoke national hatred and ultranationjalism in Ukraine. To tell the truth, it is a huge tragedy for Russia. It is a huge tragedy for the Ukrainian people. Russia has never waged war against Ukraine, is not waging war against Ukraine and will never wage war in Ukraine, no matter how much some people would like that to be true.

As for Crimea, which for a time was accidentally an administrative part of Ukraine, the people of Crimea expressed their will to return to Russia in a timely and wholly democratic election, in compliance with all norms of international law. Crimea managed thereby to avoid the fate of the rest of Ukraine – the civil war. Crimea has always been and will always be an integral part of Russia. We invite everyone to visit that thriving part of the Russian Federation and to see for themselves what it is like to be in that democratic society that does not accept any nationalism, xenophobia or religious tensions or hatred. That has been confirmed by many different delegations, including from the countries of the European Union, Turkey and Japan, which are constantly visiting Crimea. Those who are interested can ask them how wonderful it is to be part of a normal, peaceful and democratic society.

The Chair took the Chair.

Once again, I want to express my sympathies for the Ukrainian people. It is very unfortunate that the Ukrainian delegation is forced to read such awful texts.

Mr. Samvelian (Armenia): I will be very brief. A number of issues were touched on in the statement made by the representative of the Azerbaijani delegation. That statement was made in the usual propagandistic manner, which is nothing new to us. While considering the area of disarmament and security, it is worth mentioning that Azerbaijan is among the few countries — if not the only country — in the world nowadays that boasts of

its astronomical military expenditures. I firmly believe that increasing a military budget is not something to be proud of, especially when the rest of the world is thinking about its development goals, and not to mention the fact that many countries do not have even the minimum resources necessary.

Azerbaijan has made no secret of the fact that its ultimate aim is to seek a military solution to the Nagorno Karabakh conflict. The Minister of Defence of Azerbaijan, Zakir Hasanov, recently declared that

"the time has come ... [W]e will destroy 70 per cent of the Armenian army at the very first strike".

He went on to say that Azerbaijan had so many weapons and military equipment that a single strike would leave the Armenians unable to recover even after a century. No further comment is necessary.

With regard to the allegations about Armenia's armed forces, I can only invite the representative of Azerbaijan and the members of the Committee to look into the relevant documents of the United Nations and the Organization for Security and Cooperation in Europe on arms control, where they will find plenty of information that gives a detailed picture of Armenia's military equipment.

My colleague asserts that no peace can be achieved without confidence. I do not share that approach. This marks a difference in conviction, approach and strategy. One cannot claim to believe that there is any military option that can resolve any conflict, including the conflict in Nagorno Karabakh, because the military option has been tried and has failed. Compromise and realism are the only real options.

Out of respect for you, Sir, and in view of the long list of speakers scheduled for this afternoon, Armenia will limit itself to a single exercise of its right of reply.

Mr. Tsymbaliuk (Ukraine): I would just like to comment briefly on the remarks made by the Russian delegation.

First, I do not think that taking another country's land is the best way of demonstrating brotherhood, and we do not see it that way.

To stick to the issue in question, I would like to say a few words about the annexation of Crimea. It is quite evident that it was planned well before it was carried out. One small argument for that is that on the medal awarded for the restoration of Crimea, which is a

Russian campaign medal from the Russian Federation's Ministry of Defence — my Russian colleague knows what it looks like — the dates for the Russian military campaign in Crimea are given as 20 February 2014 to 18 March 2014. That means the campaign began two days before former President Yanukovych of Ukraine had even fled the country, and 24 days before 16 March, when a fake referendum was organized in Crimea. That, unfortunately, is what is shown on the Russian Federation's medal.

My other issue is related to the fact that my statement was focused on the matter under discussion today, which is very important not just for the region but for the entire world.

Mr. Jabrayilov (Azerbaijan): I am obliged to take the floor again to counter the totally unfounded accusations made by the Armenian representative against my country and to respond to his speculations on issues that are part of the negotiation process.

First, I am sure that everyone here is perplexed to hear condemnations of the use of force made by a country that did indeed use force in order to occupy Azerbaijani territory and whose destructive behaviour is the main reason for the current impasse in the negotiations. Armenia flagrantly violated its obligations under international law by using military force to occupy Azerbaijan's territory, carry out ethnic cleansing there and establish an ethnically determined subordinate separatist entity in the occupied territory. In its relevant resolutions, the Security Council has condemned the occupation of Azerbaijan's territory, reaffirmed Azerbaijan's sovereignty and territorial integrity and the inviolability of its internationally recognized borders, and demanded the immediate, full and unconditional withdrawal of the occupying forces from all of Azerbaijan's occupied territory. The General Assembly and other intergovernmental organizations have taken a similar position. Those are the facts.

Secondly, the Armenian representative expressed concerns about increased military budgets. Suffice it to say that a comprehensive analysis of the population, territory, annual budget and gross domestic product of Armenia in relation to its annual military expenditures and personnel and the quantity of its armaments procured and foreign military assistance received shows that it is the most highly militarized country in the South Caucasus. Armenia regularly conducts large-scale military exercises in the occupied territory

of Azerbaijan that are attended by its President, its Minister of Defence and other high-level officials.

Mr. Yermakov (Russian Federation) (*spoke in Russian*): I would like to thank my Ukrainian colleague for his fascinating reference to what is indeed a worthy medal. I do not know whether he received that medal himself. I can assure the Committee that the medal was struck much earlier. When we — the great Russian people, and Ukrainians have always been part of it — defended Crimea together in 1856 in a war against aggressors that included Great Britain and France, those medals were being struck even then. Naturally, everyone living in Ukraine — and on the territory that was suddenly said to be part of Ukraine — took part in that war. History is a very interesting science, and the medal my Ukrainian colleague referred to is also part of that history.

Mr. Tsymbaliuk (Ukraine): I believe my Russian colleague is somewhat mistaken, but I am happy to produce a photocopy of the medal I mentioned. I think that we are unfortunately referring to different things. This is another medal, awarded for the return of Crimea, which I believe was introduced in 2014 and is not such a historical artifact. It is a reminder of another war, the war against Ukraine.

The Chair: We have heard the last speaker on the cluster on regional disarmament and security.

In accordance with the programme of work and our timetable, the Committee will now turn to the cluster "Other disarmament measures and international security". We will begin by listening to an introductory statement by Mr. Carlos Luís Dantas Coutinho Perez, Chair of the Group of Governmental Experts on Developments in the Field of Information and Telecommunications in the Context of International Security.

I now give the floor to Mr. Coutinho Perez.

Mr. Coutinho Perez (Chair, Group of Governmental Experts on Developments in the Field of Information and Telecommunications in the Context of International Security): I have the honour to address the First Committee in order to introduce the report of the Group of Governmental Experts on Developments in the Field of Information and Telecommunications in the Context of International Security (see A/70/174).

The Group was established in 2014 pursuant to paragraph 4 of resolution 68/243. It was the fourth

Group of Governmental Experts dedicated to the issue and was able to build on the work of its predecessors. The first aspect I would like to highlight is the nature of the Group's mandate, which focused on three areas. The first two were part of the previous Groups' mandates. The 2015 Group's task was therefore to continue to study, first, existing and potential threats in the area of information security and possible cooperative measures for addressing them, including norms, rules and principles for the responsible behaviour of States and confidence-building measures, and, secondly, relevant international concepts aimed at strengthening the security of the global information and telecommunications systems. Furthermore, resolution 68/243 included new elements in the Group's mandate — studying the issues of the use of information and communications technologies (ICTs) in conflicts and how international law applies to States' use of ICTs.

In accordance with the terms of the resolution and on the basis of equitable geographic distribution, experts were appointed from 20 States, namely, Belarus, Brazil, China, Colombia, Egypt, Estonia, France, Germany, Ghana, Israel, Japan, Kenya, Malaysia, Mexico, Pakistan, the Republic of Korea, the Russian Federation, Spain, the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland and the United States of America. Over four week-long sessions between July 2014 and June of this year, the Group held a comprehensive, in-depth exchange of views on the components of the mandate. After intensive and constructive discussions, the Group prepared and adopted by consensus a report, contained in document A/70/174, that has been forwarded by the Secretary-General to the General Assembly.

I would like to express my sincere appreciation for the support of the experts and to acknowledge their commitment to the Group's process and their valuable contributions, which are reflected in the final report. I would also like to emphasize that the Group's results would not have been possible without the wholehearted collaboration of the various experts who, in different ways, facilitated the work of the Chair in the substantive examination of the elements of the mandate and in the preparation of the consensus report.

The current report significantly expands the discussion of norms. It is recommended that States cooperate to prevent harmful ICT practices and that they should not knowingly allow their territory to be used for internationally wrongful acts involving

ICT. There is a need for increased exchanges of information and assistance in prosecuting terrorists' and criminals' use of ICT. The Group emphasized that, in doing so, States should guarantee full respect for human rights, including the right to privacy and the freedom of expression. It also recommended that States should not conduct or knowingly support ICT activity that intentionally damaged or otherwise impaired the use and operation of critical infrastructure and should take appropriate measures to protect their critical infrastructure from ICT threats. States should not harm the information systems of other States' authorized emergency response teams or use those teams to engage in malicious international activity. States should encourage the responsible reporting of ICT vulnerabilities and take reasonable steps to ensure the integrity of the supply chain and prevent the proliferation of malicious ICT tools, techniques and harmful hidden functions.

Confidence-building measures increase cooperation and transparency and reduce the risk of conflict. With that in mind, the Group identified a number of such voluntary measures for increasing transparency and suggested additional measures for strengthening cooperation. Capacity-building is a key issue in promoting cybersecurity. The Group recognized that providing assistance was essential to international security because it improved States' capacities for cooperation and collective action. A lack of capacity can make a State's citizens and critical infrastructure vulnerable, or turn it into an unwitting haven for malicious actors. A number of voluntary measures for building capacity in securing ICTs were identified.

The Group emphasized the importance of international law, the Charter of the United Nations and the principle of sovereignty as a basis for increased security in States' use of ICTs. It also noted established international legal principles, including, where applicable, the principles of humanity, necessity, proportionality and distinction.

In its conclusions and recommendations, among others, the Group made the following proposals.

The first is that the United Nations should play a leading role in promoting dialogue about the security of ICTs in their use by States and in developing a common understanding on the application of international law and norms, rules and principles for responsible behaviour on the part of States.

The second is that there is a need for States to further develop, collectively and individually, concepts for international peace and security in the use of ICTs at legal, technical and policy levels.

The third is that increased cooperation at the regional and multilateral levels would be useful for fostering a common understanding of the potential risks to international peace and security posed by the malicious use of ICTs and of the security of ICT-enabled critical infrastructure.

The fourth is that, while States have a primary responsibility for maintaining a secure and peaceful ICT environment, effective international cooperation would benefit from identifying mechanisms for encouraging, as appropriate, the participation of the private sector, academia and civil-society organizations.

The fifth is that further research on concepts relevant to States' use of ICT would be useful. The experts noted that the United Nations Institute for Disarmament Research, which serves all Member States, could be requested to undertake such studies.

The sixth is that a new iteration of the Group of Governmental Experts should be convened in 2016 to continue to study the subject with a view to promoting a common understanding of existing and potential threats in the area of information security and possible cooperative measures for addressing them, as well as how international law applies to the use of ICTs by States, including norms, rules and principles for responsible behaviour on the part of States, confidence-building measures and capacity-building.

The Group acknowledged the contribution of the United Nations Institute for Disarmament Research, which served as a consultant to the Group and was represented by James Lewis and Kerstin Vignard. It also expressed its appreciation to Ewen Buchanan of the United Nations Office for Disarmament Affairs, who served as secretary of the Group, and to other Secretariat officials who assisted it.

As I have indicated, the Group made has substantial progress in addressing the issues contained in its mandate and has provided important recommendations on areas for further work.

In conclusion, I would like to commend the report of the Group of Governmental Experts to the First Committee, and through the Committee to Member States for their consideration.

The Chair: I thank the Chair of the Group of Governmental Experts on Developments in the Field of Information and Telecommunications in the Context of International Security for the clarity of his statement.

We will now proceed with the list of speakers for the cluster "Other disarmament measures and international security".

Before I open the floor, may I remind all speakers once again to observe the time limit of five minutes when speaking in their national capacity and seven minutes when speaking on behalf of a group.

I give the floor to the representative of Indonesia to introduce draft resolutions A/C.1/70/L.7 and A/C.1/70/L.10.

Mr. Isnomo (Indonesia): I am pleased to speak on behalf of the Movement of Non-Aligned Countries (NAM).

While noting that considerable progress has been made in developing and applying the latest information technologies and means of telecommunication, the Movement is concerned that these technologies and means can potentially be used for purposes that are inconsistent with the objectives of maintaining international stability and security and may adversely affect the integrity of States' infrastructure to the detriment of their security in both the civil and military fields. While taking into account the ongoing efforts within the United Nations, NAM calls upon Member States to further promote at multilateral levels the consideration of existing and potential threats in the field of information security, as well as possible strategies to address the threats emerging in this field.

The Movement emphasizes that these technologies and means should be utilized by Member States in a manner consistent with international law and the purposes and principles of the Charter of the United Nations. In that regard, NAM calls for the intensification of efforts towards safeguarding cyberspace from becoming an arena of conflict and ensuring instead the exclusively peaceful uses, which would enable the full realization of the potential of information and communications technologies (ICT) for contributing to social and economic development. The Movement furthermore highlights the central role of Governments in areas related to the public policy aspects of ICT security.

The Movement notes with concern cases of the illegal use of new information and communications technologies, including social networks, to the detriment of States members of the Movement and expresses its strongest rejection of those violations. The Movement stresses the importance of ensuring that the use of such technologies is fully in accordance with the purposes and principles of the Charter and international law, and especially the principles of sovereignty, non-interference in States' internal affairs and internationally known rules of peaceful coexistence among States. As the use of information and communication technologies has the potential to endanger international peace and security, countering such emerging security challenges and reducing their risk is essential. The development of a legal framework to address these issues should be pursued within the United Nations with the active and equal participation of all States.

The Movement emphasizes the importance of the observance of environmental norms in the preparation and implementation of disarmament and arms-limitation agreements. Furthermore, the Movement reaffirms that international disarmament forums should take fully into account the relevant environmental norms in negotiating treaties and agreements on disarmament and arms limitation, and that all States, through their actions, should contribute fully to ensuring compliance with the those norms in the implementation of treaties and conventions to which they are parties.

The Movement expresses concern at the increasing global military expenditures, which could otherwise be spent on development needs. NAM also stresses the importance of the reduction of military expenditures by major arms-producing countries, in accordance with the principle of undiminished security at the lowest level of armaments, and urges those countries to devote those resources to global economic and social development, in particular to the fight against poverty.

Under this cluster, NAM would like to introduce two draft resolutions — draft resolutions A/C.1/70/L.7 and A/C.1/70/L.10 — entitled, respectively, "Observance of environmental norms in the drafting and implementation of agreements on disarmament and arms control", and "Relationship between disarmament and development". The Movement urges support from all member countries.

Mr. González Vivas (Uruguay) (*spoke in Spanish*): I have the honour to speak on behalf of the States members of the Union of South American Nations (UNASUR).

As countries of UNASUR, we would like to express our point of view with regard to the agenda item entitled "Developments in the field of information and telecommunications in the context of international security".

Information and communications technologies should be an instrument for the promotion of inclusion and development, and States or non-State actors should not use them in violation of international law or human rights law, of any principle of the peaceful relations between sovereign States or the privacy of citizens.

At the UNASUR Summit of Heads of State and Government held in Paramaribo in 2013, States firmly rejected measures of espionage and the interception of telecommunications. They are a threat to security and are serious violations of human rights, civil and political rights, international law and national sovereignty, in addition to harming relations between nations.

To address this issue in South America, UNASUR Heads of State and Government decided to accelerate the development of cyberdefence projects and to make the fibre-optic networks that connect their countries more secure in order to make their telecommunications safer, strengthen the development of regional technologies and promote digital inclusion.

Aware that the development of offensive capacities in cyberspace is part of military doctrines, the States members of UNASUR share a growing concern about the vulnerability of their critical infrastructure and the possible escalation of conflicts driven by cyberattacks. With that in mind, we are in favour of strengthening international standards and principles that apply to States in the field of information and telecommunications in the context of international security, while preserving the right to privacy and the free flow of information.

We welcome the deliberations of the Group of Governmental Experts on Developments in the Field of Information and Telecommunications in the Context of International Security, established under resolution 68/243. We welcome the report (see A/70/174) of the Group, which was adopted by consensus and which has contributed to progress in the assessment of activities relating to information technology and telecommunications. While we recognize the participation of two experts from UNASUR countries in the Group of Experts, including as its Chair, we believe that the discussions on this subject would benefit from greater involvement by developing countries.

The countries of UNASUR agree with the statement that international law, especially the Charter of the United Nations, is applicable and crucial to maintaining peace and stability and promoting open, secure, peaceful and accessible information and communication technologies. Furthermore, we underscore that effective cooperation among States is essential to reduce the threats related to the use of information and telecommunication technologies, including the issue of the attribution of cyberincidents.

Mr. Mattar (Egypt) (*spoke in Arabic*): The delegation of Egypt has the honour to speak on behalf of the Group of Arab States.

We align ourselves with the statement made by the representative of Indonesia on behalf of the Movement of Non-Aligned Countries.

There has been a global revolution in terms of information and communications technologies (ICTs), which has changed the lives of thousands of people. It has opened the door to information in an unprecedented way and facilitated communication among civilians and the military. It has changed the dynamics of socioeconomic issues and has impacted defence and security. ICT has become a target for criminals and those seeking to commit sabotage or organized crime. We must make cyberspace more secure for everyone, and that requires cooperation and agreement on the non-use of cyberspace to impede the interests of certain parties.

We must uphold the principles set out in the Charter of the United Nations that call for the maintenance of international peace and security. We must guarantee the implementation of Article 2, paragraph 4 of the Charter, on refraining from the threat or use of force, in cyberspace. Furthermore, we must consider how Internet governance can enable developing countries to participate in the strengthening of Internet infrastructure so that they are not simply a forsaken extension of developed countries. Therefore, we must participate in technology transfers.

Artificial intelligence applications enable us to advance human progress. However, using them to make

robotic, self-guided and deadly weapons goes against legal and moral standards. We must therefore remain within the limits of the law. Otherwise, they can be used against people indiscriminately. We believe that such weapons should not be produced.

The Chair: I now give the floor to the representative of the Russian Federation to introduce draft resolution A/C.1/70/L.45.

Mr. Yermakov (Russian Federation) (*spoke in Russian*): The Russian delegation would like to express its strong appreciation to all countries that have already indicated their interest in co-sponsoring draft resolution A/C.1/70/L.45, entitled "Developments in the field of information and telecommunications in the context of international security". There are already more than 70 sponsors, which we take as a demonstration of the great importance and priority given to the matter addressed by the draft resolution.

We believe that all global programmes connected with the use of information and communications technologies (ICTs), in particular capacity-building, ensuring freedom of access, guaranteeing the private rights of citizens and confidence-building measures, can be fully achieved only if information and communications security is achieved. Such a decision must be taken by all States collectively. Therefore, our draft resolution should be regarded as an appeal to the international community to collectively search for ways to achieve stability in cyberspace.

The draft resolution is based on the rich experience of the Group of Governmental Experts on Developments in the Field of Information and Telecommunications in the Context of International Security. The last such Group, under the able chairmanship of Brazil, presented a report with numerous ideas and recommendationst o the Secretary-General and the General Assembly. According to the assessments of various experts, including those in this room, they are considered to be the initial norms, rules and principles of States in global cyberspace. The Group was able to achieve consensus on a whole range of principles and issues connected with the use of ICT by States, in particular the fact that ICT should be used only for peaceful purposes and that international cooperation should be aimed at the prevention of conflicts in cyberspace.

In the digital sphere there are already well-recognized international legal norms, such as refraining from the use of force or threat of use of force, sovereignty and non-intervention in the internal affairs of States. States have sovereignty over their ICT infrastructure in their territories. Any accusation against States of participating in cyberattacks should be supported by evidence. States should not use go-betweens to carry out cyberattacks and should not allow their territories to be used for such purposes. States should seek to prevent the use of hidden functions — so-called malicious logic — in ICT products on which many of us have spent billions of dollars. Those are just some of the important conclusions reached by the Group.

The proposed draft resolution is aimed at further enhancing the work on the aforementioned rules of behaviour. To this end, it is proposed to establish a new group of governmental experts on information security in 2016 with a mandate that would guarantee the peaceful use of ICTs in the interests of national development and international stability. Moreover, the work of the group should be based on the undisputed fact that international law and, first and foremost, the Charter of the United Nations are applicable to the events that occur in the virtual world of our everyday existence. We should also have the possibility of adapting international law to new realities, including the cyberrevolution and modern methods of using ICTs.

For 17 years now, we have enjoyed consensus support, and every year this resolution, which receives consensus support and has an increasing number of active supporters, has contributed to the positive efforts of the international community to ensure peace and security. I call on all Member States to support the draft resolution and invite them to become sponsors.

Mr. Abbani (Algeria) (*spoke in Arabic*): My delegation would like to make a statement on the topic of other disarmament measures and international security.

Algeria aligns itself with the statement made by the representative of Indonesia on behalf of the Movement of Non-Aligned Countries and with the statement by the representative of Egypt on behalf of the Group of Arab States.

New information and communications technologies (ICTs) offer unique opportunities for the socioeconomic development of countries owing to their importance in the civilian and military spheres. Cyberspace has become a realm used in various fields. We must not let cyberspace, including its applications for defence and security systems, pass us by.

Nevertheless, the possibilities for the use of new ICTs for non-peaceful purposes, specifically by terrorists and criminal groups, present considerable risks for peace and security, including terrorist attacks against ICT infrastructure and facilities, which makes it necessary to make cyberspace secure by strengthening international cooperation and preventing any malicious use of these new technologies.

In that context, the report (see A/70/174) of the Group of Governmental Experts on Developments in the Field of Information and Telecommunications in the Context of International Security, which was presented earlier by the Chair, and the conclusions and recommendations contained therein are a significant contribution to combating the use of these technologies for terrorist and criminal purposes, especially the recommendations related to the promotion of international cooperation and the strengthening of confidence-building and transparency measures that seek to limit the risk of emerging conflicts. In that regard, we would like to emphasize that concerns about dual use of these new technologies should not impede their transfer to countries that have the greatest need for them, in particular developing countries. We must take into account the legitimate defence needs of these countries.

Algeria emphasizes the importance of the United Nations Disarmament Information Programme, which is a valuable tool that enables all States to fully participate in deliberations and negotiations on disarmament that take place at various levels in different United Nations bodies. It assists States in carrying out and implementing the treaties they are party to. It also assists them in making contributions to agreed transparency and confidence-building mechanisms.

Artificial-intelligence applications provide promising prospects for the world and enable further contributions to be made to the well-being and development of humankind. Nevertheless, the use of this type of application for the design and development of self-guided weapons presents legal, moral and humanitarian challenges. That is why the international community must establish a clear legal framework on the issue and warn against the potential dangers of terrorist groups making use of these technologies, which would have disastrous effects.

Lastly, Algeria reaffirms once again that international bodies must take the relevant environmental norms into account in negotiating and agreeing on disarmament treaties. All States must fully respect these norms in the implementation of the treaties and conventions they are party to.

Mrs. Ramos Rodríguez (Cuba) (*spoke in Spanish*): Cuba endorses the statement delivered by the representative of Indonesia on behalf of the Movement of Non-Aligned Countries.

We would also like to say that the draft resolutions being submitted to the First Committee under the cluster "Other disarmament measures and international security" are of great importance. In particular, I would like to focus on the following three draft resolutions, which are of particular importance for my delegation, namely, draft resolution A/C.1/70/L.7, entitled "Observance of environmental norms in the drafting and implementation of agreements on disarmament and arms control"; draft resolution A/C.1/70/L.9, entitled "Promotion of multilateralism in the area of disarmament and non-proliferation"; and draft resolution A/C.1/70/L.10, entitled "Relationship between disarmament and development".

It is essential to consider environmental norms when negotiating treaties and agreements on disarmament and arms control. They must be strictly complied with by all States. Cuba has vast experience in the adoption and implementation of laws and policies that enable it to comply with environmental norms in all processes of social life, including their implementation with regard to the various international instruments on disarmament and arms control to which it is a party.

The existence of weapons of mass destruction and their continued modernization are the most serious threats to international peace and security, the fragile environmental balance of our planet and the sustainable development for all without distinction. To date, the Chemical Weapons Convention remains the only international agreement that includes verifiable destruction of weapons of mass destruction and their production facilities, as well as measures for the protection of people and the environment. Strengthening the Biological Weapons Convention through a protocol that addresses its basic pillars, including cooperation and verification, will be essential for the protection of the environment and the preservation of biodiversity on our planet.

It is urgent that we begin multilateral negotiations on a treaty that prohibits and fully eliminates nuclear

weapons within a set time frame and under strict international control. An international treaty on nuclear disarmament must necessarily include measures to protect the environment.

With regard to the promotion of multilateralism in the area of disarmament and non-proliferation, Cuba reiterates the importance of achieving negotiated solutions at the multilateral level, and the need to reach collective agreements as the only way to ensure peace and security. Practice has shown that the goal of disarmament, arms control and the non-proliferation of weapons of mass destruction cannot be achieved through the implementation of unilateral measures or the promotion of agreements negotiated outside the internationally recognized multilateral frameworks or through the use or threat of use of force. Multilateralism and negotiated peaceful settlements, in accordance with the Charter of the United Nations, are the only appropriate way to settle disputes and move forward towards general and complete disarmament.

With regard to disarmament and development, both aspects are two of the main challenges that humankind must face, especially given the global nature of the deep economic, social, food, energy and environmental crisis affecting us. It is alarming that approximately $1.75 trillion is being earmarked for military expenditures, when that could be invested to combat extreme poverty or help to fight diseases such as Ebola.

Cuba reiterates its proposal to create a fund managed by the United Nations to which at least half of all current military expenditures would be allocated in order to address the economic and social development needs of countries in need. Similarly, we reiterate our support for the action programme adopted at the International Conference on the Relationship between Disarmament and Development, which includes an international commitment to allocate for social development part of the resources that would be made available through disarmament.

Mr. Wood (United States of America): My remarks today will address the United States' views relating to developments in the field of information and telecommunications in the context of international security.

It is a fundamental goal of the United States to create a climate in which all States are able to enjoy the benefits of cyberspace, all have incentives to cooperate and avoid conflict and all have good reason not to disrupt or attack one another — a concept we often call international cyberstability. For several years, we have sought to achieve that goal by nurturing a broad consensus on what constitutes responsible State behaviour in cyberspace. After recently concluding a fourth round of negotiations at the United Nations by the Group of Governmental Experts on Developments in the Field of Information and Telecommunications in the Context of International Security, we are pleased that 20 nations were able to achieve a strong consensus report (see A/70/174) to advance that goal.

The United States believes that international cyberstability and conflict prevention are best advanced by established international law, in conjunction with additional voluntary cyberspecific norms of responsible State behaviour in peacetime and practical confidence-building and conflict-prevention measures. The 2013 round of negotiations by the Group of Governmental Experts reached the landmark consensus that existing international law, in particular the Charter of the United Nations, applied to State conduct in cyberspace. Building on that agreement, the Group's recent round of negotiations took its first step in studying how international law applied to cyberactivities. We did not achieve all of the progress we would have liked in this area. Nonetheless, the Group took a step forward in its report by highlighting that the United Nations Charter applied in its entirety, while also affirming the applicability of States' inherent right of self-defence as recognized in Article 51 of the Charter and noting the applicability of the law of armed conflict's fundamental principles of humanity, necessity, proportionality and distinction.

Importantly, the experts recommended a number of voluntary norms designed for peacetime. They include several norms proposed by the United States, such as the protection of critical infrastructure, the protection of computer-incident response teams and cooperation between States in responding to appropriate requests in mitigating malicious cyberactivity emanating from their territory. Another recommended norm calls on States to seek to prevent the proliferation of cybertools that can be used for malicious purposes. As United States Secretary of State Kerry highlighted in May, these measures,

"if observed, can contribute substantially to conflict prevention and stability in time of peace".

We call on all States to study the report in its entirety and consider endorsing its conclusions.

Our efforts do not conclude here. The report of the Group of Governmental Experts noted the importance of ensuring that Member States considered convening a follow-on group in 2016. The United States supports that continuation in the hope the next Group will make progress in areas where we have been unable to find consensus in the past. We look forward to future dialogue on these issues with the international community. We favour international engagement in developing a consensus on appropriate State behaviour in cyberspace, based on existing principles of international law, and we cannot support other approaches that would serve only to legitimize repressive State practices.

Our full statement on the topic will be posted on the Secretariat's website.

Mr. Toro-Carnevali (Bolivarian Republic of Venezuela) (*spoke in Spanish*): I would like to congratulate you, Sir, on your stewardship of the First Committee's work.

My delegation associates itself with the statements delivered earlier by the representatives of Indonesia, on behalf of the Non-Aligned Movement, and Uruguay, on behalf of the Union of South American Nations.

The most recent report (see A/70/174) of the Group of Governmental Experts on Developments in the Field of Information and Telecommunications in the Context of International Security shows that significant agreement exists regarding the promotion of confidence-building measures and capacity-building. Just as significant, if only nascent, is the agreement on developing norms and laws for governing cyberspace. We should highlight the Group's position regarding the application of international law in regulating cyberspace, with an emphasis on the principles of sovereign equality, the settlement of international disputes through peaceful means, refraining from the use of force, respect for human rights, fundamental freedoms and international humanitarian law, as well as non-intervention in the internal affairs of States.

That represents a significant accomplishment, but it leaves pending the debate about the direction that the international community should take in regulating cyberspace. That debate encompasses at least two major approaches, one of which seeks to prohibit the placement of weapons and the use or threat of use of force in cyberspace, while the second seeks simply to control weapons there. The first wants to ban weapons in cyberspace and prevent the possibility of an arms race. Its emphasis is on preserving cyberspace's peaceful nature and its potential for contributing to the common good. The second approach assumes that it is impossible to prevent the placement of weapons in cyberspace and that therefore the best we can do is to control their proliferation and mitigate the possible consequences with confidence-building measures. If we accept that approach it must inevitably lead to the industrial military complex's expansion into protection and the use of force in cyberspace. And we know that once that space is colonized by the industry there will be no going back.

The Group of Governmental Experts has other, more technical but also still fundamental challenges, such as defining what constitutes a weapon in cyberspace, what kinds of cyberoperations would constitute an act of aggression or breach of the peace according to the Charter of the United Nations, and how to assign responsibility for illegal acts in cyberspace. But no challenge is as important as making progress on a recommendation on which of the two approaches — arms prohibition or arms control — we should take with regard to cyberspace.

According to a recent report from the United Nations Institute for Disarmament Research, more than 40 States are developing military cybercapacities, at least 12 of them for offensive action within the framework of a cyberwar. One country in particular occupies a privileged position in the development of a capacity for cyberattacks, with a cyberforce of more than 6,200 people divided among 33 teams working on defence, espionage and attack in cyberspace. We are talking here about concrete steps being taken to add another environment for waging war to those of land, sea and air. If we consider that a general and large-scale cyber attack could disrupt a State's critical infrastructure, such as the production, transmission and distribution of energy, transportation by sea and air, as well as its defence systems, causing total collapse with an incalculable human cost, we should be worried about the direction being taken in the debate over banning arms from cyberspace or militarizing it.

Paragraph 18 of the report of the Group of Governmental Experts recommends that, given the rate at which information and communications technologies are evolving and the extent of this threat,

"regular institutional dialogue with broad participation under the auspices of the United Nations, as well as regular dialogue through bilateral, regional and multilateral forums and other international organizations."

Venezuela urges the leadership of all of the relevant United Nations bodies, and the Secretary-General, to promote that institutional dialogue and to broaden the understanding and participation of States in that regard.

Mr. Phua (Singapore): I would like to join previous speakers in congratulating you, Sir, and the members of the Bureau on your respective elections. You can count on the full support of my delegation. In the interests of time, I will deliver an abridged version of my statement, the full text of which will be available on PaperSmart.

This year marks the forty-fifth anniversary of the entry into force of the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons (NPT). With its near-universal membership, the NPT remains a cornerstone of the global nuclear non-proliferation regime. However, it is widely acknowledged that the Treaty has come under severe strain. Progress in disarmament remains lacklustre and the political will to bring about full realization of the article VI of the Treaty remains weak. A few States are still conspicuously absent from the NPT. Recent missile launches and the threat of a fourth nuclear test on the Korean peninsula continue to be a source of serious concern. Despite efforts by many delegations, States parties at the 2015 NPT Review Conference were unable to reach consensus on a final outcome document. The divide between nuclear- and non-nuclear-weapon States over the priority that should be given to nuclear disarmament versus non-proliferation continues to widen.

We recognize that complete nuclear disarmament is a long-term aspiration. As long as some countries continue to possess nuclear weapons and others do not, the imbalance will always engender a sense of insecurity and distrust. In order to advance nuclear disarmament, we urge all the nuclear-weapon States to make concrete commitments to significantly reduce their nuclear arsenals in a transparent, irreversible and verifiable manner, and to refrain from making qualitative improvements to their nuclear weapons and testing them. The Comprehensive Nuclear-Test-Ban Treaty (CTBT) remains a key tool for advancing disarmament and nuclear non-proliferation and building mutual trust and confidence. We strongly urge

all countries, particularly annex 2 States, that have yet to sign and ratify the CTBT to do so. We also need to make progress at the Conference on Disarmament and on a fissile material cut-off treaty.

The discussion of the humanitarian dimension of the impact of nuclear weapons has been gaining political support. Three conferences on the issue have been held since 2013. For the first time, two nuclear-weapon States attended the third International Conference on the Humanitarian Impact of Nuclear Weapons, held in Vienna in December 2014. That initiative was also an important element in discussions at the 2015 NPT Review Conference. To date, 119 States parties to the Treaty, including Singapore, have endorsed the humanitarian pledge. While we collectively deliberate on the next steps forward in a transparent and inclusive manner, we urge all States parties to uphold the NPT, especially article VI, in order to eliminate the risks that nuclear weapons pose to humankind.

As we work for complete nuclear disarmament, Singapore strongly supports the establishment of nuclear-weapon-free zones, as building blocks for strengthening global security. Within our region, we seek to preserve South-East Asia as a zone free of nuclear weapons. As a State party to the Southeast Asia Nuclear-Weapon-Free-Zone Treaty, Singapore supports the intensification of ongoing efforts by States members of the Association of Southeast Asian Nations and the nuclear-weapon States to resolve all outstanding issues, in accordance with the objectives and principles of the Treaty, pertaining to the signing and ratifying of the Treaty's Protocol. We regret that a conference on the establishment in the Middle East of a zone free of nuclear weapons and all other weapons of mass destruction has yet to be held, and we reiterate our call to the relevant stakeholders to continue open and constructive engagement on working towards convening it as soon as possible.

While Singapore remains committed to global non-proliferation efforts, we note that a robust global export-control regime that guards against proliferation without hampering legitimate trade is critical. Since 2003, Singapore has been an active supporter of the activities of the Proliferation Security Initiative (PSI). We are a member of the PSI operational experts group and participate in its annual meetings. Singapore hosted two PSI maritime interdiction exercises — Deep Sabre I and II, in 2005 and 2009, respectively — and will be

hosting a third in 2016 in support of the Asia-Pacific exercise rotation initiative.

In conclusion, we believe that the international community must demonstrate renewed commitment and political will in order to make progress on disarmament, non-proliferation and other security threats. As the Secretary-General said in his message to the 2015 NPT Review Conference,

"True national security can only be achieved outside and away from the shadow of the nuclear threat. This shadow must be removed for the sake of present and future generations."

Let us work together to bring about a more secure world.

Mr. Van der Kwast (Netherlands): The official cybersecurity assessment of the Netherlands for 2015 concluded that over the past year geopolitical tensions had become increasingly manifest in cyberspace. States and other actors are increasingly using cyberoperations to pursue their strategic interests, and that is of great concern to us, since cyberoperations have the potential to create instability in international relations and present risks to international peace and security. However, the international community is also taking steps to address those risks. In that regard, the Netherlands welcomes the latest report (see A/70/174) of the Group of Governmental Experts on Developments in the Field of Information and Telecommunications in the Context of International Security. We call on all States to adhere to the norms of behaviour and legal interpretations outlined in the report.

The Netherlands is proud of the results of the Global Conference on Cyberspace 2015, held in The Hague in April. Issues of international peace and security in the cyberdomain formed one of its main topics. Through a broad and inclusive process, the Conference enabled more stakeholders to participate in the debate than ever before. Among other conclusions, the Chair's statement underlines the importance of international law for this area, including, among other things, the principle of State responsibility and, especially, the Charter of the United Nations. The Conference also discussed a number of possible norms for responsible State behaviour in protecting critical national infrastructures and components of the global Internet, both physical and logistical.

In the wake of the Conference, the Netherlands will continue to promote the international legal order in cyberspace and to organize a number of activities. For instance, we are supporting the United Nations Institute for Disarmament Research and the Centre for Strategic and International Studies in organizing a series of workshops dealing with the application of international law, countering the proliferation of malicious cybertools and techniques, and the stability and security of the global Internet itself. In February 2016 we will organize another consultation meeting on the Tallinn Manual 2.0 on the International Law Applicable to Cyber Warfare. Thirdly, we are in the process of creating a global commission on cyberstability, intended as a multistakeholder platform for discussions on norms between States and other actors and for dealing with norms for State behaviour regarding the public core of the Internet itself, consisting of protocols, standards and other critical components. Such issues are relevant to an increasing number of countries, and all these projects and events are therefore open to broad and inclusive participation.

Lastly, the Netherlands is a candidate for the next Group of Governmental Experts, should it be created.

All the activities I have mentioned are aimed at reaching a shared understanding on key concepts and increasing international cooperation. We believe that such activities are key to reducing the risk of conflict in cyberspace and maintaining a free, open and secure cyberspace that serves the common good of humankind.

Mr. McConville (Australia): The Internet now constitutes critical global infrastructure on which the broad international community — Government, businesses, civil society and individuals — all depend. There is growing international attention to developing clearer rules of the road on what is acceptable behaviour in cyberspace. Given the complexities involved, forging broad international agreement on such rules will be a lengthy but necessary endeavour.

On that note, I would like to thank the Chair of the Group of Governmental Experts on Developments in the Field of Information and Telecommunications in the Context of International Security for introducing the Group's report (see A/70/174). As Chair of the Group's predecessor, we appreciate the challenges he faced in delivering a consensus report. We congratulate him and the members of the Group on that achievement. The report builds on previous work, notably the fundamental principle established by the 2013 report (see A/68/98), which has increasingly wide acceptance,

that international law applies to States' behaviour in cyberspace. We are pleased to see that the current report has begun the process, which will necessarily take some years, of elaborating precisely how international law applies. In particular, we welcome the observation that States' inherent right to take measures consistent with international law, as recognized in the Charter of the United Nations, applies to State conduct in cyberspace. The Group's recognition of established international legal principles — including, where applicable, the principles of humanity, necessity, proportionality and distinction — also advances our understanding.

The report makes an important contribution in the area of norms, rules and principles for States' responsible behaviour. We attach particular importance to the norms regarding undertakings to ensure that States do not intentionally damage critical infrastructure through cybermeans or harm the information systems of other States' computer emergency response teams, and that they respond to requests from other States to mitigate malicious cyberactivity emanating from their territory.

We welcome the report's observations on confidence-building measures and expect that they will be give further impetus. Australia, as a member of the Group of Western European and other States located in the Indo-Pacific region, which carries increasing economic and strategic weight globally, has been active in taking forward that work through the regional forum of the Association of Southeast Asian Nations.

The draft resolution (A/C.1/70/L.45) on developments in the field of information and telecommunications in the context of international security would have the General Assembly welcome the report of the Group of Governmental Experts, which provides important guidance for States and a mandate for a new Group. Australia endorses the report and is pleased to be a sponsor of the draft resolution.

Lastly, Australia has engaged actively in the development of cybernorms and confidence-building measures and in building cybercapacity, globally, regionally and bilaterally, for many years. The Group is the primary vehicle within the United Nations for taking that work forward. Australia successfully chaired the Group established for 2012 and 2013, and we stand ready to participate in its next incarnation if that is mandated by the General Assembly.

Mr. Fu Cong (China) (*spoke in Chinese*): The rapid growth of information and communication technologies (ICTs) has had profound effects on every aspect of the social and economic life of humankind and has transformed the world into a global village. The international community has developed a common destiny, tied together by its intertwined interests. At the same time, cybersecurity is becoming increasingly significant. Cybercrime and cyberterrorism are on the rise. The risks of an arms race and conflict in cyberspace are growing. We continue to see imbalances in the management and distribution of critical Internet resources, which exposes every State to an uncertain cybersecurity environment. The absence of international norms is an obstacle to the orderly long-term development of cyberspace. Cybersecurity is becoming a new topic in global governance and an emerging challenge for the international security.

We cannot overemphasize the importance of cybersecurity, and, given its relationship to international peace, development and cooperation, the United Nations can and should play an important role in the area. China urges the international community to build on the existing consensus and to work together to enhance global cybersecurity by changing the security paradigms and creating innovative mechanisms.

First, we should pursue a new cybersecurity concept based on shared security. The rapid evolution of ICTs calls for a new security philosophy aimed at guiding our efforts to address the challenges. Given the omnipresent impact of cybersecurity, no country can be immune from its effects or achieve absolute security. We should therefore all abandon a Cold War or zero-sum mentality and pursue a new cybersecurity concept based on shared, comprehensive, cooperative and sustainable security. We should champion dialogue and cooperation to enable us to achieve shared and lasting security on a basis of win-win cooperation and mutual respect for each other's security.

Secondly, we should uphold the rule of law. Cyberspace is a new frontier, but it is not an enclave outside the law. The emergence of cyberspace has not changed the international order anchored in the Charter of the United Nations and in international law and the principles governing international relations. In order to avoid the risk of an arms race and the possibility of turning cyberspace into a battlefield, we should uphold in cyberspace the basic norms of international relations established by the Charter, including the principles of sovereignty, non-interference in the internal affairs of States, the peaceful settlement of disputes and the

non-use of force. We should carefully examine the application of the existing international law and explore new international norms specific to cyberspace in the interest of peace. Our interpretation and application of international law should be conducive to peace and development rather than allowing hegemony and power politics to flourish, and they should certainly not sow the seeds of future conflicts.

Thirdly, we should attach equal importance to development and security. Cybersecurity is as much an issue of development as it is one of security. From the security perspective, in accordance with Liebig's law of the minimum, deficiencies in the security of one country may render global efforts less effective. From a development perspective, the Internet is owned and developed by all and should be shared and governed by all. For many developing countries, the key to security lies in economic development. As such, we should look at the cybersecurity issue from the perspective of global governance and work for win-win results through cooperation. We should allow the power of ICTs its full scope in boosting economic growth and encourage States to share the dividends of the digital economy. We should make capacity-building in cyberspace a top priority, encourage joint investment, infrastructure construction and benefit-sharing, and enhance interconnectivity.

The frequency of problematic incidents in cyberspace has tested our wisdom. We have witnessed with concern practices involving double standards, groundless accusations, threats and unilateral sanctions, and even the imposition of long-distance jurisdiction through cyberspace, in defiance of international law. China has always believed that — given cyberattacks' unique attributes, such as their cross-border nature and anonymity and the difficulty of tracing them — cooperation on a basis of mutual trust is the only viable way forward.

As an old Chinese saying has it, nothing can be accomplished without rules or standards. Against that backdrop, it is crucial to ensure that the international community establishes norms of State behaviour tailored to cyberspace's specifics so as to preserve order in that realm. In 2011, China, Russia and other countries submitted to the General Assembly a draft of an international code of conduct on information security that was updated in January. As an open-ended voluntary political document, the code is intended to consolidate the international community's political

will, promote mutual trust and serve as a reference point for formulating specific norms in the future. It is our hope that it can lay a good foundation for international discussion of the subject and contribute to international consensus on it as soon as possible.

China has always been a firm believer in safeguarding cybersecurity and has advocated for it and done its part in building a healthy order in cyberspace. We have always supported and participated in international cybersecurity processes. Last year we launched the first of what will be an annual world Internet conference aimed at consolidating international consensus and cooperation. This year, China once again hosted a workshop on internet governance during the Boao Forum for Asia and, with Malaysia, co-hosted an Association of Southeast Asian Nations regional forum workshop on cybersecurity capacity-building with a view to promoting cybersecurity's regional processes.

China supported and actively participated in the Group of Governmental Experts on Developments in the Field of Information and Telecommunications in the Context of International Security, making its own contribution to the Group's progress. We welcome the report of the Group (see A/70/174), adopted in June, and believe that it will go a long way towards enhancing security and confidence in cyberspace. We expect the Group to build on its momentum and to focus on formulating norms for State behaviour in its future work that will lay a solid foundation for a peaceful, secure, open and cooperative cyberspace.

We are very pleased to be a co-sponsor of the draft resolution entitled "Developments in the field of information and telecommunications in the context of international security". We support mandating a new group on the topic. We expect the group to build on its momentum and to focus on formulating international norms of behaviour in its future work, thereby laying a solid foundation for building a peaceful, secure, open and cooperative cyberspace.

Ms. Rahamimoff-Honig (Israel): I would like to begin by thanking the Chair of the Group of Governmental Experts on Developments in the Field of Information and Telecommunications in the Context of International Security for his untiring devotion to moving the work of the Group forward and steering our efforts with dedication and wisdom.

The Group's 2015 report (see A/70/174) is an important step towards improving global cooperation

regarding security issues related to information and communications technologies (ICTs). It highlights several significant aspects of responsible behaviour on the part of States, most importantly the recognition that effective cooperation among States is essential if we are to reduce risks to international peace and security. The Group also emphasized the importance of international law and the Charter of the United Nations in particular, and noted that voluntary, non-binding norms can reduce risks to international peace, security and stability.

Looking forward, the Group's task should be to continue the work of its predecessors and to develop consensus further. As mentioned in the report, one objective is to identify further voluntary non-binding norms for responsible safe behaviour in order to increase stability and security in the global ICT environment. Future groups of governmental experts should therefore maintain a clear distinction between existing international law, on the one hand, and voluntary non-binding norms, on the other, in order to continue to facilitate a broad base for international consensus and in the light of rapid technological advances in this field. Additionally, it is also important to expand the list of confidence-building measures and to support other efforts in that context.

ICT-related threats are on the rise. As the last report of the Group of Governmental Experts mentions, the diversity of malicious non-State actors, including criminal groups and terrorists, their differing motives, the speed at which malicious ICT actions can occur and the difficulty in attributing the source of an ICT incident, all increase risk. That is one of the challenges that should be addressed. We need to redouble our efforts with regard to international security to allow the global community to fully and safely exploit the contribution of ICTs to social and economic growth for the benefit of global prosperity.

The Chair: I now give the floor to the representative of India to introduce draft decision A/C.1/70/L.22.

Mr. Nath (India): India associates itself with the statement made earlier in this thematic debate by the representative of Indonesia on behalf of the Movement of Non-Aligned Countries.

India has the honour to introduce draft decision A/C.1/70/L.22, which proposes the inclusion of the item entitled "Role of science and technology in the context of international security and disarmament" in

the provisional agenda of the General Assembly at its seventy-first session.

Science and technology remain critical factors for economic and social development. Developing countries are especially dependent on access to scientific developments and new technologies for the purpose of development and active participation in global trade. We therefore believe that international cooperation on peaceful uses of science and technology should be promoted through all relevant means, including technology transfer, sharing of information and the exchange of equipment and materials.

Scientific and technological developments have both civilian and military applications, including weapons of mass destruction, as well as the invention of entirely new weapon systems. The military applications of scientific and technological developments can have an impact on the upgrading of weapons systems and on increasing their lethality. For instance, the international community has expressed concerns about the misuse of information and communications technologies for criminal or hostile purposes, as well as about the development of lethal autonomous weapons systems. There is also increasing attention on the impact of information and communications technologies on international security. We believe that there is a need to closely follow scientific and technological developments that may have a negative impact on the security environment and disarmament, particularly when they give rise to proliferation concerns.

While progress in science and technology for civilian applications should be encouraged, it is imperative that international transfers of dual-use goods and technologies and high technology with military applications be effectively regulated, keeping in mind the legitimate defence requirements of all States. National regulations and export controls for appropriate standards in this field should be strengthened and effectively implemented. The relevant international agreements in this area should be implemented in a manner designed to avoid hampering the economic or technological development of States parties to those agreements.

The role of science and technology in the context of international security and disarmament is an important and dynamic subject that affects the interests of all States. There is therefore a need for dialogue among Member States to find a viable forward-looking

approach, taking into account current trends and possible future directions. We therefore hope that, as in past years, the First Committee will endorse the draft decision submitted by India.

Mr. Masmejean (Switzerland) (*spoke in French*): Switzerland welcomes the report (see A/70/174) of the Group of Governmental Experts on Developments in the Field of Information and Telecommunications in the Context of International Security, which was submitted in accordance with resolution 68/243. We also thank the Chair of the Group for introducing the report.

We share the Group's concern with regard to the striking increase in the malicious use of information and communications technologies (ICTs) by both State and non-State actors. To effectively counter this threat, the international community must swiftly increase cooperation. To that end, States should boost confidence-building measures and build capacities. They should also reaffirm existing obligations under international law and clarify their application to cyberspace. In addition, they should promote norms of responsible State behaviour. We commend the Group for its work, which has made advances in all of those areas. Switzerland would like to raise the following four specific points related to the Group's work.

First, increased consideration should be given to the implementation of the reports of groups of governmental experts. Many of the recommendations in the July 2015 report are concrete and can be implemented directly. As an example, some of the recommended confidence-building measures encourage the sharing of information on national strategies, policies and best practices. Such exchanges could be carried out in the context of the voluntary reporting to the Secretary-General provided for by resolution 68/243, as well as its possible follow-up resolution. Other recommendations require the establishment of new mechanisms. For example, the Group of Experts recommends the establishment of a directory of national contact points, which would entail tasking a central entity with establishing and updating the directory. That task could be mandated to the Secretariat. These examples highlight the need for a general reflection on the best way to implement all of the Group's recommendations.

Secondly, with regard to the pivotal role played by regional organizations in the implementation and promotion of the Group's report, at the Organization for Security and Cooperation in Europe (OSCE),

among other forums, substantive progress has been achieved with regard to confidence-building measures. An initial set of measures were adopted in 2013, while a second set is currently being negotiated. At the same time, we are aware that each regional process has its own priorities and follows its own pace. Considering the wealth of experience at the regional level, we believe that exchanges of best practices among regional processes can be beneficial for the implementation of the Group's recommendations. Given that cyberspace is global in nature, States should also ensure the coherent implementation of the Group's recommendations beyond regional boundaries. The Group's report provides a global benchmark that can serve as a point of convergence in that regard.

Thirdly, it is important for the expertise of non-governmental actors to be taken into account, as much of the infrastructure underlying cyberspace is largely created or governed by the private sector, academia and civil society. Given the important role played by these actors, Switzerland shares the view of the Group that international cooperation could benefit from identifying mechanisms aimed at bringing in the expertise of non-governmental actors upon the request of States. Last year, while Switzerland chaired the OSCE, we invited representatives from academia and the private sector to deliver presentations on specific topics related to the process led by that organization. That type of informal and timely exchange proved to be very beneficial for the discussions that were held within the OSCE. Similar mechanisms could be explored by a future group of experts.

Fourthly and lastly, as the report underscores, the challenges that remain to be met are numerous, and it is important to pursue the work begun by the Group. Switzerland fully supports the proposal of establishing a new group of governmental experts to that end and wishes to underline here its interest in participating in it. Switzerland's candidature is based in particular on the different initiatives that it took on the multilateral level over the past several years and the expertise that it was able to develop during that time. We also wish to underscore the need to enlarge the membership of the group. While its current size allowed it to achieve notable progress, we should now discuss how to allow additional States to participate in that work and thereby support the progress made. The expansion of the membership of the group would bolster the legitimacy of its recommendations while also allowing

for the contribution of other Member States. Moreover, outreach activities beyond the group would allow to increase the impact of its work.

Switzerland remains determined in supporting the efforts of the Group of Governmental Experts to build a peaceful cyberspace that serves as a multiplier for human rights and development. We are convinced that the four points outlined in our statement could contribute to maximizing the impact of the Group's recommendations.

Ms. D'Ambrosio (Italy): It my statement I will address Italy's views on the topic of gender and disarmament. Italy is keenly aware of the importance of gender-based approaches in disarmament discussions and processes. Our Government is at the forefront of international efforts to address all related issues, particularly in the context of conflict prevention and post-conflict recovery.

The relationship between gender and disarmament is complex and must be addressed in at least two respects. On the one hand, based on a consolidated body of research, we know that conflicts do not have the same impact on different segments of the population. Men typically constitute the primary victims of direct armed violence. At the same time, women and children usually make up the majority of so-called collateral damage and of refugees and internally displaced persons. They also suffer more than men from the indirect impacts of conflict. Adding a gender dimension to the disarmament debate means identifying and addressing those specific needs — for instance, in connection with programmes related to disarmament and, more important, to the reintegration of ex-combatants and their supporting networks, which are largely made up of women and youth, into post-conflict societies.

A second dimension of the gender debate specifically entails the need for equal access and the full participation of women in decision-making processes and efforts aimed at both preventing and resolving conflicts. Women and girls play a crucial role in reconstruction. They represent the cornerstone of families and communities. They offer different perspectives on political, economic and social life, and they are critical actors in reconciliation. With the first resolution on women and peace and security — Security Council resolution 1325 (2000) — the international community started addressing the specific aspect of the gender issue. Italy has supported the resolution from

the outset. It is also one of the more than 40 countries in the world to have elaborated a national action plan for its implementation. Our second national action plan, for the 2014-2016 triennium, aims to promote the role of women in the national armed forces, State police and peace-support operations, as well as in decision-making. In particular, Italy's national action plan envisions activities regarding the issue of women and peace and security in specific conflict-affected geographical areas. We are also aware that security and development are intimately connected, and firmly support all initiatives that take that connection into account. In line with that approach, Italy, together with Namibia, Kenya, Spain, Thailand, the United Arab Emirates and UN-Women, recently hosted a high-level event on the issue of women and peace and security in the post-2015 development agenda.

This year, for the first time, the Conference on Disarmament (CD) dedicated an informal meeting to the issue of gender and disarmament under the guidance of the Dutch presidency. We warmly welcomed that initiative, which resulted in a very fruitful exchange of views. We look forward to more opportunities of the same type in the specific context of the CD.

Lastly, let me underline the value that we attach to partnerships in this area, specifically to the involvement of civil society. That has been instrumental in drawing attention to the relationship between gender and security and is a key factor in the elaboration and implementation of operational programmes.

Mr. Hashmi (Pakistan): Pakistan aligns itself with the statement made earlier by the representative of Indonesia on behalf of the Movement of Non-Aligned Countries.

In many ways, technology is reshaping societies and States. Its scale, pace and impact is unprecedented in human history. Even as technological innovations offer immense opportunities for peace and development, they are also accompanied by several challenges, including in the area of arms control and disarmament, as well as peace and security at the national, regional, subregional and international levels. The dual nature of new and emerging technologies, such as information and communications technologies (ICTs), lethal autonomous weapon systems (LAWS), armed drones and artificial intelligence, present unique challenges in terms of the definitions, scope and application and interpretation of existing international law. Dangers

posed by the development, production and use of those technologies are real and urgent because they reduce or eliminate the risk of human casualties for user States, thereby increasing the propensity for their use. The net result is the lowering of the threshold for resort to armed conflict.

The risks associated with the malicious use of ICTs are growing, with far-reaching implications for international peace and security. Cyberspace has emerged as the new domain of warfare along with the traditional arenas of land, sea, air and outer space. The ability to act anonymously or in secret, without traditional geographical limitations, at a very low risk to human life, coupled with the ability to mass-produce cyberweapons quickly and cheaply, makes cyberweapons extremely attractive and dangerous. Information and communications technologies have not only been used for indiscriminate surveillance in violation of the international legal regime, including the right to privacy, freedom of expression and information, but also as a means of waging cyberattacks. The misuse and unregulated use of those technologies could lead to serious implications for international peace and security, including in the event of a cyberattack launched on critical infrastructure — such as electricity grids — the disruption of satellites, weather forecasting and even the security infrastructure of States. In that context, the hostile use of cybertechnologies can indeed be characterized as a new weapon of mass destruction and disruption.

We are pleased to have engaged positively with international efforts to address challenges arising from the misuse of those technologies, including in the recent report (see A/70/174) of the Group of Governmental Experts. The Group has made an important contribution in working towards the development of common understanding on this important subject. As a new group is to be established next year, we look forward to continuing discussions on the applicability of international law in cyberspace, the development of norms, rules and principles of responsible behaviour by States, confidence-building measures and international assistance and cooperation. We also acknowledge the importance of the draft international code of conduct on information security. Given the importance and implications of ICTs for Member States, it is essential to take into account the representation and views of different regions in the work of the new group. We also remain open to the possibility of the Conference

on Disarmament considering the issue in the form of negotiating an international instrument that regulates the use of cyberweapons from an arms-control perspective.

The development of new types of weapons, such as lethal autonomous weapon systems, remains an area of concern for the international community. Those weapons are rightly being described as the next revolution in military affairs, similar to the introduction of gunpowder and nuclear weapons. LAWS, by their very nature, are unethical. They take the human out of the loop and delegate power to machines, which inherently lack any compassion, feelings and intuition, to make life and death decisions. LAWS cannot distinguish between combatants and non-combatants. They lack morality, mortality and judgment. The use of LAWS will make war even more inhumane. The introduction of LAWS could affect progress on disarmament and non-proliferation as well. Faced with the prospect of being overwhelmed by LAWS, States that possess capabilities for weapons of mass destruction could be reluctant to give them up, while others could feel encouraged to acquire them. LAWS could therefore further undermine international peace and security. Pakistan shares the widely held view that the further development and use of these weapon systems must be pre-emptively banned, and the States currently developing such weapons should place an immediate moratorium on their production and use.

While the international community is understandably focused on the impact of weapons of mass destruction on international security, the rapid development of new weapon technologies in the conventional weapons domain also pose serious threats. That reality is underscored by the increasing and indiscriminate use of new weapons such as armed drones. The use of drones, especially against civilians, contravenes State sovereignty and Charter of the United Nations restrictions on the legitimate use of force for self-defence, in the absence of imminent danger and without express permission from the States on whose territory the drones are used. The established principles of distinction, proportionality, transparency and accountability are also violated.

The emergence of artificial intelligence also poses distinct challenges, as their development is outpacing the regulations needed to govern their production and use. Machine learning and artificial intelligence applications, if left unregulated, could pose potentially

significant risks for international peace and security. If history is any guide, the development of artificial intelligence as a weapon could inevitably lead to an arms race in this field, as well as to the risk of increased proliferation. It is therefore both essential and urgent to evolve agreed rules and regulations to govern the development, production and use of this new and emerging technology. The United Nations remains an indispensable platform for that purpose.

The Chair: I now give the floor to the representative of Ecuador.

Mr. Luque Márquez (Ecuador) (*spoke in Spanish*): The history of humankind, and therefore of the Organization, has has been marked by an expansion of the rights of all human beings, while further building on those already established, such as in the case of privacy and the inviolability of communications. It is worrisome to note, however, how today, when as a result of technological advances every individual on the planet can communicate with any other individual in the world, is also when we discover the degree to which global surveillance mechanisms have been developed that do not respect the borders of any country and that do not distinguish friend from foe or criminal from law-abiding citizen. Those mechanisms know no limits and do not respect the sovereignty of any States or the right to privacy.

We should avoid the militarization of cyberspace, which would thereby convert it into a new realm of disputes among countries. Therefore, cyberspace should also retain its peaceful character. In that regard, we would like to express our support for the report (see A/70/174) of the Group of Governmental Experts. We urge that their recommendations be taken into account in connection with the draft code of conduct and on confidence-building measures in cyberspace, as well as in the area of international cooperation and capacity-building on protecting information infrastructure.

Cyberspace is not outside the scope of the application of international law, which is why it is necessary that the principles that govern all other activities between States also be applied in this area. In addition, a suitable international legal framework should be developed that prevents cyberattacks and that protects the information infrastructure, which is now so essential for the development of our societies.

Mr. AlAjmi (Kuwait) (*spoke in Arabic*): My delegation would like to endorse the statement delivered earlier by the representative of Egypt on behalf of the Group of Arab States and the statement delivered by the representative of Indonesia on behalf of the Movement of Non-Aligned Countries.

The revolution in information and communications technologies has made an enormous contribution to improving and changing our daily lives. It has had a positive impact on our civilization and in the promotion of cooperation for the benefit of all humankind. It has unleashed creative potential and has contributed to the promotion of prosperity for all. Despite such positive aspects, there exist some fears about the use of these technologies in attempting to achieve goals that run counter to peace and security — for instance, they can be used for criminal or terrorist purposes — and be in violation of the provisions of the Charter of the United Nations.

The use of artificial intelligence can produce positive advantages. However, it can also be employed for deleterious purposes, such as the production of lethal autonomous weapon systems, and pose challenges to humankind. The international community should therefore not neglect to establish controls in this areas, so as to prevent the development and production of indiscriminate and massive lethal autonomous weapon systems.

Mr. Herráiz España (Spain) (*spoke in Spanish*): My delegation would like to address various aspects of information and communications technologies (ICTs) security. It has been abundantly clear in recent years that States and citizens in general are increasingly more dependent on these technologies and the opportunities and advantages they offer us. An open and free cyberspace has been contributing to the promotion of political and social integration around the world, creating what we could call a true democratization of ICTs, including in basic sectors such as the economy and society. At the same time, this dependence on cyberspace is nevertheless making us vulnerable and exposes us to risks and threats that were unimaginable until a few years ago.

The increased prevalence of ICTs, fostered by the growing use of Internet cloud services, mobile technologies and social media, together with the emergence of threats, has generated an increase in risks, a trend that appears to be gaining a foothold. It is to be expected that threats such as cyberespionage

and cybercrime will increase in the short and medium terms.

My country wishes to reiterate the call to promote better international cooperation via the exchange of information on new technologies and tools in order to neutralize cyberincidents caused by cyberattacks. In addition, confidence-building measures on cybersecurity must have the goal of confronting the vulnerabilities of cyberspace and of capacity-building in the countries that need it. In that regard, there must be an understanding that security begins with the individual.

Spain's national cybersecurity strategy, adopted in 2013, and the establishment of a national council on cybersecurity have made possible coordinated and cooperative efforts at the institutional level among all entities and agencies with responsibilities in this area. We have also established a national cybersecurity plan that includes measures aimed at international cooperation and cooperation with the European Union. Furthermore, Spain's external action plan for the period 2015-2018, as well as our responsibilities as a non-permanent member of the Security Council for the period 2015-2016, makes the promotion of cybersecurity a top priority of our policy. Moreover, a Spanish expert played an active part in the discussions of the Group of Governmental Experts on Developments in Information and Telecommunications in the Context of International Security established in 2014 by participating as a facilitator in deliberations on confidence-building measures.

We believe it is very important that the United Nations, through the Group of Experts, continue to lead this process, thereby helping to achieve consensus to ensure universal access to ICTs and, at the same time, ensuring the security of the Internet, the protection of information and respect for human rights in cyberspace. Therefore, we support the conclusions and recommendations of the most recent report (see A/70/174) of the Group of Experts, submitted by the Secretary-General to the General Assembly.

I would like to emphasize that the 2015 report expands the discussion on standards. The Group recommended that States cooperate to avoid harmful practices in the field of ICTs and not knowingly allow their territory to be used to commit internationally illegal acts with the use of these technologies. I would also like to underscore the recommendation that a State

should not deliberately carry out or support activities in the field of ICTs that intentionally damage critical infrastructure or hinder its use or operation. Finally, allow me to underscore that the Group stressed the importance of international law, the Charter of the United Nations and the principle of sovereignty as the basis for greater security in the use of ICTs by States.

Spain supports the convening of a new group of governmental experts in 2016 and expresses its desire to contribute with its experience to the group's discussions.

In conclusion, I would like to stress that it would be a good idea for future deliberations on cybersecurity to adopt a comprehensive approach that balances security and freedom and upholds respect for fundamental rights, such as the freedom of expression, the right to privacy and the protection of personal data, including the openness of, and universal access to, the Internet as a tool for economic and social development.

The Chair: I now give the floor to the representative of Malaysia to introduce draft resolutions A/C.1/70/L.51 and A/C.1/70/L.58.

Ms. Dris (Malaysia): As this year's Chair of the Association of Southeast Asian Nations (ASEAN) and on behalf of 10 member States — namely, Brunei, Cambodia, Indonesia, the Lao People's Democratic Republic, Malaysia, Myanmar, the Philippines, Singapore, Thailand and Viet Nam — Malaysia has the honour to introduce to the First Committee the biennial draft resolution A/C.1/70/L.58, entitled "Treaty on the South-East Asia Nuclear-Weapon-Free Zone (Bangkok Treaty)".

This biennial draft resolution reiterates ASEAN's commitment to intensify ongoing efforts to resolve all outstanding issues in accordance with the objectives and principles of the Treaty pertaining to the signing and ratifying of the Protocol to the Treaty at the earliest possible date. That commitment is reflected in the latest blueprint of the organization, which received the full endorsement of all 10 ASEAN Foreign Ministers in October. We look forward to continued support for and co-sponsorship of the draft resolution, in particular by the States parties to the Treaty and the nuclear-weapon States. We also take this opportunity to thank the sponsors of the draft resolution for sharing our aspirations to keep South-East Asia free of nuclear weapons and other weapons of mass destruction.

Our delegation has also the honour to introduce to the First Committee draft resolution A/C.1/70/L.51, entitled "Follow-up to the advisory opinion of the International Court of Justice on the legality of the threat or use of nuclear weapons". This draft resolution is so far sponsored by 54 delegations. Malaysia and the sponsors extend their collective appreciation to the Secretary-General for his report (A/70/181) on the follow-up to the advisory opinion of the International Court of Justice on the legality of the threat or use of nuclear weapons. We also take this opportunity to thank the Member States that submitted the information requested pursuant to resolution 69/43.

The draft resolution underscores the concerns of Malaysia and other Member States regarding the threat that nuclear weapons pose to humankind. Important decisions of the Court are reflected specifically in paragraphs 1 and 2. With a view to achieving the broadest support possible, my delegation has retained the substantive paragraphs in their existing form, while the necessary technical updates have been revised.

The International Court of Justice's advisory opinion remains a significant contribution to the field of nuclear disarmament. Its humanitarian context gives weight to a moral argument in calling for the total elimination of nuclear weapons. This particular point is all the more relevant today, given the growing increase in the humanitarian impact of nuclear weapons. This is evident with several new draft resolutions being submitted this year that address the important factor of humanitarian impact.

In co-sponsoring and supporting this draft resolution, Member States would share our conviction that the Court's opinion is an important and positive development in nuclear disarmament through the multilateral process and should be built on. Malaysia thanks the sponsors and would like to take this opportunity to invite other delegations to join in sponsoring it.

My delegation also wishes to reaffirm its continued appreciation for the tireless efforts of civil society aimed at nuclear disarmament, including by assisting us to move this draft resolution forward from its adoption in 1996 until the present day.

The meeting rose at 5.35 p.m.