



General Assembly

Seventy-fifth session

First Committee

14th meeting

Monday, 9 November 2020, 10 a.m.
New York

Official Records

Chair: Mr. Santos Maraver(Spain)

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

Agenda items 94 to 110 (continued)

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

The Chair (*spoke in Spanish*): The Committee will now turn to cluster 5, “Other disarmament measures and international security”.

First, I shall give the floor to delegations wishing either to make a general statement or to introduce new or revised drafts under cluster 5. Statements are limited to three minutes. Once again, I appeal to delegations to consider submitting a written statement.

Mrs. Castro Loredó (Cuba) (*spoke in Spanish*): The Cuban delegation takes the floor to make a general statement on draft resolution A/C.1/75/L.8/Rev.1, “Developments in the field of information and telecommunications in the context of international security”, which Cuba has traditionally co-sponsored and supported.

The Open-Ended Working Group on Developments in the Field of Information and Telecommunications in the Context of International Security is undoubtedly a historic process. It is the first forum that gives all Member States an opportunity to participate in negotiations and express their views in a transparent and equal manner.

In that regard, we call on Member States to vote in favour of draft resolution A/C.1/75/L.8/Rev.1 as a

whole — as well as the tenth preambular paragraph and paragraph 1, for which separate votes have been requested — to show their support for the continuation of discussions on information and communications technologies in the transparent and inclusive Open-ended Working Group, in which all Member States can continue to negotiate on an equal footing and without interference of any kind.

The draft resolution in no way predetermines the results of the ongoing process, but rather offers us a space in which to discuss them. It also provides us with the appropriate multilateral and institutional framework within which to discuss national proposals, as well as to further examine, with a view to promoting common understanding, the current and potential threats arising from information and communication technologies.

We continue to support the initiation, without further delay, of a negotiating process in the framework of the United Nations to adopt a legally binding international instrument that will make it possible to effectively respond to the significant legal gaps that currently exist in the context of cybersecurity and to address the growing challenges and threats that we face in that field in an appropriate manner and on the basis of multilateral cooperation.

The Chair (*spoke in Spanish*): I now give the floor to the representative of the Russian Federation to introduce draft resolution A/C.1/75/L.64.

Mr. Polyanskiy (Russian Federation) (*spoke in Russian*): Today we are in dire need of a creative and constructive agenda for arms control, disarmament

This record contains the text of speeches delivered in English and of the translation of speeches delivered in other languages. Corrections should be submitted to the original languages only. They should be incorporated in a copy of the record and sent under the signature of a member of the delegation concerned to the Chief of the Verbatim Reporting Service, room U-0506 (verbatimrecords@un.org). Corrected records will be reissued electronically on the Official Document System of the United Nations (<http://documents.un.org>).



and non-proliferation. We are convinced that it is in our common interests to strengthen existing treaty regimes and develop new consensus-based regimes, and to that end we have the honour to introduce draft resolution A/C.1/75/L.64, entitled “Strengthening and developing the system of arms control, disarmament and non-proliferation treaties and agreements”. That well-known and popular initiative was adopted by the General Assembly almost by consensus last year (resolution 74/66). We urge members to support it this year as well.

In 2018, Russia led the initiative to create a universal, transparent and truly democratic negotiating mechanism on international information security at the United Nations, in the form of the Open-Ended Working Group on Developments in the Field of Information and Telecommunications in the Context of International Security, which constituted a victory for the international community. Every State, regardless of the level of its economic or technological development, was given the opportunity to participate in global negotiations on an equal footing and, more important, the right to vote in related decision-making processes. This year, Russia has also co-sponsored draft resolution A/C.1/75/L.8/Rev.1 on that initiative.

For two years, no States opposed to the idea took it upon themselves to challenge it. Unfortunately, this year the situation changed dramatically. For the first time, the format was openly attacked, with opponents seeking to remove key provisions of the draft resolution co-sponsored by Russia. Paragraph 1, which proposes the convening of a new open-ended working group from 2021 to 2025, is the core of our draft resolution, and the very reason we introduced it.

We believe that to put paragraph 1 to a vote would be counterproductive and would serve only to undermine the international community’s work to date, allowing agreements to be reached among the most technologically advanced actors while other countries are left behind. It is essential to guarantee the future of the negotiation process based on a tried and tested system that has already proven its effectiveness. Given the scope and dynamics of the threats to cyberspace, the international community cannot afford to postpone a decision on the issue until the seventy-sixth session of the General Assembly.

We urge all States that are interested in maintaining an open and democratic approach to their work in this

area not to yield to provocations and to take a responsible position during the voting. We hope that those who intend to vote in favour of the draft resolution as a whole will also oppose the proposal to put paragraph 1 to a separate vote. Moreover, we will view abstentions as votes against the draft resolution.

We are equally concerned about the attempts to revise the previously agreed wording of the preambular paragraphs of draft resolution A/C.1/75/L.8/Rev.1. I would like to underscore that the tenth preambular paragraph, for which a separate vote has been requested, was taken from resolution 73/27, of 5 December 2018, which was supported by 119 countries. It stresses the need to prevent conflict arising from the use of information and communications technologies, which should be used exclusively for peaceful purposes in order to build a common future. Apparently, the country that has requested a separate vote to challenge the entire paragraph in question, without offering any alternative, doubts those provisions, which are fundamental for ensuring international information security.

We strongly oppose this approach. We are convinced that there is no need to revise for subjective reasons any of the wording that has already been approved by the international community. We are categorically against any attempts to condition the outcome of negotiations on international information security in the United Nations upon the outcomes of the Open-Ended Working Group and the Panel of Governmental Experts mentioned in paragraph 6 of draft resolution A/C.1/75/L.4 submitted by the representative of the United States.

We categorically oppose such an approach because it undermines the sovereign right of States to present national initiatives on international information security within the United Nations. I would like to take the floor once again before the vote on draft resolution A/C.1/75/L.8/Rev.1, in accordance with paragraph 129 of the rules of procedure of the General Assembly.

Mr. Hassan (Egypt): Progress on addressing the international peace and security aspects of information and telecommunications technologies has been stalled and held hostage for decades. Discussions continue to be characterized by obvious polarization and subjectivity. The positions of many States continue to be guided by competition rather than cooperation.

Egypt is of the view that information and communications technologies are becoming too important to be left without any clear international

rules for regulating State behaviour in the use of those technologies and for preventing information and communications technologies from being turned into weapons that could be used against civilian infrastructure or pose a threat to international peace and security.

We welcome and value the progress made during the deliberations of the Open-Ended Working Group on Developments in the Field of Information and Telecommunications in the Context of International Security, established by resolution 73/27, which have proven the necessity of addressing the issue expeditiously and in an inclusive format with the participation of all Member States and the engagement of multiple stakeholders. It is disappointing, however, that none of the proposals introduced on that issue contain the type of actionable and tangible measures that the majority of Member States aspire to.

In our view, progress means taking action to implement the voluntary recommendations that have already been agreed and commence negotiations on further rules and norms to fill the obvious gaps in the domain of information and communications technologies, in conformity with international law. Egypt hopes that at the next session of the First Committee there will be one proposal on the issue that includes clear actions and tangible measures that take the efforts of the United Nations forward instead of around in circles.

Turning to the role of science and technology in the context of international security and disarmament, we stress that science and technology have been recognized as essential enablers of sustainable development and the achievement of the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development. It is each State's inalienable and inherent right to develop, utilize and acquire technologies for socioeconomic development. Proliferation concerns should not become a pretext for denying dual-use technologies. Such denials are often based on political grounds. It is necessary that the right to access such technologies be ensured on a non-discriminatory basis.

The Chair (*spoke in Spanish*): I now give the floor to the representative of Trinidad and Tobago to introduce draft resolution A/C.1/75/L.21.

Mr. Barman (Trinidad and Tobago): I have the honour to formally introduce draft resolution A/C.1/75/L.21, entitled "Women, disarmament, non-proliferation and arms control".

The first draft resolution on this subject was considered by the First Committee and recommended for adoption by the General Assembly in 2010 (resolution 65/69). Since that time, the delegation of Trinidad and Tobago, along with the co-sponsors of draft resolution A/C.1/75/L.21, have called upon the Committee to recognize, in a comprehensive manner, the role of women in decision-making processes related to disarmament, non-proliferation and arms control.

The draft resolution builds on its previous iterations, highlighting the recent progress made in the area of disarmament, non-proliferation and arms control.

The draft resolution has also preserved language on the Arms Trade Treaty, as its relevance to the draft resolution is twofold: it is the only international legally binding instrument to regulate the trade in conventional weapons, of which small and light weapons is a category; and it is the first global instrument to recognize the connection between arms transfers and violence against women and children.

The draft resolution continues to recognize the instrumental role played by civil society organizations in promoting women's involvement and meaningful engagement in disarmament, non-proliferation and arms control.

Finally, the delegation of Trinidad and Tobago takes this opportunity to express our sincerest gratitude to all Member States for their contributions, which have certainly enriched draft resolution A/C.1/75/L.21. We once again request their support for the draft resolution, given the vast importance of women, disarmament, non-proliferation and arms control to the international community in maintaining peace and addressing global challenges in relation to international security.

Mr. Reyes Hernández (Bolivarian Republic of Venezuela) (*spoke in Spanish*): Venezuela takes the floor to make a general statement on draft resolution A/C.1/75/L.8/Rev.1, entitled "Developments in the field of information and telecommunications in the context of international security", of which it is a co-sponsor.

My delegation believes that it is appropriate for Member States to cooperate in the development and implementation of measures to strengthen stability and security in the use of information and communication technologies, as well as to prevent practices that are harmful or could pose threats to international peace and security.

Venezuela notes with interest the proposal contained in paragraph 1 of the draft resolution to convene a new open-ended working group on security of and in the use of information and telecommunications for the period 2021 to 2025, which could provide an inclusive and transparent forum for advancing the necessary development of an international legally binding instrument that would allow us to address the challenges posed by matters relating to cybersecurity.

The Venezuelan delegation invites Member States to vote in favour of draft resolution A/C.1/75/L.8/Rev.1 as a whole in order to preserve multilateral discussions of information and communications technologies.

Mr. Jianjian Wu (China) (*spoke in Chinese*): The First Committee is about to take action on draft resolution A/C.1/75/L.8/Rev.1, entitled “Developments in the field of information and telecommunications in the context of international security”.

The global pandemic has meant that the discussions of the Group of Governmental Experts on Advancing Responsible State Behaviour in Cyberspace in the Context of International Security and the Open-Ended Working Group on Developments in the Field of Information and Telecommunications in the Context of International Security have fallen well behind schedule. Thanks to the leadership of the co-Chairs, Ambassador Lauber and Ambassador de Aguiar Patriota, as well as the excellent support provided by the Secretariat, all parties were able to participate via video-teleconferencing in informal discussions to ensure the continuity of the two processes. China expects them to successfully complete their negotiations next year and submit substantive reports to the General Assembly at its seventy-sixth session, as scheduled.

Many countries are considering how to advance discussions on information security issues within the framework of the United Nations upon the conclusion of those two processes. China believes that the establishment of two parallel processes with similar mandates was not only a duplication but also a cause for division. After two years of discussions, we are pleased to see more and more countries endorsing China's view that the United Nations should have only one inclusive process in which all countries can participate in discussions on an equal footing.

Draft resolution A/C.1/75/L.8/Rev.1 proposes the creation of a new open-ended working group for a period of five years, which will contribute to the establishment

of an inclusive mechanism within the United Nations to discuss and negotiate issues related to information security and put an end to the current anomaly of two parallel mechanisms.

I would like to use this opportunity to once again express our dismay that certain countries have challenged and called for a separate vote on the tenth preambular paragraph of the draft resolution, which refers to the concept of a community of shared future for humankind. Is there anything wrong with that concept? The coronavirus disease pandemic has shown that all countries of the world are an interdependent community in which no country can afford to be isolated or sealed off. The response to climate change further demonstrates that the international community shares a common fate and no country can survive alone.

The cybersecurity issue reminds the world that the future and destiny of humankind face threats and challenges to which no one can remain indifferent. The concept of a community of shared future for humankind is widely endorsed and supported by the international community. Its incorporation in the draft resolution on cybersecurity is proper and fitting. Do the countries who challenge that fact seek to deny that humankind is a closely interrelated community and that the future and destiny of all countries are inextricably linked?

We therefore call on all Member States to vote in favour of the tenth preambular paragraph and of paragraph 1 of draft resolution A/C.1/75/L.8/Rev.1, and in favour of the draft resolution as a whole in order to collectively protect the multilateral processes on cybersecurity, establish a consultative approach to strategies for cooperation on cybersecurity, build a global cyberspace order and share cyberspace for lasting peace and stability.

Mr. Jiménez (Nicaragua): (*spoke in Spanish*): Nicaragua takes the floor to make a general statement on draft resolution A/C.1/75/L.8/Rev.1, entitled “Developments in the field of information and telecommunications in the context of international security”, which Nicaragua has traditionally supported and co-sponsored.

The Open-Ended Working Group on Developments in the Field of Information and Telecommunications in the Context of International Security is undoubtedly a historic process in which all Member States, regardless of their size or level of development, have an opportunity

to participate and deliberate in a transparent and equal manner.

In that regard, we invite Member States to vote in favour of the paragraphs for which separate votes have been requested and in favour of the draft resolution as a whole, as a sign of support for further discussions on information and communications technology in an open, transparent and inclusive open-ended working group in which all Member States can continue to negotiate on an equal footing and without interference of any kind.

We reaffirm our support for a negotiating process within the framework of the United Nations to adopt a legally binding international instrument to provide an effective response to the significant legal gaps that currently exist in the context of cybersecurity and to address the increasing challenges and threats that we face in that area effectively and on the basis of multilateral cooperation.

Mr. Tozik (Belarus) (*spoke in Russian*): We consider the Open-Ended Working Group on Developments in the Field of Information and Telecommunications in the Context of International Security to be one of the most important instruments for taking into account the interests of all States when developing solutions to counter threats in the field of information communications technologies.

We are in favour of extending the mandate of the Open-Ended Working Group, as provided for in draft resolution A/C.1/75/L.8/Rev.1, entitled “Developments in the field of information and telecommunications in the context of international security”. We support the principle of encouraging the use of information and communications technologies in order to create a community of shared future for humankind, as enshrined in the tenth preambular paragraph of the draft resolution. We also support the principle enshrined in paragraph 1, without which the draft resolution would lose its importance and key message.

We express our unwavering support for draft resolution A/C.1/75/L.64, entitled “Strengthening and developing the system of arms control, disarmament and non-proliferation treaties and agreements”, which we consider to be the cornerstone of efforts to preserve an atmosphere of trust, mutual understanding and consensus on international security issues.

The Chair (*spoke in Spanish*): We have heard the last general statement on the draft resolutions and draft decisions submitted under cluster 5. I shall now give the floor to representatives wishing to speak in explanation of vote or position.

Mr. Balouji (Islamic Republic of Iran): We will vote against draft decision A/C.1/75/L.59, as it constitutes yet more proof of the hypocritical policies materialized by the United States of America. We believe that the document deserves nothing but a “no”.

It is also redundant and unnecessary considering the sophisticated compliance mechanisms already in place based on various international instruments on arms control, disarmament and non-proliferation. Ironically, the United States itself has not complied with those mechanisms. Its nuclear-weapons strategy and rigid intention to produce and deploy more sophisticated nuclear weapons are absolutely against its explicit obligations towards nuclear disarmament.

The United States has failed to comply with its obligations under the Chemical Weapons Convention and continues to retain a remarkable part of its chemical weapons arsenal. There are numerous reports about its clandestine activities contrary to the Biological Weapons Convention. We should bear in mind the destabilizing and destructive effects of its military sales to foreign invaders and violators of international human rights law and international humanitarian law.

Moreover, on draft resolution A/C.1/75/L.4, entitled “Advancing responsible State behaviour in cyberspace in the context of international security”, the Islamic Republic of Iran has joined the consensus in the First Committee regarding cybersecurity continuously since 1998. That was despite our serious reservations about how the Group of Governmental Experts (GGE) on Advancing Responsible State Behaviour in Cyberspace in the Context of International Security was established and its work conducted.

The Open-Ended Working Group (OEWG) has faced opposition since its inception, when the United States proposed the adoption of resolution 73/266 during the same General Assembly session, which created a new GGE with the same mandate. We have persistently requested that the ongoing parallelism in terms of the two processes and two resolutions be brought to an end.

In our view, as the most inclusive existing mechanism, the OEWG should continue to fulfil its

mandate until and unless a new inclusive multilateral institutional dialogue mechanism is established within the United Nations. If needed in its work, the OEWG could delegate certain technical parts of its mandate to relevant United Nations bodies or subgroups.

Draft resolution A/C.1/75/L.4 surprisingly ignores the two-year United Nations-wide discussions within the OEWG as though nothing had happened since 2015. The United States — the main sponsor of draft resolution A/C.1/75/L.4 — personifies a notorious prototype of irresponsible behaviour and malicious acts in and through cyberspace. The United States Government and its close State and non-State allies have been behind a range of malicious acts in cyberspace, including the so-called Stuxnet malware attacks against Iran's critical infrastructure in 2010. Such irresponsible behaviour has been increasing since then.

Against that backdrop, and with all due respect to those who vote otherwise, the Islamic Republic of Iran will vote against draft resolution A/C.1/75/L.4.

Mrs. Jakob (Germany): I have the honour to speak on behalf of European Union (EU) member States. The candidate countries the Republic of North Macedonia, Montenegro and Albania; the European Free Trade Association countries of Iceland and Norway; as well as Ukraine, the Republic of Moldova and Georgia, align themselves with this explanation of vote.

The EU and its member States welcomed the resumption of discussions on cyber issues at the United Nations in 2019 and reaffirm their commitment to work both within the Group of Governmental Experts (GGE) on Advancing Responsible State Behaviour in Cyberspace in the Context of International Security and the Open-Ended Working Group (OEWG) on Developments in the Field of Information and Telecommunications in the Context of International Security. We support the continuation of their important work in 2021, including discussions on future institutional dialogue. We should let both processes conclude their work first to allow the discussions on cyber issues in the First Committee to return to one consensus track.

The proposal by Russia (draft resolution A/C.1/75/L.8/Rev.1) pre-empts the outcome of the existing Open-Ended Working Group. It is perceived as going against the inclusive and open spirit of resolution 73/27 and disregarding its mandate, as well as the engagement of the whole United Nations community to make progress on cyber issues. It is

therefore with great regret that EU member States cannot support the draft resolution. We also regret that the main sponsor has chosen to include language that has not enjoyed consensus in the past within the First Committee framework.

We further regret that, despite the invitation by many States to revert to consensual language and endorse a constructive approach, such efforts have been denied. The draft resolution risks postponing the possibility of the OEWG recommending the establishment of a permanent and regular institutional dialogue.

We acknowledge and welcome the broad desire for continued regular dialogue with universal participation, including multistakeholder participation, on the implementation of the GGE reports on responsible behaviour of States in cyberspace endorsed by all United Nations States Members. Our proposal to establish a programme of action to advance responsible State behaviour in cyberspace, which is jointly supported by 46 countries to date, constitutes the most promising current proposal that would allow for the return to a one-track process based on consensus. It offers an opportunity to work together towards an inclusive, more permanent and constructive environment that includes the entire United Nations membership without delay or interruption.

We reiterate that the consensus achieved at the meetings of the GGE held in 2015 regarding the application of international law, including the Charter of the United Nations, as well as the developed norms of responsible State behaviour in cyberspace, must be preserved. We welcome the work done to date in the framework of the OEWG, which offers a valuable platform for exchanging positions and fostering a stronger common understanding on how to face threats and promote responsible State behaviour in cyberspace. We also welcome the consultation of the GGE with the United Nations membership and other stakeholders, notably through regional organizations.

The EU will work with the entire United Nations membership towards the conclusion of discussions that plot a path back to consensus in the First Committee process.

Mr. Knyazyan (Armenia): I take the floor to present the position of the delegation of Armenia on draft resolutions A/C.1/75/L.8/Rev.1, "Developments in the field of information and telecommunications in the context of international security", and A/C.1/75/L.4,

“Advancing responsible State behaviour in cyberspace in the context of international security”.

We recognize the critical role of information and communications technologies in promoting peace and development, enabling the realization of human rights and enhancing cooperation among nations. Armenia attaches high priority to the protection of human rights and the freedom of speech in the process of combating the use of information and communications technologies for malicious purposes. The denial of access to information and its underlying infrastructure violates human rights, in particular the right to the freedom of expression. Those rights should include the freedom to seek, receive and share information and ideas, regardless of frontiers, as enshrined in article 19 of the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights.

Armenia underscores the great importance of an open, free, stable and secure cyberspace, based on the purposes and principles of the Charter of the United Nations. We would like to reiterate our long-standing position that the principles of international law in their entirety should become the basis for responsible State behaviour in cyberspace. All purposes and principles of the Charter of the United Nations, including the principles of the equal rights and self-determination of peoples, are applicable and essential to maintaining peace and stability and promoting an open, secure, stable, accessible and peaceful environment for information and communications technologies.

Therefore, we do not support selective references to the principles of international law and the Charter of the United Nations. We believe that the Open-Ended Working Group on Developments in the Field of Information and Telecommunications in the Context of International Security, as an inclusive and transparent platform for discussions among Member States, should elaborate its own set of comprehensive rules, norms and procedures in the field of information and communications technologies, which will come to fill the gaps in the report of the Group of Governmental Experts on Advancing Responsible State Behaviour in Cyberspace in the Context of International Security.

It is with that understanding that the delegation of Armenia will vote in favour of draft resolutions A/C.1/75/L.8/Rev.1 and A/C.1/75/L.4.

Mrs. Castro Loredó (Cuba) (*spoke in Spanish*): We take the floor in explanation of vote on draft resolution

A/C.1/75/L.4, “Advancing responsible State behaviour in cyberspace in the context of international security”.

This year, our delegation will once again not be able to support draft resolution A/C.1/75/L.4. We will vote against it because we believe that its main sponsor should have shown flexibility and submitted instead a joint text with the Russian Federation, thereby allowing for the restoration of consensus on that important issue, rather than promoting an approach that seeks to end discussions on the matter within an open, transparent and inclusive framework.

It is not for the main sponsor of the draft resolution to determine when or how Member States should continue discussions on the subject by attempting to prejudge future discussions in an open-ended working group. Such an attitude has once again led to polarization on an important issue, and we therefore oppose the presentation of two competing parallel draft resolutions that seek to divide the international community. We recall that it was the sponsor of draft resolution A/C.1/75/L.4 that broke the consensus in 2018 and promoted an alternative text to the one traditionally considered by the Committee.

Draft resolution A/C.1/75/L.4 is unbalanced in its treatment of the Open-Ended Working Group on Developments in the Field of Information and Telecommunications in the Context of International Security, which is unquestionably the appropriate forum to address the issue in a transparent, inclusive, multilateral, democratic and open manner, with the full participation of all Member States on an equal footing.

We reiterate that the Group of Governmental Experts on Advancing Responsible State Behaviour in Cyberspace in the Context of International Security has already exhausted discussions on the applicability of international law to the use of information and communications technologies, without reaching consensus on the urgent actions needed to prevent the covert and illegal use by individuals, organizations and States of other nations' computer systems to attack third countries.

The sponsor of draft resolution A/C.1/75/L.4 has no moral standing whatsoever to promote responsible behaviour by States in cyberspace while it develops its own cyberoffensive operations and capabilities, as well as a military doctrine that authorizes the use of cyberweapons and the ability to launch pre-emptive cyberattacks to deter adversaries. We reject attempts

to turn cyberspace into a theatre of military operations and to legitimize, in that context, punitive unilateral acts of force.

Mr. Knight (United States of America): My delegation intends to vote against draft resolution A/C.1/75/L.8/Rev.1, “Developments in the field of information and telecommunications in the context of international security”, because we believe it is a needlessly divisive proposal at a time when most Member States are working in good faith to make progress in a consensus manner, via the ongoing processes of the Open-Ended Working Group (OEWG) on Developments in the Field of Information and Telecommunications in the Context of International Security and the Group of Governmental Experts (GGE) on Advancing Responsible State Behaviour in Cyberspace in the Context of International Security.

The attempt by Russia, the sponsor of the draft resolution, to render irrelevant the ongoing OEWG — which it proposed itself two years ago — is an affront to all United Nations States Members that are actively participating in the OEWG, which was mandated to develop consensus recommendations on future institutional dialogue on cybersecurity, among other issues.

The sponsor of draft resolution A/C.1/75/L.8/Rev.1 held no open consultations on the text, and neither did it consult with all United Nations regional groups. The sponsor wants to be seen as a leader on these issues and pays lip service to inclusive consensus processes; however, its true objective is to pursue at all costs an affirmation of its authoritarian model for cyberspace and in the process to destroy two decades’ worth of consensus-driven work that was welcomed by the international community in order. The drafter is attempting to turn the OEWG mechanism and the draft resolutions on cybersecurity recommended by the First Committee into a Trojan horse for its own parochial interests.

The United States has been an active participant in the OEWG and GGE processes. Until this year’s First Committee negotiations, we were hopeful that those processes would reach consensus on useful recommendations and enable us to reorient back to a consensus-based approach. If the draft resolution is adopted, it is hard to envision the United Nations operating on a consensus basis to achieve any meaningful new results on those issues for years to

come. That would be fundamentally detrimental to the achievement of international cyberstability.

The United States aligns itself with the many Member States that seek to return to a consensus-based approach on cybersecurity within the First Committee. We reflected that objective in the draft resolution we proposed (A/C.1/75/L.4). In contrast, if the draft resolution proposed by Russia is adopted, it will cement — for five years — the decision and controversy on cyber issues about which so many Member States have expressed frustration.

Mr. Horne (Australia): I take the floor to express my delegation’s explanation of vote on draft resolution A/C.1/75/L.4, “Advancing responsible State behaviour in cyberspace in the context of international security”, and draft resolution A/C.1/75/L.8/Rev.1, “Developments in the field of information and telecommunications in the context of international security”.

Australia is committed to the continuation of inclusive dialogue on cyber issues in the First Committee. We co-sponsored draft resolution A/C.1/75/L.4, which reflects agreed text, welcomes the ongoing work of both the Open-Ended Working Group (OEWG) on Developments in the Field of Information and Telecommunications in the Context of International Security and the Group of Governmental Experts (GGE) on Advancing Responsible State Behaviour in Cyberspace in the Context of International Security and constitutes a sensible and balanced draft resolution. Most important, it respects the mandates of both those processes.

Like many, we conducted extensive outreach in New York, Moscow and Canberra to request changes to draft resolution A/C.1/75/L.8/Rev.1. We are disappointed, like many other members, that Russia has refused to let other voices be heard. While we voted against the initial establishment of the OEWG, we have engaged in good faith and helped steer it towards an outcome that we can all own. In that spirit, we abstained in the voting on the equivalent decision last year despite it containing non-consensus language that we could not support. We want the OEWG to succeed. To succeed, it must be allowed to complete its mandate. We thank the Russian Federation for initiating the OEWG; however, its outcomes and its future must belong to all Member States. It is not for Russia to decide our fate alone.

It is therefore with deep regret that we cannot support the draft resolution, and we cannot abstain in the voting

on a draft resolution that, to our deep disappointment, takes a backward step and risks entrenching divides for a further five-year period. The draft resolution is stacked with non-consensus language. It prejudices the OEWG outcome and establishes a new forum for dialogue, the mandate for which includes issues outside of the competence of the First Committee, such as data security. It also proposes new structures and methodologies of work that have not been discussed.

The current OEWG is mandated to make recommendations on regular institutional dialogue. Consensus recommendations to that effect are within reach in just a few short months. That gives us a precious opportunity to return to consensus, which Member States need to stand up and grasp. Australia will defend that path back to consensus by voting against both the paragraphs of draft resolution A/C.1/75/L.8/Rev.1 that will be put to the vote and against the draft resolution as a whole. The ongoing divisions here are truly disheartening, especially when it is clear that there is such an appetite among all United Nations Member States for an ongoing, inclusive and transparent discussion on cyber issues in the First Committee.

We reaffirm our commitment to continue to engage in good faith with all Member States to return the agenda to consensus, end the dual tracks, deliver meaningful and complementary outcomes in both the OEWG and the GGE and make consensus recommendations shaped by all Member States on the future of cyber discussions at the United Nations.

Ms. Rose (United Kingdom): I take the floor to give the United Kingdom's explanation of vote on draft resolution A/C.1/75/L.8/Rev.1.

The United Kingdom supports an inclusive, sustained and universal process to agree practical measures for State cooperation in cyberspace beyond the conclusion of the current Open-Ended Working Group (OEWG) on Developments in the Field of Information and Telecommunications in the Context of International Security and the Group of Governmental Experts on Advancing Responsible State Behaviour in Cyberspace in the Context of International Security. We hope and expect the outcomes of those processes to deliver that.

But there are no quick wins. Member States must work together in good faith, giving ourselves time to find common ground and ensuring everyone has an opportunity to fully participate and be heard. The

challenges of 2020 have been significant. We had hoped that pragmatism, commitment and consensus would win through in that context, and we therefore wholeheartedly regret Russia's attempts to undermine the work of those United Nations Groups by pre-empting the outcomes of our important discussions.

Russia claims that it has introduced an inclusive, transparent, democratic process, giving all Member States a voice in those discussions, but in practice the draft resolution it has proposed makes it clear that their voices do not matter when it comes to important decisions. Discussion, agreement and consensus outcomes have been replaced by unilaterally drafted recommendations. We welcome the addition to the draft resolution of its paragraph 2, which would allow us to continue our important work in 2021, but in all other respects the draft resolution undermines the United Nations process, further eroding trust and cohesion.

The draft resolution also introduces topics that go beyond the mandate of the OEWG, rewrites existing consensus that provides the foundation for our work today and rolls back our commitment to ensuring the broad participation of all stakeholders. Given our serious reservations regarding the content of the draft resolution and despite our clear support for and engagement in the existing OEWG, it is therefore with great regret that we must on this occasion vote against draft resolution A/C.1/75/L.8/Rev.1 as a whole.

That overall position will be reinforced by our vote against paragraph 1 of draft resolution A/C.1/75/L.8/Rev.1 on the basis that the contents of that paragraph must be discussed and taken forward in consensus by all Member States if we are to make progress in future discussions. We urge others to join us in voting against paragraph 1 and against the draft resolution as a whole.

On the other hand, draft resolution A/C.1/75/L.4 and the two draft decisions submitted by the Chairs of those processes, draft decision A/C.1/75/L.47 and draft decision A/C.1/75/L.60, are uncontentious. For that reason, we will vote in favour of draft resolution A/C.1/75/L.4 and draft decisions A/C.1/75/L.47 and A/C.1/75/L.60.

Despite our disagreement with the approach taken in the proposal of draft resolution A/C.1/75/L.8/Rev.1, the United Kingdom commits itself to working actively within any future process on the issue to return our dialogue to consensus. We remain committed to

successful outcomes in both existing processes and hope that others will approach future dialogue with the same level of genuine engagement.

Mrs. Nadeau (Canada): I take the floor to explain Canada's vote on draft resolution A/C.1/75/L.8/Rev.1, "Developments in the field of information and telecommunications in the context of international security". We have three concerns about the draft resolution.

First, the current Open-Ended Working Group (OEWG) on Developments in the Field of Information and Telecommunications in the Context of International Security is still ongoing. One of the items in its mandate is to put forward options for a future institutional mechanism to address cyber issues at the United Nations. A virtual Open-Ended Working Group meeting on that very issue will be held in early December.

There are several proposals being considered, including very interesting proposals by France and Egypt to create a programme of action. Those options should be discussed further in December with a view to including a recommendation in the final report of the OEWG. We value the OEWG because it is an inclusive and consensus-based process. However, establishing a new OEWG now, as the draft resolution seeks to do, would prejudge the outcome of the current OEWG.

(spoke in French)

Secondly, in its paragraph 1 the draft resolution would give the proposed open-ended working group a five-year term, which is unusually long. Previous OEWGs on cyber issues had terms of one to two years, as do the current OEWG and the Group of Governmental Experts (GGE) on Advancing Responsible State Behaviour in Cyberspace in the Context of International Security. The fact that the proposed open-ended working group would report to the General Assembly at its eightieth session could, in our view, be detrimental to its productivity.

Thirdly, the draft resolution includes language regarding misinformation that we find unacceptable. We are concerned that such language could be used by some States to justify the suppression of free speech. We also believe that the issue falls outside the scope of an OEWG. In short, we are concerned about the content of some of the paragraphs in the draft resolution. We also believe that the current OEWG and GGE should be allowed to complete their work,

including to address a future institutional mechanism before such a mechanism is established, as provided for in draft resolution A/C.1/75/L.4, of which Canada is a co-sponsor.

In the light of those concerns, we will vote against the paragraphs of draft resolution A/C.1/75/L.8/Rev.1 that are put to the vote and against the draft resolution as a whole.

Mr. Reyes Hernández (Bolivarian Republic of Venezuela) *(spoke in Spanish)*: Venezuela takes the floor to explain why we will not support draft resolution A/C.1/75/L.4, entitled "Advancing responsible State behaviour in cyberspace in the context of international security".

Venezuela believes that the use of information and communications technologies cannot contravene the purposes and principles of the Charter of the United Nations and international law, in particular the principles of the sovereign equality of States, non-intervention in the internal affairs of States, refraining from the threat or use of force against the territorial integrity and the political independence of any State, and the peaceful settlement of disputes.

Venezuela has always expressed the need to make the relevant adaptations to ensure the applicability of international law in matters relating to cyberspace in order to avoid misinterpretations that might give rise to attempts to justify the threat or use of force against a State on the basis of alleged responsibility for a cyberattack.

In addition, Venezuela does not accept the use of the term "attribution of cyberattacks", given that no scientific, technical or legal procedure has yet been established to determine and adjudicate responsibility for cyberattacks or any other similar incident against State or non-State actors.

The eleventh preambular paragraph of draft resolution A/C.1/75/L.4 interferes with the deliberations taking place in the Open-Ended Working Group on Developments in the Field of Information and Telecommunications in the Context of International Security, as it seeks to impose a biased view that exclusively favours Western interests over the approach that the membership of the Organization aspires to build in order to prevent the malicious use of information and communications technologies.

All of that is intended to coerce the final conclusions of the Open-Ended Working Group, which is highly alarming when we recall that among the proponents of such a vision are Powers that view cyberspace as a theatre of war. The draft resolution is unbalanced in its mention of the Open-Ended Working Group, downplaying its contributions, and instead refers to the effective work of the Group of Governmental Experts on Advancing Responsible State Behaviour in Cyberspace in the Context of International Security.

In the view of my delegation, the work of the Group of Governmental Experts has been insufficient and does not represent the views of the membership. The Open-Ended Working Group is the only inclusive intergovernmental body within the United Nations for the development of discussions to ensure the use of information and communications technologies in a manner compatible with the maintenance of international peace and security.

The main focus of the United Nations should be the formulation of a binding international legal framework to ensure security in cyberspace. The draft resolution determines the formulation of norms, rules and procedures for that purpose and favours the promotion of voluntary confidence-building measures, generating false expectations of security for States.

Bearing in mind the points I have made and the status of the debate, Venezuela will vote against draft resolution A/C.1/75/L.4.

Mr. Penaranda (Philippines): The delegation of the Philippines reiterates its support for the urgent and important work of the Open-Ended Working Group (OEWG) on Developments in the Field of Information and Telecommunications in the Context of International Security and considers it an open and inclusive platform for discussing matters concerning information and communications technology in the context of international security. We continue to support the Chair of the OEWG as he leads it towards a successful outcome.

Despite the challenges presented by the pandemic, draft resolution A/C.1/75/L.4 and draft resolution A/C.1/75/L.8/Rev.1 present a scenario in which two OEWG sessions would be held in 2021 — one to conclude the work of the existing OEWG under draft resolution A/C.1/75/L.4 and another to commence the work of the proposed new open-ended working group under draft resolution A/C.1/75/L.8/Rev.1. While it

is possible to hold two such OEWG sessions in 2021, both of which we support, the work would be intense for Member States, particularly small delegations, considering that the Group of Governmental Experts on Advancing Responsible State Behaviour in Cyberspace in the Context of International Security, which we also support, will be convening its session next year as well.

If both draft resolutions were adopted, the Fifth Committee would have to consider their programme budget implications, and the Secretariat would have to deal with logistical issues. Those in themselves would be a challenge in the face of the numerous sessions at the United Nations that have been postponed until 2021 due to the pandemic.

In recent years, the First Committee has considered draft resolutions that sometimes appeared to be competing, subjecting Member States to the difficult task of determining which one to support. In some cases, delegations decided to support both draft resolutions, thereby producing duplicative and competing mechanisms and processes that strain the finite resources of the United Nations. That situation could also result in the fragmentation of the work of the Committee.

We therefore urge the sponsors of such draft resolutions in the First Committee to allow for sufficient discussion among delegations with a view to reaching consensus and to exert every effort to arrive at an agreement with other sponsors on a unified draft resolution, before putting it to a vote. That will ensure efficiency and effectiveness in the work of the Committee and produce credible collective action that can address outstanding issues on information and communications technologies and cybersecurity in a timely manner.

Ms. Pailhe (Belgium) (*spoke in French*): Belgium takes the floor to explain its vote on draft resolution A/C.1/75/L.14, “Effects of the use of armaments and ammunitions containing depleted uranium”.

On 11 May 2007, Belgium approved a law classifying inert ammunition and arms containing depleted uranium, or any other type of general industrial uranium, as prohibited weapons. That law entered into force in 2009. Belgium was therefore the first country in the world to decree a ban on that type of weapon in accordance with the precautionary principle.

Indeed, the adoption of the Belgian law was preceded by parliamentary hearings during which scientific experts spoke and various points of view were expressed on the assessment of the dangers to health and the environment posed by the use of weapons containing depleted uranium. Belgium pays close attention to any development in the scientific analysis of the dangers linked to the use of depleted uranium-weapon systems, including studies conducted on the matter at the international level. Belgium remains at the disposal of the United Nations and its Member States for any information concerning the definitions, objectives and modalities of the law of 11 May 2007.

Belgium hopes that draft resolution A/C.1/75/L.14, proposed for adoption by the First Committee, can contribute to a better understanding at the international level of the possible effects induced by depleted-uranium munitions with a view to agreeing on a common assessment in due course.

Mr. Jiménez (Nicaragua) (*spoke in Spanish*): Our delegation would like to explain its vote on draft resolution A/C.1/75/L.4, “Advancing responsible State behaviour in cyberspace in the context of international security”.

We regret that the sponsor of the draft resolution never held consultations, and that is why our delegation will not support it and will vote against it.

Also, we cannot ignore the fact that the sponsor should have taken into account a proposal that would allow for a joint text to be presented together with the Russian Federation, thereby enabling consensus on such an important issue, instead of promoting an approach that seeks to bring to an end discussions on the subject in an open, transparent and inclusive framework.

In our view, it is not up to the main sponsor of the draft resolution to decide when or how Member States should continue discussions on the subject by seeking to prejudice or hijack future discussions in an open-ended working group. That attitude has once again led to division on the issue.

We also oppose the submission of parallel and competing draft resolutions that are regrettably intended to divide the international community yet again.

Mr. Lynch (New Zealand): New Zealand will vote against draft resolution A/C.1/75/L.8/Rev.1, entitled “Developments in the field of information

and telecommunications in the context of international security”.

New Zealand acknowledges the importance of discussions among the United Nations membership on the critical topic of responsible State behaviour online. To that end, we have been an active contributor to Open-Ended Working Group (OEWG) on Developments in the Field of Information and Telecommunications in the Context of International Security, which is concerned with those issues. We recognize the value of the conversations we have had in that forum. We think that it has acted as a confidence-building measure in and of itself, and we will work to support it in delivering a report that delivers meaningful progress on the implementation of the framework of responsible State behaviour online.

We acknowledge that there is an appetite among States to continue the conversation that the OEWG started and, as part of the ongoing OEWG process, we are required to consider the question of regular institutional dialogue that seeks to address that very issue. We think that it is worth in-depth discussion among all Member States. There are a range of different ways in which we may wish to take the work of the OEWG forward, and we think we should give the membership the ability to talk that through in detail and at expert level within the current process.

That is the primary reason that we will vote against draft resolution A/C.1/75/L.8/Rev.1 as a whole. We believe that it pre-empts OEWG discussions on future dialogue and does so in a way that undermines the inclusive, transparent and democratic mandate it is supposed to have. We will vote against paragraph 1 of the draft resolution for the same reason.

The Chair (*spoke in Spanish*): We have heard the last speaker in explanation of vote before the vote.

As previously indicated, the representative of the Russian Federation has asked for the floor to speak on a point of order before we begin the voting process. I now give him the floor.

Mr. Polyanskiy (Russian Federation) (*spoke in Russian*): I did not wish to speak on a point of order but on the voting procedure.

I will not deign to address the groundless and absolutely shameless fabrications regarding draft resolution A/C.1/75/L.8/Rev.1 that we have just heard

from our Western colleagues. I will exercise my right of reply in that regard later in the meeting.

As I mentioned in my earlier statement, we would like to challenge the request that paragraph 1 of the draft resolution we proposed, on international cybersecurity, be put to a separate vote.

In accordance with rule 129 of the rules of procedure of the General Assembly, we would like to put that request to the vote. We consider the request for a separate vote on paragraph 1 of the draft resolution to be a counterproductive step that would undermine its content and remove its key proposal — to create a new open-ended working group on international information security in 2021. That proposal lies at the very heart of the draft resolution and cannot be separated from the rest of its text.

If paragraph 1 on the creation of a new open-ended working group, is deleted, then the draft resolution we proposed will lose its meaning. In our view, our opponents' approach is dishonest and dishonourable. We could have requested that paragraph 6 of draft resolution A/C.1/75/L.4, proposed by the United States, also be put to a separate vote; however, we believed that would be unethical. Such actions are unworthy of serious international actors. We are convinced that we should all be expressing our positions on the draft resolution as a whole and not extracting key elements from it.

We call on all United Nations States Members that are interested in continuing an inclusive negotiation process on international cybersecurity not to succumb to provocations and to rally in the interest of preserving our common heritage by opposing a separate vote on paragraph 1. The decision is theirs. It might be a long time before we are provided with a new opportunity to implement that idea.

The Chair (*spoke in Spanish*): I understand that the representative of the Russian Federation did not wish to speak on a point of order but to call on the States present to take a certain position in the voting process. Is that so, or was there a point of order that I did not understand?

I call on the representative of the Russian Federation.

Mr. Polyanskiy (Russian Federation): As I said earlier, Mr. Chair, it was not a point of order. I simply wanted to raise a procedural issue. I would like our procedural proposal to be put to the vote in

accordance with rule 129 of the rules of procedure of the General Assembly.

The Chair: An objection has been made to the request for division in accordance with rule 129 of the rules of procedure of the General Assembly. If objection is made to the request for division, the motion for division shall be voted upon.

Permission to speak on the motion for division shall be given only to two speakers in favour and two speakers against.

Mr. Horne (Australia): I am still trying to figure out what exactly has been proposed by the representative of the Russian Federation. Before we can work out how we would like to respond, I think we need some clarity on what exactly we would be responding to.

We heard the representative of the Russian Federation question whether or not there should be a division of the draft resolution. States are free to call for separate votes on specific paragraphs, of which the representative of the Russian Federation is surely aware.

I am sure those delegations that called for a separate vote on paragraph 1 did so because they felt that the Russian Federation had not been in any way inclusive in its efforts to try and find an appropriate way forward on that paragraph.

Before I could potentially respond as one of those two speakers either for or against, it would be good to have some clarity on what it is we are actually discussing.

The Chair: I will give the floor back to the representative of the Russian Federation and consider his statement as one of the two statements permitted against the motion for division.

I will then defer to the decision of the Committee because the interpretation of any such questions falls to the Committee as a whole and not to any individual or the Chair.

I now call on the representative of the Russian Federation.

Mr. Polyanskiy (Russian Federation) (*spoke in Russian*): I will continue speaking in Russian, and I hope that I will be properly understood. I am amazed at the inability of our Western colleagues to understand elementary matters when it is not in their interests. I believe I was very clear in my previous statement.

We believe that paragraph 1 of draft resolution A/C.1/75/L.8/Rev.1, which we proposed and for which a separate vote has been requested, contains the key element of the entire draft resolution. A separate vote on that paragraph would therefore strip the entire draft resolution of its meaning. Our Western colleagues are fully aware of that, and the request for a separate vote is a cunning and unscrupulous approach.

Once again, we could have done the same with respect to draft resolution A/C.1/75/L.4, proposed by the United States, but we did not. Members should play fair. If members oppose the draft resolution we proposed, then they should vote against it. There is no need to put to a separate vote the paragraph that contains the very substance of the draft resolution.

That is why we are invoking rule 129 of the rules of procedure of the General Assembly, and we believe that we have every right to do so. We count on your support, Mr. Chair, in that regard.

The Chair: As I said before, that is for the Committee to collectively decide.

An objection has been made to the request for the division of paragraph 1 from draft resolution A/C.1/75/L.8/Rev.1.

In accordance with rule 129 of the rules of procedure, if objection is made to the request for division, the motion for division shall be voted upon. Permission to speak on the motion for division shall be given only to two speakers in favour and two speakers against.

I now call on the representative of Cuba.

Mrs. Castro Loredó (Cuba) (*spoke in Spanish*): I will be brief.

We would like to support the objection made by the Russian delegation to the division of paragraph 1 from draft resolution A/C.1/75/L.8/Rev.1, which we consider to be of great relevance and which should be voted on as a whole.

The Chair: I now call on the representative of the United States.

Mr. Knight (United States of America): This may be a point of order, but I wanted to clarify for the First Committee the vote we are about to undertake.

Could you clarify that a “yes” vote would be a vote in favour of the division, which would occasion a separate vote on paragraph 1?

The Chair: A “yes” vote will mean support for the request for a separate vote on paragraph 1 of draft resolution A/C.1/75/L.8/Rev.1.

I call on the representative of the United States.

Mr. Knight (United States of America): In that case, I will speak in favour of the division. We request that all Member States vote “yes” to divide paragraph 1 from draft resolution A/C.1/75/L.8/Rev.1 for a separate vote on that paragraph.

We request that members of the First Committee vote in favour of the division.

The Chair: In accordance with rule 129, I shall now put to the vote the motion for division of paragraph 1 from draft resolution A/C.1/75/L.8/Rev.1 for a separate vote.

A vote in favour will support the request for a separate vote on paragraph 1 of draft resolution A/C.1/75/L.8/Rev.1. A vote against will oppose the request for a separate vote on paragraph 1 of draft resolution A/C.1/75/L.8/Rev.1.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour:

Albania, Andorra, Australia, Austria, Belgium, Botswana, Bulgaria, Canada, Chile, Colombia, Croatia, Cyprus, Czech Republic, Denmark, Estonia, Finland, France, Georgia, Germany, Greece, Hungary, Iceland, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Japan, Kenya, Latvia, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Malta, Marshall Islands, Mauritania, Monaco, Montenegro, Netherlands, New Zealand, North Macedonia, Norway, Panama, Poland, Portugal, Republic of Korea, Republic of Moldova, Romania, San Marino, Sierra Leone, Slovakia, Slovenia, Spain, Sweden, Switzerland, Turkey, Ukraine, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America

Against:

Algeria, Angola, Azerbaijan, Belarus, Bolivia (Plurinational State of), Burundi, Cambodia, China, Comoros, Cuba, Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Dominica, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Kazakhstan, Kyrgyzstan, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Mongolia, Mozambique, Myanmar, Nicaragua, Pakistan, Peru, Russian Federation, Singapore, Sri Lanka, Syrian Arab Republic,

Tajikistan, Uzbekistan, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of), Zambia, Zimbabwe

Abstaining:

Argentina, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belize, Bhutan, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Chad, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Djibouti, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Eritrea, Fiji, Ghana, Guatemala, Guinea, Guyana, India, Indonesia, Iraq, Jamaica, Jordan, Kiribati, Kuwait, Lebanon, Lesotho, Libya, Madagascar, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Mauritius, Mexico, Namibia, Nepal, Nigeria, Oman, Papua New Guinea, Paraguay, Philippines, Qatar, Rwanda, Saint Lucia, Samoa, Saudi Arabia, Solomon Islands, South Africa, Sudan, Thailand, Timor-Leste, Togo, Trinidad And Tobago, Tunisia, United Arab Emirates, Uruguay, Yemen

The motion for the division of paragraph 1 from draft resolution A/C.1/75/L.8/Rev.1 for a separate vote was adopted by 57 votes to 31, with 63 abstentions.

The Chair: The Committee will now proceed to take action on draft resolution A/C.1/75/L.4, entitled “Advancing responsible State behaviour in cyberspace in the context of international security”.

I give the floor to the Secretary of the Committee.

Ms. Elliott (Secretary of the Committee): Draft resolution A/C.1/75/L.4 was submitted on 4 October by the representative of the United States of America. The sponsors of the draft resolution are listed in document A/C.1/75/L.4. The additional sponsors are listed in the e-deleGATE portal of the First Committee.

The Chair: A recorded vote has been requested.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour:

Afghanistan, Albania, Algeria, Andorra, Angola, Antigua and Barbuda, Argentina, Armenia, Australia, Austria, Azerbaijan, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belgium, Belize, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia (Plurinational State of), Bosnia and Herzegovina, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Bulgaria, Cabo Verde, Canada, Chad, Chile, Colombia, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Croatia, Cyprus, Czech Republic, Democratic Republic of the Congo, Denmark, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, El Salvador, Equatorial Guinea,

Eritrea, Estonia, Fiji, Finland, France, Gabon, Gambia, Georgia, Germany, Ghana, Greece, Guatemala, Guinea, Guyana, Haiti, Honduras, Hungary, Iceland, India, Indonesia, Iraq, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Kazakhstan, Kenya, Kiribati, Kuwait, Kyrgyzstan, Latvia, Lesotho, Liberia, Libya, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Madagascar, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Marshall Islands, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mexico, Micronesia (Federated States of), Monaco, Mongolia, Montenegro, Morocco, Mozambique, Namibia, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nigeria, North Macedonia, Norway, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Qatar, Republic of Korea, Republic of Moldova, Romania, Rwanda, Saint Kitts And Nevis, Saint Lucia, Samoa, San Marino, Sao Tome and Principe, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Slovakia, Slovenia, Solomon Islands, South Africa, Spain, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Sweden, Switzerland, Tajikistan, Thailand, Timor-Leste, Togo, Tonga, Trinidad And Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, Turkmenistan, Uganda, Ukraine, United Arab Emirates, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United Republic of Tanzania, United States of America, Uruguay, Uzbekistan, Viet Nam, Yemen

Against:

Burundi, China, Cuba, Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Dominica, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Nicaragua, Russian Federation, Syrian Arab Republic, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of), Zimbabwe

Abstaining:

Belarus, Cambodia, Comoros, Djibouti, Egypt, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lebanon, Myanmar, Palau

Draft resolution A/C.1/75/L.4 was adopted by 153 votes to 11, with 9 abstentions.

The Chair: The Committee will now proceed to take action on draft resolution A/C.1/75/L.8/Rev.1, entitled “Developments in the field of information and telecommunications in the context of international security”.

I give the floor to the Secretary of the Committee.

Ms. Elliott (Secretary of the Committee): Draft resolution A/C.1/75/L.8 was submitted on 5 October by the representative of the Russian Federation. A revised draft resolution (A/C.1/75/L.8/Rev.1) was submitted on 26 October.

A statement on the programme budget implications of draft resolution A/C.1/75/L.8/Rev.1 has been issued as document A/C.1/75/L.74 and placed in the e-deleGATE portal. The sponsors of the draft resolution are listed in document A/C.1/75/L.8/Rev.1. The additional sponsors are listed in the e-deleGATE portal of the First Committee. Madagascar has also become a sponsor.

The Chair: Separate votes have been requested on the tenth preambular paragraph and paragraph 1 of draft resolution A/C.1/75/L.8/Rev.1. I shall now put those paragraphs to the vote, one by one.

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

In favour:

Algeria, Angola, Antigua and Barbuda, Argentina, Armenia, Azerbaijan, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belarus, Belize, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia (Plurinational State of), Bosnia and Herzegovina, Botswana, Brunei Darussalam, Burundi, Cabo Verde, Cambodia, Cameroon, Chad, China, Comoros, Congo, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Cuba, Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Democratic Republic of the Congo, Djibouti, Dominica, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Equatorial Guinea, Eritrea, Ethiopia, Fiji, Gabon, Gambia, Ghana, Guinea, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Jamaica, Jordan, Kazakhstan, Kenya, Kiribati, Kuwait, Kyrgyzstan, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lebanon, Lesotho, Libya, Madagascar, Malaysia, Maldives, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Myanmar, Namibia, Nepal, Nicaragua, Nigeria, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Qatar, Russian Federation, Rwanda, Saint Lucia, Samoa, Sao Tome And Principe, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Singapore, South Africa, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Syrian Arab Republic, Tajikistan, Thailand, Timor-Leste, Tunisia, Turkmenistan, Uganda, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Tanzania, Uruguay, Uzbekistan, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of), Viet Nam, Yemen, Zambia, Zimbabwe

Against:

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

Abstaining:

Brazil, Chile, Guatemala, Guyana, Iraq, Mali, Papua New Guinea, Solomon Islands, Switzerland, Trinidad and Tobago, Turkey

The tenth preambular paragraph was retained by 108 votes to 49, with 11 abstentions.

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

In favour:

Afghanistan, Algeria, Angola, Antigua And Barbuda, Argentina, Armenia, Azerbaijan, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Belarus, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia (Plurinational State of), Bosnia and Herzegovina, Brunei Darussalam, Burundi, Cambodia, Cameroon, Chad, China, Comoros, Congo, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Cuba, Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Democratic Republic of the Congo, Djibouti, Dominica, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, Equatorial Guinea, Eritrea, Ethiopia, Fiji, Gabon, Gambia, Ghana, Guinea, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Jordan, Kazakhstan, Kiribati, Kuwait, Kyrgyzstan, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lebanon, Lesotho, Madagascar, Maldives, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Myanmar, Namibia, Nepal, Nicaragua, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Qatar, Russian Federation, Samoa, Sao Tome and Principe, Saudi Arabia, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Syrian Arab Republic, Tajikistan, Thailand, Timor-Leste, Togo, Tunisia, Turkmenistan, Uganda, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Tanzania, Uruguay, Uzbekistan, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of), Yemen, Zambia, Zimbabwe

Against:

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

Abstaining:

Bahamas, Barbados, Belize, Brazil, El Salvador, Guatemala, Guyana, India, Indonesia, Iraq, Jamaica, Kenya, Libya, Malaysia, Mali, Mexico, Nigeria, Papua New Guinea, Saint Lucia, Senegal, Solomon Islands, Switzerland, Trinidad and Tobago, Viet Nam

Paragraph 1 was retained by 92 votes to 52, with 24 abstentions.

The Chair: The Committee will now proceed to take action on draft resolution A/C.1/75/L.8/Rev.1, as a whole.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour:

Afghanistan, Algeria, Angola, Antigua and Barbuda, Argentina, Armenia, Azerbaijan, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Belarus, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia (Plurinational State of), Bosnia and Herzegovina, Botswana, Brunei Darussalam, Burundi, Cambodia, Chad, China, Comoros, Congo, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Cuba, Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Democratic Republic of the Congo, Djibouti, Dominica, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Equatorial Guinea, Eritrea, Ethiopia, Fiji, Gabon, Gambia, Ghana, Guinea, Honduras, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Jamaica, Jordan, Kazakhstan, Kenya, Kiribati, Kuwait, Kyrgyzstan, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lebanon, Lesotho, Madagascar, Malaysia, Maldives, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Myanmar, Namibia, Nepal, Nicaragua, Nigeria, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines,

Qatar, Russian Federation, Rwanda, Saint Kitts and Nevis, Saint Lucia, Samoa, Sao Tome and Principe, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Singapore, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Syrian Arab Republic, Tajikistan, Thailand, Timor-Leste, Togo, Tunisia, Turkmenistan, Uganda, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Tanzania, Uruguay, Uzbekistan, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of), Viet Nam, Yemen, Zambia, Zimbabwe

Against:

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

Abstaining:

Bahamas, Barbados, Belize, Brazil, Cabo Verde, Guatemala, Guyana, Haiti, India, Iraq, Libya, Mali, Palau, Papua New Guinea, Sierra Leone, Solomon Islands, South Africa, Switzerland, Tonga, Trinidad and Tobago

Draft resolution A/C.1/75/L.8/Rev.1, as a whole, was adopted by 104 votes to 50, with 20 abstentions.

The Chair: The Committee will now proceed to take action on draft resolution A/C.1/75/L.12, entitled "United Nations disarmament fellowship, training and advisory services".

I give the floor to the Secretary of the Committee.

Ms. Elliott (Secretary of the Committee): Draft resolution A/C.1/75/L.12 was submitted on 5 October by the representative of Nigeria. The sponsors of the draft resolution are listed in document A/C.1/75/L.12. The additional sponsors are listed in the e-deleGATE portal of the First Committee. Equatorial Guinea and Namibia have also become sponsors.

The Chair: The sponsors of the draft resolution have expressed the wish that the draft resolution be adopted by the Committee without a vote. If I hear no

objection, I will take it that the Committee wishes to act accordingly.

Draft resolution A/C.1/75/L.12 was adopted.

The Chair: The Committee will now proceed to take action on draft resolution A/C.1/75/L.14, entitled “Effects of the use of armaments and ammunitions containing depleted uranium”.

I give the floor to the Secretary of the Committee.

Ms. Elliott (Secretary of the Committee): Draft resolution A/C.1/75/L.14 was submitted on 5 October by the representative of Indonesia on behalf of the States Members of the United Nations that are members of the Movement of Non-Aligned Countries. The sponsors of the draft resolution are listed in document A/C.1/75/L.14.

The Chair: A recorded vote has been requested.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour:

Afghanistan, Algeria, Andorra, Angola, Antigua and Barbuda, Argentina, Armenia, Austria, Azerbaijan, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belarus, Belgium, Belize, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia (Plurinational State of), Bosnia and Herzegovina, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Burundi, Cabo Verde, Cambodia, Cameroon, Chad, Chile, Colombia, Comoros, Congo, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Cuba, Cyprus, Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Democratic Republic of the Congo, Djibouti, Dominica, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Equatorial Guinea, Eritrea, Eswatini, Ethiopia, Fiji, Finland, Gabon, Gambia, Ghana, Greece, Grenada, Guatemala, Guinea, Guyana, Honduras, Iceland, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Ireland, Italy, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Kazakhstan, Kenya, Kiribati, Kuwait, Kyrgyzstan, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lebanon, Lesotho, Liberia, Libya, Liechtenstein, Luxembourg, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Marshall islands, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mexico, Mongolia, Montenegro, Morocco, Mozambique, Myanmar, Namibia, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Nigeria, North Macedonia, Norway, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Qatar, Republic of Moldova, Rwanda, Saint Kitts and

Nevis, Saint Lucia, San Marino, Sao Tome and Principe, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Slovenia, Solomon Islands, South Africa, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Sweden, Switzerland, Syrian Arab Republic, Tajikistan, Thailand, Timor-Leste, Togo, Tonga, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkmenistan, Tuvalu, Uganda, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Tanzania, Uruguay, Uzbekistan, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of), Viet Nam, Yemen, Zambia, Zimbabwe

Against:

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

Abstaining:

Albania, Australia, Canada, Croatia, Czech Republic, Denmark, Estonia, Georgia, Germany, Hungary, Latvia, Lithuania, Micronesia (Federated States of), Monaco, Poland, Portugal, Republic of Korea, Romania, Russian Federation, Slovakia, Spain, Turkey, Ukraine

Draft resolution A/C.1/75/L.14 was adopted by 150 votes to 4, with 23 abstentions.

The Chair: The Committee will now proceed to take action on draft resolution A/C.1/75/L.15, entitled “Relationship between disarmament and development”.

I give the floor to the Secretary of the Committee.

Ms. Elliott (Secretary of the Committee): Draft resolution A/C.1/75/L.15 was submitted on 5 October by the representative of Indonesia on behalf of the States Members of the United Nations that are members of the Movement of Non-Aligned Countries. The sponsors of the draft resolution are listed in document A/C.1/75/L.15.

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

Draft resolution A/C.1/75/L.15 was adopted.

The Chair: The Committee will now proceed to take action on draft resolution A/C.1/75/L.19, entitled “Promotion of multilateralism in the area of disarmament and non-proliferation”.

I give the floor to the Secretary of the Committee.

Ms. Elliott (Secretary of the Committee): Draft resolution A/C.1/75/L.19 was submitted on 5 October by the representative of Indonesia on behalf of the States Members of the United Nations that are members of the Movement of Non-Aligned Countries. The sponsors of the draft resolution are listed in document A/C.1/75/L.19.

The Chair: *A recorded vote has been requested.*^[17]
A recorded vote was taken.

In favour:

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

Against:

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

Abstaining:

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

Draft resolution A/C.1/75/L.19 was adopted by 125 votes to 4, with 50 abstentions.

The Chair: The Committee will now proceed to take action on draft resolution A/C.1/75/L.21 entitled "Women, disarmament, non-proliferation and arms control".

I give the floor to the Secretary of the Committee.

Ms. Elliott (Secretary of the Committee): Draft resolution A/C.1/75/L.21 was submitted on 5 October by the representative of Trinidad and Tobago. The sponsors of the draft resolution are listed in document A/C.1/75/L.21. The additional sponsors are listed in the e-deleGATE portal of the First Committee. Botswana, Equatorial Guinea, Kiribati and Lesotho have also become sponsors.

The Chair: Separate votes have been requested on the fifth, ninth, thirteenth and sixteenth preambular paragraphs of draft resolution A/C.1/75/L.21. I shall therefore put those paragraphs to the vote, one by one.

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

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour:

Afghanistan, Albania, Algeria, Andorra, Angola, Antigua and Barbuda, Argentina, Australia, Austria, Azerbaijan, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belarus, Belgium, Belize, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia (Plurinational State of), Bosnia and Herzegovina, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Burundi, Cabo Verde, Cambodia, Canada, Chad, Chile, China, Colombia, Comoros, Congo, Costa Rica,

Côte d'Ivoire, Croatia, Cuba, Cyprus, Czech Republic, Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Democratic Republic of the Congo, Denmark, Djibouti, Dominica, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Equatorial Guinea, Eritrea, Estonia, Eswatini, Ethiopia, Fiji, Finland, France, Gabon, Gambia, Georgia, Germany, Ghana, Greece, Grenada, Guatemala, Guinea, Guyana, Haiti, Honduras, Hungary, Iceland, India, Indonesia, Iraq, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Kazakhstan, Kenya, Kiribati, Kuwait, Kyrgyzstan, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Latvia, Lebanon, Lesotho, Liberia, Libya, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Madagascar, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Marshall Islands, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mexico, Micronesia (Federated States of), Monaco, Mongolia, Montenegro, Morocco, Mozambique, Myanmar, Namibia, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Nigeria, North Macedonia, Norway, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Qatar, Republic of Korea, Republic of Moldova, Romania, Rwanda, Saint Kitts and Nevis, Saint Lucia, Samoa, San Marino, Sao Tome and Principe, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Slovakia, Slovenia, South Africa, Spain, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Sweden, Switzerland, Tajikistan, Thailand, Timor-Leste, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, Tuvalu, Uganda, Ukraine, United Arab Emirates, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United Republic of Tanzania, United States of America, Uruguay, Uzbekistan, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of), Viet Nam, Yemen, Zambia, Zimbabwe

Against:

None

Abstaining:

Armenia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Russian Federation, Syrian Arab Republic

The fifth preambular paragraph was retained by 173 to none with 4 abstentions.

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

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour:

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

Against:

None

Abstaining:

Algeria, China, Russian Federation, Solomon Islands

The ninth preambular paragraph was retained by 171 to none with 4 abstentions.

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

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour:

Afghanistan, Albania, Andorra, Angola, Antigua and Barbuda, Argentina, Australia, Austria, Bahamas, Bahrain, Barbados, Belgium, Belize, Benin, Bhutan, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Burundi, Cabo Verde, Cambodia, Canada, Chad, Chile, China, Colombia, Comoros, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Croatia, Cyprus, Czech Republic, Democratic Republic of the Congo, Denmark, Djibouti, Dominica, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, El Salvador, Equatorial Guinea, Eritrea, Estonia, Eswatini, Ethiopia, Fiji, Finland, France, Gabon, Gambia, Georgia, Germany, Ghana, Greece, Grenada, Guatemala, Guinea, Guyana, Haiti, Honduras, Hungary, Iceland, Iraq, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Kazakhstan, Kenya, Kiribati, Kuwait, Kyrgyzstan, Latvia, Lebanon, Lesotho, Liberia, Libya, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Madagascar, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Marshall Islands, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mexico, Micronesia (Federated States of), Monaco, Mongolia, Montenegro, Morocco, Mozambique, Namibia, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nigeria, North Macedonia, Norway, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Paraguay, Peru, Poland, Portugal, Qatar, Republic of Korea, Republic of Moldova, Romania, Rwanda, Saint Kitts and Nevis, Saint Lucia, Samoa, San Marino, Sao Tome and Principe, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Slovakia, Slovenia, South Africa, Spain, Sudan, Suriname, Sweden, Switzerland, Thailand, Timor-Leste, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, Tuvalu, Uganda, Ukraine, United Arab Emirates, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America, Uruguay, Uzbekistan, Yemen, Zambia, Zimbabwe

Against:

None

Abstaining:

Algeria, Armenia, Azerbaijan, Bangladesh, Belarus, Bolivia (Plurinational State of), Cuba, Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Egypt, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Lao People's Democratic Republic, Myanmar, Nicaragua, Russian Federation, Solomon Islands, Sri Lanka, Syrian Arab Republic, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of)

The thirteenth preambular paragraph was retained by 153 votes to none, with 20 abstentions.

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

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour:

Afghanistan, Albania, Andorra, Angola, Antigua and Barbuda, Argentina, Australia, Austria, Azerbaijan, Bahamas, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belgium, Belize, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia (Plurinational State of), Bosnia and Herzegovina, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Burundi, Cabo Verde, Cambodia, Canada, Chile, Colombia, Comoros, Congo, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Croatia, Cuba, Cyprus, Czech Republic, Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Democratic Republic of the Congo, Denmark, Djibouti, Dominica, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, El Salvador, Estonia, Eswatini, Ethiopia, Fiji, Finland, France, Gabon, Georgia, Germany, Ghana, Greece, Grenada, Guatemala, Guinea, Guyana, Haiti, Honduras, Hungary, Iceland, Iraq, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Jamaica, Japan, Kazakhstan, Kenya, Kiribati, Kyrgyzstan, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Latvia, Lebanon, Lesotho, Liberia, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Madagascar, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Marshall Islands, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mexico, Micronesia (Federated States of), Monaco, Mongolia, Montenegro, Morocco, Mozambique, Myanmar, Namibia, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Nigeria, North Macedonia, Norway, Pakistan, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Republic of Korea, Republic of Moldova, Romania, Rwanda, Saint Kitts and Nevis, Saint Lucia, Samoa,

San Marino, Sao Tome and Principe, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Slovakia, Slovenia, South Africa, Spain, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Sweden, Switzerland, Tajikistan, Thailand, Timor-Leste, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, Tuvalu, Uganda, Ukraine, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America, Uruguay, Uzbekistan, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of), Viet Nam, Zambia, Zimbabwe

Against:

None

Abstaining:

Algeria, Bahrain, Belarus, China, Egypt, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Jordan, Kuwait, Libya, Oman, Qatar, Russian Federation, Saudi Arabia, Solomon Islands, United Arab Emirates, Yemen

The sixteenth preambular paragraph was retained by 153 votes to none, with 18 abstentions.

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

Draft resolution A/C.1/75/L.21 was adopted.

The Chair: The Committee will now proceed to take action on draft resolution A/C.1/75/L.27, entitled “Observance of environmental norms in the drafting and implementation of agreements on disarmament and arms control”.

I give the floor to the Secretary of the Committee.

Ms. Elliott (Secretary of the Committee): Draft resolution A/C.1/75/L.27 was submitted on 6 October by the representative of Indonesia on behalf of the States Members of the United Nations that are members of the Movement of Non-Aligned Countries. The sponsors of the draft resolution are listed in document A/C.1/75/L.27.

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

Draft resolution A/C.1/75/L.27 was adopted.

The Chair: The Committee will now proceed to take action on draft resolution A/C.1/75/L.33, entitled “Role of science and technology in the context of international security and disarmament”.

I give the floor to the Secretary of the Committee.

Ms. Elliott (Secretary of the Committee): Draft resolution A/C.1/75/L.33 was submitted on 9 October by the representative of India. The sponsors of the draft resolution are listed in document A/C.1/75/L.33. The additional sponsors are listed in the e-deleGATE portal of the First Committee.

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

Draft resolution A/C.1/75/L.33 was adopted.

The Chair: The Committee will now proceed to take action on draft resolution A/C.1/75/L.41, entitled “United Nations Disarmament Information Programme”.

I give the floor to the Secretary of the Committee.

Ms. Elliott (Secretary of the Committee): Draft resolution A/C.1/75/L.41 was submitted on 9 October by the representative of Mexico. The sponsors of the draft resolution are listed in document A/C.1/75/L.41. The additional sponsors are listed in the e-deleGATE portal of the First Committee.

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

Draft resolution A/C.1/75/L.41 was adopted.

The Chair: The Committee will now proceed to take action on draft resolution A/C.1/75/L.42, entitled “United Nations study on disarmament and non-proliferation education”.

I give the floor to the Secretary of the Committee.

Ms. Elliott (Secretary of the Committee): Draft resolution A/C.1/75/L.42 was submitted on 9 October by the representative of Mexico. The sponsors of the draft resolution are listed in document A/C.1/75/L.42. The additional sponsors are listed in the e-deleGATE portal of the First Committee.

The Chair: A separate vote has been requested on paragraph 4 of draft resolution A/C.1/75/L.42. I shall therefore now put to the vote paragraph 4.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour:

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

Against:

None

Abstaining:

Iran (Islamic Republic of), Russian Federation, Syrian Arab Republic

Paragraph 4 was retained by 170 votes to none, with 3 abstentions.

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

Draft resolution A/C.1/75/L.42 was adopted.

The Chair: The Committee will now proceed to take action on draft decision A/C.1/75/L.47, entitled "Open-ended Working Group on Developments in the Field of Information and Telecommunications in the Context of International Security established pursuant to General Assembly resolution 73/27 of 5 December 2018".

I give the floor to the Secretary of the Committee.

Ms. Elliott (Secretary of the Committee): Draft decision A/C.1/75/L.47 was submitted on 13 October by the representative of Switzerland. The sponsors of the draft decision are listed in document A/C.1/75/L.47. A statement on the programme budget implications of the draft decision has been issued as document A/C.1/75/L.76 and is available on the e-deleGATE portal of the First Committee.

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

Draft decision A/C.1/75/L.47 was adopted.

The Chair: The Committee will now proceed to take action on draft decision A/C.1/75/L.59, entitled "Compliance with non-proliferation, arms limitation and disarmament agreements and commitments".

I give the floor to the Secretary of the Committee.

Ms. Elliott (Secretary of the Committee): Draft decision A/C.1/75/L.59 was submitted on 14 October by the representative of the United States of America. The sponsor of the draft decision is listed in document A/C.1/75/L.59.

The Chair: A recorded vote has been requested.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour:

Afghanistan, Albania, Algeria, Andorra, Angola, Antigua and Barbuda, Argentina, Armenia, Australia, Austria, Azerbaijan, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belgium, Belize, Benin, Bhutan, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Burundi, Cabo Verde, Cambodia, Cameroon, Canada, Chad, Chile, China, Colombia, Comoros, Congo, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Croatia, Cyprus, Czech Republic, Democratic Republic of the Congo, Denmark, Djibouti, Dominica, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, El Salvador, Equatorial Guinea, Eritrea, Estonia, Eswatini, Ethiopia, Fiji, Finland, France, Gabon, Gambia, Georgia, Germany, Ghana, Greece, Grenada, Guatemala, Guinea, Guyana, Haiti, Honduras, Hungary, Iceland, India, Indonesia, Iraq, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Kazakhstan, Kenya, Kiribati, Kuwait, Kyrgyzstan, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Latvia, Lebanon, Lesotho, Liberia, Libya, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Madagascar, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Marshall Islands, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mexico, Micronesia (Federated States of), Monaco, Mongolia, Montenegro, Morocco, Mozambique, Myanmar, Namibia, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nigeria, North Macedonia, Norway, Oman, Pakistan, Palau, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Qatar, Republic of Korea, Republic of Moldova, Romania, Rwanda, Saint Kitts and Nevis, Saint Lucia, Samoa, San Marino, Sao Tome and Principe, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Slovakia, Slovenia, Solomon Islands, South Africa, Spain, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Sweden, Switzerland, Tajikistan, Thailand, Timor-Leste, Togo, Tonga, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, Turkmenistan, Tuvalu, Uganda, Ukraine, United Arab Emirates, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America, Uruguay, Uzbekistan, Viet Nam, Yemen, Zambia

Against:

Iran (Islamic Republic of)

Abstaining:

Belarus, Bolivia (Plurinational State of), Cuba, Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Egypt, Nicaragua, Russian Federation, Syrian Arab Republic, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of), Zimbabwe

Draft decision A/C.1/75/L.59 was adopted by 169 votes to 1, with 10 abstentions.

The Chair: The Committee will now proceed to take action on draft decision A/C.1/75/L.60, entitled "Group of Governmental Experts on Advancing Responsible State Behaviour in Cyberspace in the Context of International Security established pursuant to General Assembly resolution 73/266 of 22 December 2018".

I give the floor to the Secretary of the Committee.

Ms. Elliott (Secretary of the Committee): Draft decision A/C.1/75/L.60 was submitted on 14 October by the representative of Brazil. The sponsor of the draft decision is listed in document A/C.1/75/L.60. A statement on the programme budget implications of the draft decision has been issued as document A/C.1/75/L.77 and is available on the e-deleGATE portal of the First Committee.

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

Draft decision A/C.1/75/L.60 was adopted.

The Chair: The Committee will now proceed to take action on draft resolution A/C.1/75/L.64, entitled "Strengthening and developing the system of arms control, disarmament and non-proliferation treaties and agreements".

I give the floor to the Secretary of the Committee.

Ms. Elliott (Secretary of the Committee): Draft resolution A/C.1/75/L.64 was submitted on 15 October by the representative of the Russian Federation. The sponsors of the draft decision are listed in document A/C.1/75/L.64. The additional sponsors are listed in the e-deleGATE portal of the First Committee. The Comoros and Equatorial Guinea have also become sponsors.

The Chair: A recorded vote has been requested.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour:

Afghanistan, Albania, Algeria, Andorra, Angola, Antigua and Barbuda, Argentina, Armenia, Australia, Austria, Azerbaijan, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belarus, Belgium, Belize, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia (Plurinational State of), Bosnia and Herzegovina, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Burundi, Cabo Verde, Cambodia, Cameroon, Canada, Chad, Chile, China, Colombia, Comoros, Congo, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Croatia, Cuba, Cyprus, Czech Republic, Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Democratic Republic of the Congo, Denmark, Djibouti, Dominica, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Equatorial Guinea, Eritrea, Estonia, Eswatini, Ethiopia, Fiji, Finland, France, Gabon, Gambia, Germany, Ghana, Greece, Grenada, Guatemala, Guinea, Guyana, Haiti, Honduras, Hungary, Iceland, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Kazakhstan, Kenya, Kiribati, Kuwait, Kyrgyzstan, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Latvia, Lebanon, Lesotho, Liberia, Libya, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Madagascar, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Marshall Islands, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mexico, Micronesia (Federated States of), Monaco, Mongolia, Montenegro, Morocco, Mozambique, Myanmar, Namibia, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Nigeria, North Macedonia, Norway, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Qatar, Republic of Korea, Republic of Moldova, Romania, Russian Federation, Rwanda, Saint Kitts and Nevis, Saint Lucia, Samoa, San Marino, Sao Tome and Principe, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Slovakia, Slovenia, Solomon Islands, South Africa, Spain, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Sweden, Switzerland, Syrian Arab Republic, Tajikistan, Thailand, Timor-Leste, Togo, Tonga, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, Turkmenistan, Tuvalu, Uganda, United Arab Emirates, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United Republic of Tanzania, United States of America, Uruguay, Uzbekistan, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of), Viet Nam, Yemen, Zambia, Zimbabwe

Against:

None

Abstaining:

Georgia, Palau, Ukraine

Draft resolution A/C.1/75/L.64 was adopted by 179 votes to none, with 3 abstentions.

The Chair (*spoke in Spanish*): We have concluded the voting process under cluster 5, "Other disarmament measures and international security".

I shall now give the floor to those representatives who wish to speak in explanation of vote or position on the draft resolutions and decisions just adopted.

Mr. Balouji (Islamic Republic of Iran): My delegation joined the consensus in adopting draft resolution A/C.1/75/L.21, entitled "Women, disarmament, non-proliferation and arms control". However, we would like to put on record that the draft resolution is acceptable to my delegation in as much as it is in line with all constitutions, laws and regulations, as well as administrative procedures. Our position on the subjects of the fifth and ninth preambular paragraphs as articulated on other occasions remains valid. We abstained in the voting on the sixth preambular paragraph, as we believe that referring to an issue such as the coronavirus disease pandemic in the context of disarmament and arms control is not relevant.

With regard to draft resolution A/C.1/75/L.64, Iran supported and voted in favour of it for the following reasons. One specific nuclear-weapon State continuously violates the provisions of treaties on disarmament and arms control, thereby weakening them individually. The disarmament and arms control machinery also suffers immensely owing to such irresponsible behaviour. By highlighting the views of the peace-loving nations that comply with international law and their related commitments, the adoption of that draft resolution sends a strong message to that country.

Given its non-compliance, the United States regime has brought about a complicated situation that undermines the trust in, and the efficiency of, such treaties in the escalating international crisis. A clear example in that regard is non-compliance with the implementation with the explicit obligation for nuclear disarmament based on article VI of the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons (NPT) and the recommendations of the NPT Review Conferences. The United States of America has opposed strengthening the Biological Weapons Convention through negotiations, as well as the adoption of legally binding protocols and

the implementation of all its provisions, including, inter alia, a verification mechanism.

We believe that, while draft resolution A/C.1/75/L.64 contains a number of constructive elements, it can be further strengthened and promoted. For instance, the universalization of disarmament and arms control treaties has not been taken into account in the draft resolution. The Israeli regime is not a member of any of the treaties concerning weapons of mass destruction, and it has been threatening the security of regional States parties to those treaties in the Middle East.

Mr. Situmorang (Indonesia): Indonesia would like to deliver an explanation of vote regarding its position on draft resolution A/C.1/75/L.8/Rev.1, entitled “Developments in the field of information and telecommunications in the context of international security”.

At the outset, Indonesia commends the Russian delegation, as the penholder on the draft resolution, on its initiative and active engagement, including through various informal consultations. We note with appreciation that the draft resolution was considerably revised following discussions with Member States. We still have concerns about modalities for the proposed new open-ended working group contained in paragraph 1 of the draft resolution.

First, we remain convinced that the mandate of a follow-up open-ended working group process needs to consider and address the outcome of the current one.

Secondly, in order to keep pace with the rapid advancements in information and communications technologies (ICT) and maintain the relevance of the open-ended working group’s discussions, we need to update its mandate every two years.

Thirdly, we welcome the inclusion of national initiatives in the proposed mandate and are of the view that particular initiatives should be decided by the new open-ended working group rather than in the draft resolution.

For those reasons, we abstained in the voting on paragraph 1 of draft resolution A.C.1/75/L.8/Rev.1. Indonesia continues to support the draft resolution as a whole, which reflects its principled support for this multilateral and inclusive institutional process, with a view to increasing the stability and security of the ICT environment. During the open-ended working group process, we submitted several inputs and proposals both

in our national capacity and as a member of a group of States. Our active contribution is a testament to our delegation’s commitment to realizing meaningful and successful outcomes in the open-ended working group

Lastly, Indonesia reiterates its support for a multilateral, inclusive and consensual process that belongs to and is driven by all United Nations States Members. We look forward to continued constructive engagement on future discourse on ICT in the context of international security.

Ms. Jáquez Huacuja (Mexico) (*spoke in Spanish*): I take the floor in explanation of vote on draft resolution A/C.1/75/L.8/Rev.1, entitled “Developments in the field of information and telecommunications in the context of international security”.

Mexico voted in favour of the draft resolution as a sign of its commitment to the centrality of the United Nations and the proposed new open-ended working group as the necessary inclusive format for advancing cybersecurity issues and ensuring the peaceful uses of cyberspace. It also demonstrates the importance of exercising flexibility to continue collaborating on international security issues and achieve substantive results.

However, Mexico believes that the initiative to establish a new working group is somewhat premature, given that forging agreements remains imperative in order to complete the mandate and important work of the processes already under way. For Mexico, the five-year time frame seems arbitrary and fails in its intention to institutionalize the current discussion.

It is imperative that the new working group established by the draft resolution build on the foundation already laid and continue the previous work of the Open-Ended Working Group on Developments in the Field of Information and Telecommunications in the Context of International Security and the Group of Governmental Experts on Advancing Responsible State Behaviour in Cyberspace in the Context of International Security. It must satisfy the interests of all countries and take into account the many initiatives that have been proposed, without giving preference to national issues or initiatives that fail to enjoy majority support or consensus. Applying international law and fostering trust, peace and stability in cyberspace must continue to be prioritized, and going forward Mexico will work to that end.

We would also like to explain our vote on draft resolution A/C.1/75/L.64, entitled “Strengthening and developing the system of arms control, disarmament and non-proliferation treaties and agreements”. We support the draft resolution and we thank Russia for proposing it. We support its call for full and unconditional compliance with the various treaties and agreements.

However, the assertion that multilateral disarmament, non-proliferation and arms control instruments are based on consensus is not correct or factual. On the contrary, every treaty and forum has its own dynamics and rules of procedure, and consensus is not the common denominator. Mexico reiterates that, while achieving a consensus is always a desirable aspiration, it must not be used as a byword or justification for paralysing multilateral forums.

Mr. Hassan (Egypt): I take the floor to explain my delegation’s vote on draft resolution A/C.1/75/L.8/Rev.1, entitled “Developments in the field of information and telecommunications in the context of international security”.

Egypt voted in favour of the draft resolution in line with its principled support for an interest in maintaining the central role of the United Nations in addressing the international peace and security aspects of information and communications technologies (ICT) in an inclusive and universal platform. However, while it appreciates the efforts of the Russian Federation in conducting intensive rounds of informal consultations, my delegation is obliged to place on record a number of observations and concerns that we expressed during the consultations, some of which were not fully addressed.

First, Egypt is of the view that the creation of a new open-ended working group or any other mechanism on ICT should be considered only after the existing open-ended working group has concluded its deliberations and fulfilled its mandate, in order not to pre-empt the outcome of ongoing discussions and negotiations.

Secondly, there are several structural issues in relation to the proposed new open-ended working group. For example, the proposed five-year period implies that Member States that aspire to tangible progress and action-oriented results have to wait at least until 2025 before any tangible progress or significant action is achieved. Open-ended working groups and governmental groups of experts are by definition and design deliberative platforms or preparatory processes that should lead to further action-oriented steps, such as

the establishment of a plan of action — as proposed by 46 Member States, including Egypt — or the convening of a conference to negotiate legally binding instruments.

Thirdly, the name of the new open-ended working group proposed in paragraph 1 is rather confusing and could create issues with regard to interpreting its mandate, while the selective reference to specific issues, such as data security and national initiatives, may also create imbalances in addressing several other issues of interest that represent an increasing threat to international peace and security.

Lastly, we reiterate that we question the relevance and added value of the creation of thematic subgroups as proposed in paragraph 4. We stress in advance that the creation of such groups must not be interpreted as an opening for creating exclusive subgroups that do not allow for the full and equal participation of all Member States. It also must not lead to convening parallel meetings that impose limitations on the capacity of the majority of New York-based Missions to participate in them.

Mrs. Castro Loredó (Cuba) (*spoke in Spanish*): We take the floor in explanation of vote on draft decision A/C.1/75/L.59, “Compliance with non-proliferation, arms limitation and disarmament agreements and commitments”.

Although the draft decision requests the issue to be placed on the agenda only for the next session, our delegation abstained in the voting, as it believes that the United States has no moral standing to advocate in the First Committee for a text on the issue, when it ignores and withdraws from international agreements and commitments concerning disarmament and arms control.

The United States promotes a policy of war through the shift in its position on nuclear weapons and the publication of a new nuclear doctrine that encompasses the modernization and production of new nuclear weapons. Lowering the threshold for the use of such weapons and ramping up their role in national security doctrines, in addition to the withdrawal from the Intermediate-Range Nuclear Forces Treaty and the nuclear agreement with Iran, undermine peace and security for all and the nuclear disarmament and non-proliferation architecture.

The United States — the world’s leader in conducting nuclear tests, which carried out 1,032 tests from 1945

to 1992 alone — continues to violate all its legal obligations under the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons (NTP) and the commitments made at NTP Review Conferences. In July, while the world struggled to address the coronavirus disease pandemic, the United States — the country most affected by the pandemic owing to its failed policies and which deploys more nuclear weapons than any other country — adopted the 2021 National Defense Authorization Act, which authorizes \$740.5 billion for national defence programmes.

There is no doubt that the greatest danger to international peace and security is the irresponsible behaviour of the United States Government — a country that promotes conflicts in all regions of the planet, as well as unconventional wars and trade wars, sponsors the forcible overthrow of sovereign Governments, encourages terrorism, endorses supremacist and racist ideas and imposes harsh unilateral coercive measures with complete disregard for international law.

Mrs. Jakob (Germany): I take the floor again on behalf of European Union (EU) member States, as well as Albania, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Canada, Iceland, Liechtenstein, Montenegro, Norway and the Republic of North Macedonia, which have aligned themselves with this explanation of vote, a full version of which will be submitted in writing.

After careful consideration, the EU member States decided to continue to vote in favour of draft resolution A/C.1/75/L.64, entitled “Strengthening and developing the system of arms control, disarmament and non-proliferation treaties and agreements”. Yet it is important that all parties, including the main sponsor of the draft resolution, contribute constructively to improving the strategic context and preserving and further advancing treaties and agreements for arms control, disarmament and non-proliferation in order to enhance global security.

In that regard, we reiterate our call on all States to join the Arms Trade Treaty and the Anti-Personnel Mine Ban Convention. We are gravely concerned about the continued non-compliance by some States with their international obligations. The international community must ensure accountability, end impunity for violations and uphold global norms. That is why the EU has strongly supported the establishment of an international attribution mechanism to identify and hold accountable the perpetrators of the use of chemical weapons.

We regret that such issues relating to compliance have not been included in the draft resolution by its main sponsor. We also recall that Russia has violated its commitment to refrain from the threat or use of force against the territorial integrity or sovereignty of Ukraine under the 1994 Memorandum on Security Assurances in Connection with Ukraine’s Accession to the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons, also known as the Budapest Memorandum.

With respect to issues of compliance, the Intermediate-Range Nuclear Forces Treaty is a case in point. Given the heightened tensions, we must be careful not to embark upon the path towards a new arms race. We also stress the great importance that we attach to the New START Treaty and strongly call for its extension, as well as negotiations on a broader follow-on agreement.

We are dismayed by the repeated and continuing attempts by a few States to challenge the authority and integrity of the Organization for the Prohibition of Chemical Weapons (OPCW). There is no doubt that the Director-General and the Technical Secretariat are fulfilling their duties in the service of the international community in a professional, objective and impartial manner. We recall the use of the veto by Russia against the extension of the mandate of the Joint Investigative Mechanism in that regard.

We also recall the cyberattack that targeted the offices of the OPCW carried out by a Russian military intelligence service, following the attack in Salisbury. We further recall the assassination attempt on Mr. Navalny, who was poisoned in Russia by a military chemical toxic nerve agent of the Novichok group, as confirmed by the OPCW. We expect all States to reaffirm their strong political support for the work of that important organization, as well as other relevant treaties and conventions.

We also urge those States that have not done so to pay their contributions in full and on time and settle their outstanding arrears without further delay. We emphasize that gender equality and the empowerment of women are an important cross-cutting priority for the EU and that the women and peace and security agenda continues to feature prominently in EU external action. The EU will continue to provide significant political and financial support for multilateral institutions in order to uphold and strengthen key international treaties

and agreements, promoting universal adherence thereto and helping build capacities in party countries.

Mr. Polyanskiy (Russian Federation) (*spoke in Russian*): We would like to express our gratitude to all States that supported draft resolution A/C.1/75/L.8/Rev.1, which we introduced, to create a new open-ended working group on international and information security in 2021. We are once again witnessing a historic event. The international community has been given the opportunity to participate in an inclusive negotiations process on information security under the auspices of the United Nations. We are convinced that the continuing work of the specialized mechanism in the open-ended working group format is in the interest of every State that seeks to have the right to vote during specialized international discussions. Today we have managed to defend that right through our joint efforts.

We voted against draft resolution A/C.1/75/L.4, sponsored by the United States and entitled “Advancing responsible State behaviour in cyberspace in the context of international security”. Ironically, the text almost exactly reproduces resolution 71/28, which was introduced by Russia in 2016. Perhaps we would have not objected to it if it had remained unchanged.

However, draft resolution A/C.1/75/L.4 unfortunately uses vague notions to hide an extremely dangerous idea in a newly drafted paragraph 6, which essentially seeks to ban United Nations States Members from taking any initiative on international information security until the Open-Ended Working Group on Developments in the Field of Information and Telecommunications in the Context of International Security and the Group of Governmental Experts on Advancing Responsible State Behaviour in Cyberspace in the Context of International Security have completed their work.

We believe that was the underlying motive for proposing the draft resolution. It is particularly hypocritical, as the United States has never voted in favour of the Open-Ended Working Group, yet now it believes it has the right to decide its future. We are convinced that kind of constraint runs counter to the principles of the Organization. It is categorically unacceptable to make the future of the United Nations negotiations process on international information security depend on the outcome of existing negotiating platforms. The international community cannot afford to put off addressing the issue until the seventy-

sixth session of the General Assembly and miss the opportunity to take advantage of an available universal mechanism for negotiations on international information security for the entire year.

We previously joined the consensus on the annual resolution on women, disarmament, non-proliferation and arms control and would have liked to support it during this session. However, in considering draft resolution A/C.1/75/L.21, we noticed that attempts had been made to incorporate any and all gender provisions from various international instruments, regardless of whether they originated from multilateral organizations or enjoyed the support of all Member States.

We were unable to agree with such an approach, and during the informal consultations we therefore proposed removing a number of provisions from the preamble, which could have resolved the situation. During consultations, we also suggested that the reference to the coronavirus disease pandemic, which affects men and women equally, was not appropriate in the context of the draft resolution. Unfortunately, as our suggestions were not heeded, we therefore abstained in the voting on the corresponding preambular paragraphs of the draft resolution, although we supported the consensus on the draft resolution as a whole.

Ms. Mac Loughlin (Argentina) (*spoke in Spanish*): Argentina voted in favour of draft resolutions A/C.1/75/L.4 and A/C.1/75 L8/Rev.1.

Argentina believes that future discussions on responsible behaviour by States in cyberspace and developments in the field of information and telecommunications in the context of international security should ideally be based on the consensus decision of the Open-Ended Working Group on Developments in the Field of Information and Telecommunications in the Context of International Security and the Group of Governmental Experts (GGE) on Advancing Responsible State Behaviour in Cyberspace in the Context of International Security.

The experience of having an open, transparent and inclusive space for dialogue under the auspices of the United Nations has demonstrated the advantages and potential of such a format. After six renewals of the GGE in a context in which cybersecurity threats to international peace and security are becoming increasingly evident, we believe that we have reached a turning point at which we must formalize discussions to a greater degree. Nevertheless, we agree with the call

made in draft resolution A/C.1/75/L.4 for the General Assembly to consider the conclusions of the Open-Ended Working Group and the Group of Governmental Experts and evaluate future work on this agenda item.

Argentina endorses the programme of action for advancing responsible State behaviour in cyberspace proposed by France and Egypt, based on the understanding that it will provide the potential for the continuity and institutionalization of discussions; the flexibility to make progress in stages; and thematic packages that will make it possible to achieve consensus, transparency, inclusiveness and greater political commitment to the implementation of the body of norms, rules and principles recommended by the General Assembly, as a guide for the responsible behaviour of States in cyberspace, as well as the development of any other norms deemed necessary.

In that regard, it was our understanding that draft resolution A/C.1/75/L.1/Rev.1 would not in any way make the proposed open-ended working group incompatible with the prospect of establishing the programme of action. The nature of the relationship between the two initiatives and the approach supported by the co-sponsors of the draft resolution to finding common ground between elements of the programme of action and the proposed open-ended working group could be addressed by, and even emerge from, the existing Open-Ended Working Group.

Mr. Lagardien (South Africa): I take the floor to explain South Africa's vote on draft resolution A/C.1/75/L.8/Rev.1, entitled "Developments in the field of information and telecommunications in the context of international security".

In 2018, South Africa voted in favour of resolution 73/27, which established two processes to discuss the issue of security in the use of information and communications technologies (ICTs) — the Group of Governmental Experts on Advancing Responsible State Behaviour in Cyberspace in the Context of International Security and the Open-Ended Working Group (OEWG) on Developments in the Field of Information and Telecommunications in the Context of International Security — during the periods from 2019 to 2021 and 2019 to 2020, respectively.

My delegation joined other Member States in extending the mandate of the OEWG to enable a final session to be held in a face-to-face format. South Africa voted against paragraph 1 of draft resolution

A/C.1/75/L.8/Rev.1 and abstained in the voting on the draft resolution as a whole, as we are of the view that to establish a new mechanism — the proposed open-ended working group on security of and in the uses of ICTs from 2021 to 2025 — would be premature and Member States should instead focus their attention on completing the work of the current OEWG.

South Africa has previously shared its support for the extension of the OEWG for an additional two years to provide Member States sufficient time to achieve its mandate, with a focus on the implementation of existing norms rather than the development of new ones.

Mr. Asokan (India): India voted in favour of draft resolution A/C.1/75/L.21 as a whole, as we fully support the objectives that the draft resolution seeks to promote. We were, however, constrained to abstain in the voting on the thirteenth preambular paragraph of the draft resolution, which contains a reference to the Arms Trade Treaty (ATT).

As explained earlier with regard to draft resolution A/C.1/75/L.53, on the ATT, India is conducting an internal review on its position and, pending its conclusion, abstained in the voting on draft resolution A/C.1/75/L.53. We therefore believe that any reference in draft resolution A/C.1/75/L.21 to the ATT applies only to the States parties to the Treaty.

With regard to draft resolution A/C.1/75/L.42, India attaches great importance to promoting disarmament and non-proliferation education. India believes in the positive and important contribution that the younger generation can make to international peace and security. We are happy to note that India's annual disarmament and international security affairs fellowship, launched in 2019, has been well received by various Member States and seeks to achieve the same goal as draft resolution A/C.1/75/L.42.

Mr. Masmejean (Switzerland): I take the floor to explain Switzerland's vote on draft resolution A/C.1/75/L.4, entitled "Advancing responsible State behaviour in cyberspace in the context of international security", and draft resolution A/C.1/75/L.8/Rev.1, entitled "Developments in the field of information and telecommunications (ICTs) in the context of international security".

Despite the current global health crisis, both the Governmental Group of Experts (GGE) on Advancing Responsible State Behaviour in Cyberspace in the

Context of International Security and the Open-ended Working Group (OEWG) on Developments in the Field of Information and Telecommunications in the Context of International Security have made good progress. Through our votes, we underscore the importance that both processes finalize their work and come to successful consensus outcomes.

We voted in favour of draft resolution A/C.1/75/L.4, which relies on long-standing consensus language. Building on incrementally achieved progress remains essential to Switzerland.

We abstained in the voting on both the paragraphs of draft resolution A/C.1/75/L.8/Rev.1 that were put to the vote and on the draft resolution as a whole. We believe that universal, transparent and inclusive dialogue at the United Nations level is key to addressing challenges in cyberspace.

We take issue with paragraph 1 of the draft resolution, which prejudices current discussions by prematurely establishing a new forum for dialogue. The current OEWG is mandated to study the possibility of establishing regular dialogue and make respective recommendations. It should be allowed to finish its work.

We regret that paragraphs 2 and 3 of the draft resolution minimize expectations about the current OEWG's results and their impact.

Paragraph 4 of the draft resolution proposes new elements that have not yet been discussed. We are concerned that introducing ideas in that manner may lead us further away from consensus-based decision-making.

Going forward, we hope that the Committee will return to consensus on the topic of ICTs in the context of international peace and security. Switzerland is convinced that the United Nations needs to continue to play a leading role in supporting dialogue and in that regard we have high expectations for the outcomes of the OEWG and the GGE.

With regard to draft resolution A/C.1/75/L.64, entitled "Strengthening and developing the system of arms control, disarmament and non-proliferation treaties and agreements", the explanation of vote provided by Switzerland last year on draft resolution A/C.1/74/L.56 (see A/C.1/74/PV.25) remains fully valid.

Lastly, Sweden and my own country, Switzerland, once again voted in favour of draft resolution A/C.1/75/L.14, entitled "Effects of the use of armaments and ammunitions containing depleted uranium". The explanation of vote provided by our delegations in 2016 on draft resolution A/C.1/71/L.63 (see A/C.1/71/PV.25) also remains valid.

Mr. Fiallo Karolys (Ecuador) (*spoke in Spanish*): Ecuador takes the floor to explain its vote on the draft resolutions and draft decisions on information and telecommunication technologies in the context of international security. Ecuador joined the consensus on draft decisions A/C.1/75/L.47 and A/C.1/75 L.60 and voted in favour of draft resolutions A/C.1/75/L.4 and A/C.1/75/L.8/Rev.1.

We believe that at this session the two draft decisions were sufficient to ensure the continuation of the work of the Open-Ended Working Group on Developments in the Field of Information and Telecommunications in the Context of International Security and the Group of Governmental Experts on Advancing Responsible State Behaviour in Cyberspace in the Context of International Security, both of which were affected by the coronavirus disease pandemic in 2020. Ecuador underscores the leadership and excellent conduct of the work of both groups by Ambassador Jürg Lauber of Switzerland and Ambassador Patriota of Brazil, respectively.

However, we believe that draft resolutions A/C.1/75/L.4 and A/C.1/75/L.8/Rev.1 were not indispensable and that once again we missed the opportunity to present a single consensus proposal that would have fostered cooperation among delegations, and not increased polarization.

With regard to draft resolution A/C.1/75/L.8/Rev.1, Ecuador voted in favour of the tenth preambular paragraph and regrets that its text has been repeatedly put to the vote in this and other annual draft resolutions. Ecuador also acknowledges the merit of the majority of paragraphs in draft resolution A/C.1/75/L.8/Rev.1 and for that reason was able to vote in favour of the draft resolution as a whole, including the convening of a new open-ended working group, based on my delegation's principled belief in not automatically joining discussions proposed by specific delegations and assessing the value of each one in terms of the individual working group's progress. An example is the existing Open-Ended Working Group, which, despite having faced opposition two years ago, has served as a

universal, open, inclusive and democratic platform and has hosted essential and constructive discussions.

However, for that very reason, Ecuador regrets at the same time that draft resolution A/C.1/75/L.8/Rev.1 was adopted without awaiting the conclusions of the existing Open-Ended Working Group, which will be able to provide a consensus report once it concludes its last meeting in March 2021. Ecuador supports the programme of action proposed by France in the course of the work of the Open-Ended Working Group and will continue to support it both in that Open-Ended Working Group and in the proposed new open-ended working group, as well as in forums outside those two processes. We believe that such a proposal offers a clear opportunity for overcoming the current polarization and enabling States Members of the United Nations to cooperate and work together on the issue in a genuine and constructive manner.

Mr. Knight (United States of America): I take the floor on behalf of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland and my own country, the United States of America. I would like to explain our vote on resolution A/C.1/75/L.64, entitled “Strengthening and developing the system of arms control, disarmament and non-proliferation treaties and agreements”.

We voted in favour because of our deep commitment to the principles contained in this draft resolution. Yet we cannot leave unsaid the fact that Russia’s sponsorship of the draft resolution stands in sharp contrast to its history of violating these principles in spirit and indeed.

Meaningful arms control decreases the chances of misperception and miscalculation by helping manage strategic competition among States, but we should be mindful that progress in arms control is not an end in and of itself and depends on the security environment and the participation of willing partners. The value of any agreement is derived from the treaty partners that comply with their obligations and avoid actions that result in mistrust and miscalculation.

In the arms control and disarmament sphere, Moscow continues to violate its obligations, undermining trust that States can place in Russia as a treaty partner, including with respect to treaties that have served global security interests for years. The use of a chemical weapon in the poisoning of Alexei Navalny, which comes only two years after a similar shocking use of a chemical weapon in the United

Kingdom, is an intolerable and reprehensible act, and one that the United States, the United Kingdom and all responsible nations have condemned in the strongest possible terms. We reiterate that any use of chemical weapons anywhere, at any time, by anyone, under any circumstances is unacceptable and contravenes the international norms and standards against such use. Russia also continues to undertake destabilizing cyberoperations like the one against the Organization for the Prohibition of Chemical Weapons in an attempt to undermine the institution established to uphold the Chemical Weapons Convention.

Despite sustained efforts to reduce the role and number of nuclear weapons, today’s deteriorated international security environment is impeding nuclear-disarmament efforts. Many of Russia’s actions to build up its nuclear arsenal are unconstrained by the current arms-control architecture and have deepened the deficit of trust between Russia and the international community. Russia is upgrading and diversifying its nuclear-weapon capabilities, and its total nuclear stockpile is likely to grow over the next decade, fed by the massive increase in mid-range theatre systems and novel strategic nuclear delivery systems. These novel systems, which include an intercontinental-range nuclear-powered nuclear-capable underwater drone and an intercontinental-range nuclear-powered nuclear-armed cruise missile, are threats to regional and global security. These systems are doomsday devices antithetical to the principles of the draft resolution Russia sponsored.

The value of any agreement is derived from treaty partners maintaining compliance with their obligations and avoiding actions that result in mistrust and miscalculation. Unfortunately, Russia’s repeated failures to uphold its obligations under numerous treaties — such as the Chemical Weapons Convention, the Intermediate-Range Nuclear Forces Treaty, the Treaty on Conventional Armed Forces in Europe and the Treaty on Open Skies — have undermined the integrity of arms control. Done correctly, arms control can help manage and stabilize strategic relationships and promote greater transparency and predictability. We invite the Russians to live up to the principles contained in A/C.1/75/L.64 and to practice what they preach.

Mr. Munir Khan (Pakistan): We joined the consensus on draft resolution A/C.1/75/L.33, entitled “Role of science and technology in the context of international security and disarmament”. However,

I would like to explain our delegation's position on the rights in relation to the development, production, transfer and use of technologies for peaceful purposes, as contained in the fifth preambular paragraph of the draft resolution.

Science and technology have been recognized as critical enablers for sustainable development goals. Accordingly, it is every country's inalienable and inherent right to develop, utilize and acquire technologies for socioeconomic development and to overcome the challenges, inter alia, of climate change, disease, water scarcity and energy and food security. Pakistan believes that proliferation concerns should not become a pretext for denying transfers of dual-use technologies, especially in instances where recipient States stand ready to provide non-diversion assurances.

Such denials are often based on political grounds, with non-proliferation only a secondary consideration. It is important that the right to have access to technologies for socioeconomic development should be ensured on a non-discriminatory basis. We consider relevant those international agreements to which we are a party, as well as those international obligations that respective countries have undertaken.

Mr. Nasir (Malaysia): Malaysia has been supportive of both the Group of Governmental Experts (GGE) and the Open-ended Working Group on Developments in the Field of Information and Telecommunications in the Context of International Security (OEWG). The GGE has contributed to our substantive discourse because of its unique nature, which allows for targeted discussions and in-depth deliberations on specific topics. Furthermore, the OEWG is an inclusive platform that allows all States Members of the United Nations to openly engage on various pertinent issues, including norm-setting, principles, rules and legally binding commitments in cyberspace.

In the midst of the coronavirus disease pandemic, the cyber realm is now presented with opportunities and vulnerabilities. In this regard, what we need the most at this juncture is regular institutional dialogue involving States and other important stakeholders. At this session of the First Committee, two draft resolutions were presented, namely, draft resolution A/C.1/75/L.4 and draft resolution A/C.1/75/L.8/Rev.1. Ideally, we would have preferred for there to be one unifying draft resolution that commands consensual support from all Member States. Let us remind ourselves that the

work of the GGE should benefit all States Members of the United Nations, while the OEWG belongs to all those States.

Both platforms should rightly be preserved, protected and considered in clear detachment from the main sponsors of the respective two draft resolutions. We should be clear in forming our position on this matter. At the end of the day, what is at stake concerns us all. We have to preserve regular institutional dialogue with the full participation of Member States and, for the reasons I just stated, Malaysia voted in favour of both draft resolutions, A/C.1/75/L.4 and A/C.1/75/L.8/Rev.1, while abstaining in the voting on paragraph 1 of the latter draft resolution.

We cannot be comfortable with the status quo of divisive positions, competing approaches and constant voting exercises. Even if we are able to vote, voting should not be our first and always preferred option on this matter. The question at the end of the day is not whether a draft resolution is adopted or not, but what the implication is for our longer-term international efforts and discourse on information and telecommunications in the context of international security.

Mr. Leopoldino (Brazil): Brazil abstained in the voting on the draft resolution contained in document A/C.1/75/L.8/Rev.1, as we consider it premature to take a decision to establish an open-ended working group (OEWG) before the conclusion of the current OEWG. We believe this initiative predetermines the outcome of discussions within the latter forum on modalities of a regular institutional dialogue to be conducted within the United Nations.

I would also like to take this opportunity to reaffirm the importance Brazil attaches to restoring consensus in addressing cybersecurity issues within the scope of the General Assembly. Without consensus, the prospects for success in ongoing and future dialogue processes are hardly encouraging. In this regard, we emphasize the need for all relevant actors to engage in discussions in a constructive, inclusive and open way. We reiterate that, whatever the format, Brazil remains committed to advancing the debate in the field of cybersecurity.

The Chair (*spoke in Spanish*): We have heard the last speaker in explanation of vote after the voting on cluster 5, "Other disarmament measures and international security". The Committee will now turn to cluster 6, "Regional disarmament and security".

First, I shall give the floor to those delegations wishing to make either a general statement or to introduce new or revised drafts under cluster 6. Statements are limited to three minutes. Once again, I appeal to delegations to consider submitting written statements. As some delegations have also requested to exercise their right of reply, we will begin with rights of reply at 12:50 p.m.

I give the floor to the observer of the European Union.

Mr. Dvořák (European Union): I have the honour to speak on behalf of the European Union (EU) and its member States. The candidate countries Turkey, the Republic of North Macedonia, Montenegro, Serbia and Albania; the country of the Stabilization and Association Process and potential candidate Bosnia and Herzegovina; as well as Ukraine, the Republic of Moldova and Georgia, align themselves with this general statement on cluster 6. A full version of this statement will be provided in written form.

With regard to draft resolution A/C.1/75/L.31, entitled “Strengthening of security and cooperation in the Mediterranean region”, the European Union would like to state the following. We take note of paragraph 5, which has again been submitted with a view to maintaining consensus on this important draft resolution. It calls upon all States of the Mediterranean region that have not yet done so to adhere to all multilaterally negotiated legal instruments in force related to the field of disarmament and non-proliferation, thus creating the conditions necessary for strengthening peace and cooperation in the region.

We would like to underline that the proposed reference to “legal instruments in force” does not imply a change in our long-standing position in support of the Comprehensive Nuclear-Test-Ban Treaty (CTBT), which, regrettably, has not yet entered into force. Promoting the universalization and the early entry into force of the CTBT is among European Union’s top priorities, as the 27 EU member States have ratified the Treaty and remain strongly committed to pursuing the achievement of its objectives. The EU has also continued to provide significant financial support for the activities of the Preparatory Commission for the Comprehensive Nuclear-Test-Ban Treaty Organization in order to strengthen its monitoring and verification capabilities. The EU has become a supporter of 10 actions on the Secretary-General’s agenda for disarmament, including the action for bringing the CTBT into force.

The EU reiterates its call on all States that have not done so to sign and ratify the CTBT without any preconditions or delay. In particular, we addressed this call to the remaining eight annex 2 States, whose ratification is essential for the Treaty’s entry into force. We welcome the latest ratification by Zimbabwe.

Pending the CTBT’s entry into force, we call upon all States to maintain a moratorium on nuclear-weapon test explosions and other nuclear explosions and to refrain from any action that would undermine the Treaty’s object and purpose. In this regard, we call upon the Democratic People’s Republic of Korea to maintain its declared suspension of nuclear-weapon testing and to sign and ratify the CTBT without delay.

Nuclear-weapon test explosions and any other nuclear explosions represent a serious threat to international peace and security and undermine the global non-proliferation regime. It is important that all States signatories adhere to the objective of the Treaty. Nevertheless, the absence of the CTBT’s entry into force prevents the use of on-site inspections, which are an important verification tool. We will therefore continue to use every opportunity to advocate the Treaty’s ratification and universalization, including during the current session of the First Committee.

The Chair: I now give the floor to the representative of Pakistan to introduce draft resolutions A/C.1/75/L.23, A/C.1/75/L.24 and A/C.1/75/L.25

Mr. Munir Khan (Pakistan): Under this cluster, I have the honour to introduce three resolutions submitted by Pakistan, namely, draft resolutions A/C.1/75/L.23, A/C.1/75/L.24 and A/C.1/75/L.25, on regional disarmament, conventional arms control at the regional and subregional levels and confidence-building measures in the regional and subregional context, respectively.

Pakistan feels privileged to have spearheaded initiatives on regional disarmament, conventional arms control and confidence-building measures at the United Nations for several years now, and we are grateful for the wide support we have received for these initiatives and proposals. The General Assembly has long recognized that international peace and security mutually depends on stability at the regional and subregional levels. In view of this inextricable relationship, the Charter of the United Nations acknowledges the value of regional arrangements to ensuring global peace and security.

In the post-Cold War era, most threats to peace and security arise among States located in the same region or subregion. International efforts towards disarmament and arms control are therefore reinforced and complemented by regional approaches to addressing these threats.

The Final Document of the first special session of the General Assembly devoted to disarmament (resolution S-10/2), the United Nations Disarmament Commission and the First Committee's own resolutions have repeatedly reaffirmed the need for the simultaneous pursuit of regional and global approaches, including agreements in the area of disarmament and arms limitation. Through these mechanisms and normative frameworks, the international community has endorsed two well-recognized and well-tested tools, namely, conventional arms control and confidence-building measures, particularly at the regional and subregional levels. Given the relevance and importance of regional approaches to strengthening global peace and security, we would therefore encourage Member States to extend their support to these draft resolutions as in previous years. We also encourage delegations to co-sponsor these draft resolutions.

The Chair (*spoke in Spanish*): There being no delegation wishing to take the floor in explanation of vote or position, I shall now call on those representatives who have requested to speak in the exercise of the right of reply. In that regard, I would like to remind all delegations that both interventions in exercise of right of reply are limited to three minutes.

Mr. Polyanskiy (Russian Federation) (*spoke in Russian*): We are astounded by the level of cynicism and hypocrisy shown by the Western delegations, which today had no scruples about accusing Russia of undermining the work of the current Open-ended Working Group (OEWG) and the consensus on international information security. We would like to recall that two years ago it was the United States, the European Union and other Western countries that opposed the creation of the OEWG.

Back in 2018, they were as enthusiastic in trying to persuade everyone that there is no need for an open process, that it is premature, that it is ineffective and that it undermines the existing work that has been done. What do we see today then? They changed their position along the way and are trying to say that they were the main defenders of the OEWG, when in fact

they were against it in the first place. What is that if not an extreme level of hypocrisy?

We would like to recall clear facts in this context. If it were not for Russia, the United Nations would not have any negotiation process on international information security. We created this group of intergovernmental experts despite persistent active opposition from Western countries. We proposed to open the discussion when it became clear that it was necessary due to the current situation, and these Western delegations are finding more and more excuses to sabotage the process. It is they that are breaking consensus on international information security at the General Assembly — a consensus that Russia, with the support of the United Nations majority, upheld for almost two decades. We would like to clarify once and for all that as one of the founders of the current Working Group, which we managed to create with great effort, our country is more interested than anyone in seeing it draw to a successful conclusion.

The new OEWG should start its substantive work only after the conclusion of the existing OEWS and take into account the results thereof. I want to point out that not only did the American side fail to engage in any consultations on its own draft resolution, but it also failed to discuss a potential compromise with us. However, we tried to build dialogue. We proposed discussing options, but our partners could not find it in themselves to understand that and attempted instead to make accusations rather than discuss the matter at hand, which put us in an awkward situation.

Even so, we have not yet closed the door on a normal conversation on this matter. However, we hope that next year our partners will demonstrate common sense and allow us to achieve consensus on international information security at the United Nations.

With your permission, Sir, I will not respond to the absolutely inappropriate and senseless comments of our German colleagues attacking Russia. It seems that their desire to mask the details of their provocations concerning Mr. Navalny deprives them of their ability to think rationally. German diplomats' pathetic attempts to accuse Russia of anything and everything are increasingly pitiable. We will certainly take note of this manic desire to undermine, to Germany's own detriment, Russia's relationships with Germany and the European Union. If that was their goal, then

it has almost been achieved. They can carry on in the same spirit.

Mr. Horne (Australia) I also thank my colleagues for all of their work today. I just thought I would join in to offer a view on what has just been raised by the representative of Russia.

He is absolutely right that when the idea for the Open-Ended Working Group (OEWG) on Developments in the Field of Information and Telecommunications in the Context of International Security was proposed, the Australian delegation opposed it. We were clear about our reasons for doing so at the time. We still have concerns about various aspects of that process. But do members know what we did? We showed up and engaged in good faith. We listened to the membership and heard the appetite for having such a conversation. We engaged with that in good faith, we continue to engage with that in good faith, and our defence of the OEWG now is based on the fact that it is something that is owned by all Member States.

We all have a say in what is going to come out of this process. It is not for the Russian Federation to determine when we end it. It is not for the Russian Federation to determine what it considers to be an inclusive and Member State-owned process. We engage with this as partners. We are 193 partners. We engage outside of Member States on this, and we believe that the vast majority of the membership of the First Committee is moving towards a common goal.

We do not necessarily know what is in the mind or the heart of the representative, but we do know the consequences of some of the actions that we have seen to date at this session. There is a disturbing trend away from allowing Member States to have their say, have their voices appropriately heard and have things recognized. We are going to have a similar question

tomorrow when we move to cluster 7, and we have to see what happens with respect to the United Nations Disarmament Commission.

There is a clear process emerging from the actions of the Russian Federation in trying to introduce things not within the competence of the First Committee, which has the effect of blocking the disarmament machinery. Member States have to think about that. We have to give it real thought and think about what it is that we want to be doing. Are we here to talk to each other? Are we here to come up with solutions, to try to find consensus, to try to find a way forward, to do so constructively and collaboratively and to give appropriate respect and time to our partners, or are we just here to impose our will upon people? In my delegation's view, it is certainly about finding ways forward together, because that makes us far stronger as a Committee and as a group.

As always, my delegation will engage in good faith with everyone. We will do so through the OEWG and every other element of the disarmament machinery.

The Chair (*spoke in Spanish*): We have exhausted the time available for this meeting.

I would like to remind delegations that the deadline for the submission of explanations of vote in written form to be included in the compendium is tomorrow, 10 November.

The next plenary meeting of the Committee will be held tomorrow, Tuesday, 10 November, at 10 a.m. in the General Assembly Hall, to take up the remaining clusters and finish our work.

I thank all members for their cooperation and I thank the interpreters very much for their work.

The meeting rose at 12.55 p.m.