



General Assembly

Seventy-seventh session

First Committee

30th meeting

Thursday, 3 November 2022, 10 a.m.
New York

Official Records

Chair: Mr. Pieris(Sri Lanka)

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

Agenda items 90 to 108 (continued)

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

The Chair: This morning the Committee will continue to take action on all draft resolutions and decisions submitted under agenda items 90 to 108. We will be guided by the same procedure that I explained in our meeting of 28 October (see A/C.1/77/PV.25). We will begin by taking action on all draft resolutions and decisions under cluster 5, "Other disarmament measures and international security", as contained in informal paper A/C.1/77/INF.2/Rev.3. Thereafter, the Committee will consider the proposals contained in informal paper A/C.1/77/INF.3/Rev.1, which has been circulated to delegations electronically. Time permitting, we will consider the draft provisional programme of work and timetable of the First Committee for 2023, as contained in document A/C.1/77/CRP.5.

I now call on the representative of Micronesia on a point of order.

Mr. Zvachula (Micronesia): My delegation raises a point of order with regard to action on cluster 5, on our own behalf and on behalf of the delegations of the Marshall Islands, Nauru, Palau, Papua New Guinea and Samoa.

Yesterday we completed explanations of vote after adoption on cluster 4, followed by general statements on cluster 5 and explanations of vote before action (see

A/C.1/77/PV.29). Our delegations came prepared to register our positions on the various drafts. We waited for two hours and 45 minutes to be told that action would be postponed.

There are many meetings taking place at the same time as the main part of the General Assembly. Yesterday was an opportunity where no committee except ours or the plenary had scheduled action. Instead, we find ourselves in a situation today where we have to scramble from this room to the General Assembly plenary where a recorded vote is also expected this morning.

Our delegations do not have the luxury of calling up additional staff, as we have none. A significant part of our missions are out of town attending either the Council of the International Seabed Authority or the twenty-seventh Conference of the Parties to the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change, whose preparatory meetings for small island developing States and for the Group of 77 and China are under way.

The advice you were given, Sir, by the Secretariat to postpone action puts small delegations like ours at a serious disadvantage. Not only did we wait for voting that did not take place, but we now have to service two meetings with recorded votes at the same time. We find it unacceptable to be put in a position where we may have to choose for which votes we can be present and for which ones we cannot. While we do not have control over how many delegations want to speak, either with general statements or explanations of vote, we did have enough time yesterday to at least start with action. Had we not finished, then at least we would have given it our best try. We could have followed Friday's example,

This record contains the text of speeches delivered in English and of the translation of speeches delivered in other languages. Corrections should be submitted to the original languages only. They should be incorporated in a copy of the record and sent under the signature of a member of the delegation concerned to the Chief of the Verbatim Reporting Service, room AB-0601 (verbatimrecords@un.org). Corrected records will be reissued electronically on the Official Document System of the United Nations (<http://documents.un.org>).

22-67255(E)



Accessible document

Please recycle



when we got as far as we could and then suspended the meeting rather than adjourning it. We could then have immediately resumed the remainder of the meeting this morning. We are concerned about a wider pattern, which shows a lack of coordination between the Committees and the General Assembly plenary at the expense of small delegations. How can it be otherwise, when there is no action scheduled at all on some days, while on others as many as four meetings are set within the same time window? Our delegations do not have enough people to cover that, and that has to be better understood.

We cannot change what happened yesterday, Mr. Chair, but we can request you to use your good offices to bring those concerns to the attention of the other Committees. We never had this much overlap in previous years, and we want to make sure that it will not happen again in the future.

The Chair: I thank the representative of Micronesia for raising that point of order. I am extremely sorry for any inconvenience that may have been caused. I can assure everyone that all of us, as small jurisdictions, suffer from the same problem. Our human resources are stretched. I do indeed take that on board. The concerns of the representative of Micronesia will be duly recorded and communicated. We will try our best to ensure that the least inconvenience possible is caused by the contingency measures that are taken from time to time, which I can assure the Committee are in the greater interests of the Committee's welfare, which is paramount. That is not meant to cause any kind of prejudice to any one of us — it could be some other member today and me tomorrow. I am therefore deeply conscious of that, and the concerns expressed will be duly communicated. I hope that explanation satisfies all concerns, which will certainly be taken into account, with proper recognition of the criticism.

We will now get back to business as usual. The Committee will proceed to take action on draft resolution A/C.1/77/L.4, 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.1/77/L.4 was submitted on 8 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.1/77/L.4.

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

Draft resolution A/C.1/77/L.4 was adopted.

The Chair: The Committee will now proceed to take action on draft resolution A/C.1/77/L.5, 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.1/77/L.5 was submitted on 22 September 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.1/77/L.5.

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

Draft resolution A/C.1/77/L.5 was adopted.

The Chair: The Committee will now proceed to take action on draft resolution A/C.1/77/L.8, 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.1/77/L.8 was submitted on 22 September 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.1/77/L.8.

The Chair: We will now take action on draft resolution A/C.1/77/L.8. A recorded vote has been requested.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour:

Afghanistan, Algeria, Angola, Antigua and Barbuda, Argentina, Azerbaijan, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belize, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia (Plurinational State of), Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Burkina Faso, Burundi,

Cabo Verde, Cambodia, Cameroon, Central African Republic, Chad, Chile, China, Colombia, Comoros, Congo, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Cuba, Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Djibouti, Dominica, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Equatorial Guinea, Eritrea, Eswatini, Ethiopia, Fiji, Gabon, Ghana, Guatemala, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Haiti, Honduras, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Jamaica, Jordan, Kazakhstan, Kenya, Kiribati, Kuwait, Kyrgyzstan, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lebanon, Lesotho, Liberia, Libya, Madagascar, Malawi, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Myanmar, Namibia, Nauru, Nepal, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Oman, Pakistan, Palau, Panama, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Qatar, Russian Federation, Rwanda, Saint Kitts and Nevis, Saint Lucia, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Solomon Islands, Somalia, South Africa, Sri Lanka, Suriname, Syrian Arab Republic, Tajikistan, Thailand, Timor-Leste, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkmenistan, Tuvalu, Uganda, United Arab Emirates, Uruguay, Uzbekistan, Vanuatu, Viet Nam, Yemen, Zambia

Against:

Israel, Marshall Islands, Micronesia (Federated States of), North Macedonia, 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, Czechia, Denmark, Estonia, Finland, France, Georgia, Germany, Greece, Hungary, Iceland, Ireland, Italy, Japan, Latvia, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Malta, Monaco, Montenegro, Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway, Poland, Portugal, Republic of Korea, Republic of Moldova, Romania, Samoa, San Marino, Serbia, Slovakia, Slovenia, Spain, Sweden, Switzerland, Türkiye, Ukraine

Draft resolution A/C.1/77/L.8 was adopted by 124 votes to 6, with 49 abstentions.

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

The Chair: The Committee will now proceed to take action on draft resolution A/C.1/77/L.10, 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.1/77/L.10 was submitted on 22 September 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.1/77/L.10.

The Chair: We will now take action on draft resolution A/C.1/77/L.10. 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, Belgium, Belize, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia (Plurinational State of), Bosnia and Herzegovina, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Burundi, Cabo Verde, Cambodia, Cameroon, Central African Republic, Chad, Chile, Colombia, Congo, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Cuba, Cyprus, Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Djibouti, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Equatorial Guinea, Eritrea, Eswatini, Ethiopia, Fiji, Finland, Gabon, Gambia, Ghana, Greece, Guatemala, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Haiti, 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, Libya, Liechtenstein, Luxembourg, Madagascar, Malawi, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Marshall Islands, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mexico, Mongolia, Montenegro, Morocco, Myanmar, Namibia, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Norway, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Qatar, Republic of Moldova, Rwanda, Saint Kitts and Nevis, Saint Lucia, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, San Marino, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Serbia, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Slovenia, Solomon Islands, Somalia, South Africa, Sri Lanka, Suriname, Sweden, Switzerland, Syrian Arab Republic, Tajikistan, Thailand, Timor-Leste, Togo, Trinidad

and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkmenistan, Uganda, United Arab Emirates, Uruguay, Uzbekistan, Vanuatu, Viet Nam, Yemen, Zambia

Against:

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

Abstaining:

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

Draft resolution A/C.1/77/L.10 was adopted by 144 votes to 4, with 24 abstentions.

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

The Chair: The Committee will now proceed to take action on draft resolution A/C.1/77/L.14, entitled “International Day for Disarmament and Non-Proliferation Awareness”.

I give the floor to the Secretary of the Committee.

Ms. Elliott (Secretary of the Committee): Draft resolution A/C.1/77/L.14 was submitted on 4 October by the representative of Kyrgyzstan. The sponsors of the draft resolution are listed in document A/C.1/77/L.14. The additional sponsors are listed on the e-deleGATE portal of the First Committee. Zambia has also become a sponsor.

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

Draft resolution A/C.1/77/L.14 was adopted.

The Chair: The Committee will now proceed to take action on draft resolution A/C.1/77/L.15, entitled “United Nations study on disarmament and non-proliferation education”.

I give the floor to the Secretary of the Committee.

Ms. Elliot (Secretary of the Committee): Draft resolution A/C.1/77/L.15 was submitted on 4 October by the representative of Mexico. The sponsors of the draft resolution are listed in document A/C.1/77/L.15.

The additional sponsors are listed on the e-deleGATE portal of the First Committee.

The Chair: A separate vote has been requested on operative paragraph 4 of draft resolution A/C.1/77/L.15. We shall now begin the voting process. I shall therefore put that paragraph to the vote first.

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, Bhutan, Bolivia (Plurinational State of), Bosnia and Herzegovina, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Bulgaria, Burundi, Cabo Verde, Cambodia, Canada, Chad, Chile, China, Colombia, Comoros, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Croatia, Cuba, Cyprus, Czechia, Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Denmark, Djibouti, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Equatorial Guinea, Eritrea, Estonia, Eswatini, Ethiopia, Fiji, Finland, France, Gambia, Georgia, Germany, Ghana, Greece, Guatemala, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Haiti, Honduras, Hungary, Iceland, India, Indonesia, Iraq, Ireland, Italy, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Kazakhstan, Kenya, Kiribati, Kuwait, Kyrgyzstan, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Latvia, Lebanon, Lesotho, Liberia, Libya, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Madagascar, Malawi, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Marshall Islands, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mexico, Micronesia (Federated States of), Monaco, Mongolia, Montenegro, Morocco, Myanmar, Namibia, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, North Macedonia, Norway, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Qatar, Republic of Korea, Republic of Moldova, Romania, Rwanda, Saint Kitts and Nevis, Saint Lucia, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, Samoa, San Marino, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Serbia, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Slovakia, Slovenia, Solomon Islands, Somalia, South Africa, Spain, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Sweden, Switzerland, Thailand, Timor-Leste, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Türkiye, Uganda, Ukraine, United Arab Emirates, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America, Uruguay, Uzbekistan, Viet Nam, Yemen, Zambia, Zimbabwe

Against:

None

Abstaining:

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

Operative paragraph 4 was retained by 165 votes to none, with 4 abstentions.

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

Draft resolution A/C.1/77/L.15 was adopted.

The Chair: The Committee will now proceed to take action on draft resolution A/C.1/77/L.18, entitled "Women, disarmament, non-proliferation and arms control".

I give the floor to the Secretary of the Committee.

Ms. Elliot (Secretary of the Committee): Draft resolution A/C.1/77/L.18 was submitted on 4 October by the representative of Trinidad and Tobago. The sponsors of the draft resolution are listed in document A/C.1/77/L.18. The additional sponsors are listed on the e-deleGATE portal of the First Committee. Eswatini and Zambia have also become sponsors.

The Chair: Separate votes have been requested on the fifth, ninth, thirteenth, fourteenth and seventeenth preambular paragraphs and on operative paragraphs 4, 5, 6 and 11 of draft resolution A/C.1/77/L.18. We shall now begin the voting process. I shall put those paragraphs to the vote, one by one.

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

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour:

Afghanistan, Albania, Algeria, Andorra, Angola, Antigua and Barbuda, Argentina, Armenia, Australia, Austria, Azerbaijan, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belgium, Belize, Bhutan, Bolivia (Plurinational State of), Bosnia and Herzegovina, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Burundi, Cabo Verde, Cambodia, Canada, Central African Republic, Chad, Chile, China, Colombia, Comoros, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Croatia, Cuba, Cyprus,

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

Against:

None

Abstaining:

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

The fifth preambular paragraph was retained by 168 votes to none, with 3 abstentions.

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

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour:

Afghanistan, Albania, Algeria, Andorra, Angola, Antigua and Barbuda, Argentina, Armenia, Australia, Austria, Azerbaijan, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belgium, Belize,

Bhutan, Bolivia (Plurinational State of), Bosnia and Herzegovina, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Burundi, Cabo Verde, Cambodia, Canada, Central African Republic, Chad, Chile, Colombia, Comoros, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Croatia, Cuba, Cyprus, Czechia, Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Denmark, Djibouti, Dominica, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Equatorial Guinea, Eritrea, Estonia, Eswatini, Ethiopia, Fiji, Finland, France, Gambia, Georgia, Germany, Ghana, Greece, Guatemala, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Haiti, Honduras, Hungary, Iceland, India, Indonesia, Iraq, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Kazakhstan, Kenya, Kiribati, Kuwait, Kyrgyzstan, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Latvia, Lebanon, Lesotho, Liberia, Libya, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Madagascar, Malawi, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Marshall Islands, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mexico, Micronesia (Federated States of), Monaco, Mongolia, Montenegro, Morocco, Myanmar, Namibia, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, North Macedonia, Norway, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Qatar, Republic of Korea, Republic of Moldova, Romania, Rwanda, Saint Kitts and Nevis, Saint Lucia, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, Samoa, San Marino, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Serbia, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Slovakia, Slovenia, Solomon Islands, Somalia, South Africa, Spain, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Sweden, Switzerland, Thailand, Timor-Leste, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Türkiye, Tuvalu, Uganda, Ukraine, United Arab Emirates, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, Uruguay, Uzbekistan, Viet Nam, Yemen, Zambia, Zimbabwe

Against:

None

Abstaining:

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

The ninth preambular paragraph was retained by 168 votes 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:

Albania, Andorra, Angola, Antigua and Barbuda, Argentina, Australia, Austria, Azerbaijan, Bahamas, Bahrain, Barbados, Belgium, Belize, Bhutan, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Burundi, Cabo Verde, Cambodia, Canada, Central African Republic, Chad, Chile, China, Colombia, Comoros, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Croatia, Cyprus, Czechia, Denmark, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, El Salvador, Equatorial Guinea, Eritrea, Estonia, Eswatini, Ethiopia, Fiji, Finland, France, Georgia, Germany, Ghana, Greece, Guatemala, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Haiti, Honduras, Hungary, Iceland, Iraq, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Kazakhstan, Kenya, Kiribati, Latvia, Lebanon, Lesotho, Liberia, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Madagascar, Malawi, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Marshall Islands, Mauritius, Mexico, Micronesia (Federated States of), Monaco, Mongolia, Montenegro, Morocco, Namibia, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, North Macedonia, Norway, Pakistan, Panama, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Republic of Korea, Republic of Moldova, Romania, Rwanda, Saint Kitts and Nevis, Saint Lucia, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, Samoa, San Marino, Senegal, Serbia, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Slovakia, Slovenia, Solomon Islands, Somalia, South Africa, Spain, Suriname, Sweden, Switzerland, Thailand, Timor-Leste, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Türkiye, Tuvalu, Uganda, Ukraine, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America, Uruguay, Zambia, Zimbabwe

Against:

None

Abstaining:

Algeria, Armenia, Bangladesh, Bolivia (Plurinational State of), Cuba, Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Djibouti, Egypt, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Kuwait, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Libya, Mauritania, Myanmar, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Oman, Qatar, Russian Federation, Saudi Arabia, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Syrian Arab Republic, United Arab Emirates, Yemen

The thirteenth preambular paragraph was retained by 139 votes to none, with 28 abstentions.

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

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour:

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

Against:

None

Abstaining:

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

The fourteenth preambular paragraph was retained by 165 votes to none, with 5 abstentions.

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

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour:

Afghanistan, Albania, Algeria, Andorra, Angola, Antigua and Barbuda, Argentina, Armenia, Australia, Austria, Azerbaijan, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belgium, Belize, 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, Czechia, Denmark, Djibouti, Dominica, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Equatorial Guinea, Eritrea, Estonia, Eswatini, Ethiopia, Fiji, Finland, France, Gambia, Georgia, Germany, Ghana, Greece, Guatemala, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Haiti, Honduras, Hungary, Iceland, Indonesia, Iraq, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Kazakhstan, Kenya, Kiribati, Kuwait, Kyrgyzstan, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Latvia, Lebanon, Lesotho, Liberia, Libya, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Madagascar, Malawi, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Marshall Islands, Mauritius, Mexico, Micronesia (Federated States of), Monaco, Mongolia, Montenegro, Morocco, Myanmar, Namibia, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, North Macedonia, Norway, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Qatar, Republic of Korea, Republic of Moldova, Romania, Rwanda, Saint Kitts and Nevis, Saint Lucia, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, Samoa, San Marino, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Serbia, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Slovakia, Slovenia, Somalia, South Africa, Spain, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Sweden, Switzerland, Thailand, Timor-Leste, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Türkiye, Tuvalu, Uganda, Ukraine, United Arab Emirates, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United Republic of Tanzania, United States of

America, Uruguay, Uzbekistan, Viet Nam, Yemen, Zambia, Zimbabwe

Against:

None

Abstaining:

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

The seventeenth preambular paragraph was retained by 165 votes to none, with 8 abstentions.

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

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour:

Afghanistan, Albania, Algeria, Andorra, Angola, Antigua and Barbuda, Argentina, Armenia, Australia, Austria, Azerbaijan, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belarus, Belgium, Belize, Bhutan, Bolivia (Plurinational State of), Bosnia and Herzegovina, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Bulgaria, Burundi, Cabo Verde, Cambodia, Canada, Chad, Chile, China, Colombia, Comoros, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Croatia, Cuba, Cyprus, Czechia, Denmark, Djibouti, Dominica, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Equatorial Guinea, Eritrea, Estonia, Eswatini, Ethiopia, Fiji, Finland, France, Gambia, Georgia, Germany, Ghana, Greece, Guatemala, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Haiti, Honduras, Hungary, Iceland, Indonesia, Iraq, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Kazakhstan, Kenya, Kiribati, Kuwait, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Latvia, Lebanon, Lesotho, Liberia, Libya, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Madagascar, Malawi, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Marshall Islands, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mexico, Micronesia (Federated States of), Monaco, Mongolia, Montenegro, Morocco, Myanmar, Namibia, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, North Macedonia, Norway, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Qatar, Republic of Korea, Republic of Moldova, Romania, Rwanda, Saint Kitts and Nevis, Saint Lucia, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, Samoa, San Marino, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Serbia, Sierra Leone, Singapore,

Slovakia, Slovenia, Somalia, South Africa, Spain, Sudan, Suriname, Sweden, Switzerland, Thailand, Timor-Leste, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Türkiye, Tuvalu, Uganda, Ukraine, United Arab Emirates, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United Republic of Tanzania, United States of America, Uruguay, Viet Nam, Yemen, Zambia, Zimbabwe

Against:

None

Abstaining:

India, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Russian Federation, Sri Lanka, Syrian Arab Republic

Operative paragraph 4 was retained by 164 votes to none, with 5 abstentions.

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

The Chair: I shall now put to the vote operative paragraph 5.

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, 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, Czechia, Denmark, Djibouti, Dominica, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Equatorial Guinea, Eritrea, Estonia, Eswatini, Ethiopia, Fiji, Finland, France, Gambia, Georgia, Germany, Ghana, Greece, Guatemala, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Haiti, Honduras, Hungary, Iceland, India, Indonesia, Iraq, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Kazakhstan, Kenya, Kiribati, Kuwait, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Latvia, Lebanon, Lesotho, Liberia, Libya, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Madagascar, Malawi, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Marshall Islands, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mexico, Micronesia (Federated States of), Monaco, Mongolia, Montenegro, Morocco, Myanmar, Namibia, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand,

Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, North Macedonia, Norway, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Qatar, Republic of Korea, Republic of Moldova, Romania, Rwanda, Saint Kitts and Nevis, Saint Lucia, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, Samoa, San Marino, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Serbia, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Slovakia, Slovenia, Somalia, South Africa, Spain, Sudan, Suriname, Sweden, Switzerland, Thailand, Timor-Leste, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Türkiye, Tuvalu, Uganda, Ukraine, United Arab Emirates, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United Republic of Tanzania, United States of America, Uruguay, Viet Nam, Yemen, Zambia, Zimbabwe

Against:

None

Abstaining:

Belarus, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Russian Federation, Sri Lanka, Syrian Arab Republic

Operative paragraph 5 was retained by 165 votes to none, with 5 abstentions.

The Chair: I shall now put to the vote operative paragraph 6.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour:

Afghanistan, Albania, Andorra, Angola, Antigua and Barbuda, Argentina, Armenia, Australia, Austria, Azerbaijan, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belgium, Belize, Bhutan, Bolivia (Plurinational State of), Bosnia and Herzegovina, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Burundi, Cabo Verde, Cambodia, Canada, Chad, Chile, China, Colombia, Comoros, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Croatia, Cuba, Cyprus, Czechia, Denmark, Djibouti, Dominica, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Equatorial Guinea, Eritrea, Estonia, Eswatini, Ethiopia, Fiji, Finland, France, Gambia, Georgia, Germany, Ghana, Greece, Guatemala, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Haiti, Honduras, Hungary, Iceland, India, Indonesia, Iraq, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Kazakhstan, Kenya, Kiribati, Kuwait, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Latvia, Lebanon, Lesotho, Liberia, Libya, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Madagascar, Malawi, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali,

Malta, Marshall Islands, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mexico, Micronesia (Federated States of), Monaco, Mongolia, Montenegro, Morocco, Myanmar, Namibia, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, North Macedonia, Norway, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Qatar, Republic of Korea, Republic of Moldova, Romania, Rwanda, Saint Kitts and Nevis, Saint Lucia, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, Samoa, San Marino, Senegal, Serbia, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Slovakia, Slovenia, Somalia, South Africa, Spain, Suriname, Sweden, Switzerland, Thailand, Timor-Leste, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Türkiye, Tuvalu, Uganda, Ukraine, United Arab Emirates, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United Republic of Tanzania, United States of America, Uruguay, Viet Nam, Yemen, Zambia, Zimbabwe

Against:

None

Abstaining:

Algeria, Belarus, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Russian Federation, Saudi Arabia, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Syrian Arab Republic

Operative paragraph 6 was retained by 162 votes to none, with 8 abstentions.

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

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour:

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

Japan, Jordan, Kazakhstan, Kenya, Kiribati, Kuwait, Kyrgyzstan, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Latvia, Lebanon, Lesotho, Liberia, Libya, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Madagascar, Malawi, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Marshall Islands, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mexico, Micronesia (Federated States of), Monaco, Mongolia, Montenegro, Morocco, Myanmar, Namibia, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, North Macedonia, Norway, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Qatar, Republic of Korea, Republic of Moldova, Romania, Rwanda, Saint Kitts and Nevis, Saint Lucia, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, Samoa, San Marino, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Serbia, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Slovakia, Slovenia, Somalia, South Africa, Spain, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Sweden, Switzerland, Thailand, Timor-Leste, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Türkiye, Tuvalu, Uganda, Ukraine, United Arab Emirates, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United Republic of Tanzania, United States of America, Uruguay, Uzbekistan, Viet Nam, Yemen, Zambia, Zimbabwe

Against:

None

Abstaining:

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

Operative paragraph 11 was retained by 168 votes to none, with 5 abstentions.

The Chair: The sponsors of draft resolution A/C.1/77/L.18 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.1/77/L.18 was adopted.

The Chair: The Committee will now proceed to take action on draft resolution A/C.1/77/L.20, 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.1/77/L.20 was submitted on 5 October by the representative of Mexico. The sponsors of the

draft resolution are listed in document A/C.1/77/L.20. The additional sponsors are listed on the e-deleGATE portal of the First Committee. Colombia has also become a sponsor of the draft resolution.

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

Draft resolution A/C.1/77/L.20 was adopted.

The Chair: The Committee will now proceed to take action on draft resolution A/C.1/77/L.23/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.1/77/L.23 was submitted on 6 October by the representative of the Russian Federation. A revised version of the draft resolution was submitted on 20 October. The sponsors of the draft resolution are listed in document A/C.1/77/L.23/Rev.1. The additional sponsors are listed on the e-deleGATE portal of the First Committee. Guinea and Iraq have also become sponsors of the draft resolution.

The Chair: Separate votes have been requested on the second, fourth and seventh preambular paragraphs of draft resolution A/C.1/77/L.23/Rev.1. We shall now begin the voting process. I shall therefore put those paragraphs to the vote, one by one.

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

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour:

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

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

Against:

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

Abstaining:

Chile, Fiji, Guatemala, Honduras, Lesotho, Mexico, Papua New Guinea, Singapore

The second preambular paragraph was retained by 103 votes to 53, with 8 abstentions.

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

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour:

Algeria, Angola, Antigua and Barbuda, Argentina, Armenia, Azerbaijan, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belarus, Belize, Bolivia (Plurinational State of), Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Burundi, Cambodia, Cameroon, Central African Republic, Chad, China, Colombia, Comoros, Congo, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Cuba, Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Djibouti, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Equatorial Guinea, Eritrea, Eswatini,

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

Against:

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

Abstaining:

Bhutan, Chile, Fiji, Guatemala, Honduras, India, Lesotho, Mexico, Papua New Guinea, Singapore

The fourth preambular paragraph was retained by 102 votes to 52, with 10 abstentions.

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

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour:

Algeria, Angola, Antigua and Barbuda, Argentina, Armenia, Azerbaijan, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belarus, Belize, Bhutan, Bolivia (Plurinational State of), Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Burundi, Cambodia, Cameroon, Central African Republic, Chad, China, Comoros, Congo, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire,

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

Against:

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

Abstaining:

Chile, Colombia, Dominican Republic, Fiji, Guatemala, Guyana, Honduras, Lesotho, Mexico, Papua New Guinea, Singapore

The seventh preambular paragraph was retained by 101 votes to 52, with 11 abstentions.

The Chair: The Committee will now proceed to take action on draft resolution A/C.1/77/L.23/Rev.1, as a whole. A recorded vote has been requested.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour:

Algeria, Angola, Antigua and Barbuda, Argentina, Armenia, Azerbaijan, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belarus, Belize, Bhutan,

Bolivia (Plurinational State of), Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Burundi, Cambodia, Cameroon, Central African Republic, Chad, China, Comoros, Congo, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Cuba, Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Djibouti, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Equatorial Guinea, Eritrea, Eswatini, Ethiopia, Gabon, Gambia, Ghana, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Haiti, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Jamaica, Jordan, Kazakhstan, Kiribati, Kuwait, Kyrgyzstan, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lebanon, Libya, Madagascar, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Myanmar, Namibia, Nepal, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Qatar, Russian Federation, Rwanda, Saint Kitts and Nevis, Saint Lucia, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, Samoa, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Solomon Islands, Somalia, 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, Vanuatu, Viet Nam, Yemen, Zambia, Zimbabwe

Against:

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

Abstaining:

Chile, Colombia, Fiji, Guatemala, Honduras, Lesotho, Malawi, Papua New Guinea, Serbia, Singapore

Draft resolution A/C.1/77/L.23/Rev.1, as a whole, was adopted by 112 votes to 52, with 10 abstentions.

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

The Chair: The Committee will now proceed to take action on A/C.1/77/L.32, 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.1/77/L.32 was submitted on 10 October by the representative of Nigeria. The sponsors of the draft resolution are listed in document A/C.1/77/L.32. The additional sponsors are listed on 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.1/77/L.32 was adopted.

The Chair: The Committee will now proceed to take action on draft decision A/C.1/77/L.54, entitled “Open-ended working group on security of and in the use of information and communications technologies 2021–2025 established pursuant to General Assembly resolution 75/240”.

I give the floor to the Secretary of the Committee.

Ms. Elliott (Secretary of the Committee): Draft decision A/C.1/77/L.54 was submitted on 12 October by the representative of Singapore. The sponsors of the draft decision are listed in document A/C.1/77/L.54.

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.1/77/L.54 was adopted.

The Chair: The Committee will now proceed to take action on draft resolution A/C.1/77/L.56, entitled “Promoting international cooperation on peaceful uses 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.1/77/L.56 was submitted on 12 October by the representative of China. The main sponsors have informed the Committee of the following oral revision

to the text. In the seventh preambular paragraph, the word “member” is deleted, and the paragraph should therefore read as follows:

“Recognizing the inalienable right of all States to participate in the fullest possible exchange of equipment, materials and scientific and technological information for peaceful purposes”.

The sponsors of the draft resolution are listed in document A/C.1/77/L.56. The additional sponsors are listed on the e-deleGATE portal of the First Committee. The additional sponsors of the draft resolution are Guinea and Kyrgyzstan.

The Chair: Separate votes have been requested on the fifteenth, sixteenth and seventeenth preambular paragraphs and operative paragraph 2 of draft resolution A/C.1/77/L.56. I shall now put those paragraphs to the vote, one by one.

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

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour:

Algeria, Angola, Antigua and Barbuda, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Belarus, Bolivia (Plurinational State of), Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Burkina Faso, Burundi, Cambodia, Cameroon, Central African Republic, Chad, China, Comoros, Congo, Cuba, Democratic People’s Republic of Korea, Djibouti, Dominica, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Equatorial Guinea, Eritrea, Eswatini, Ethiopia, Gambia, Ghana, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Jordan, Kazakhstan, Kenya, Kiribati, Kuwait, Kyrgyzstan, Lao People’s Democratic Republic, Lebanon, Lesotho, Libya, Malawi, Malaysia, Mali, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mongolia, Namibia, Nepal, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Oman, Pakistan, Peru, Qatar, Russian Federation, Rwanda, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Singapore, Solomon Islands, South Africa, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Syrian Arab Republic, Tajikistan, Thailand, Togo, Tunisia, Turkmenistan, Uganda, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Tanzania, Uruguay, Uzbekistan, Viet Nam, Yemen, Zambia, Zimbabwe

Against:

Albania, Andorra, Australia, Austria, Belgium, Bulgaria, Canada, Croatia, Cyprus, Czechia, Denmark, Estonia, Finland, France, Germany,

Greece, Honduras, Hungary, Iceland, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Japan, Latvia, Liberia, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Malta, Marshall Islands, Monaco, Montenegro, Netherlands, New Zealand, North Macedonia, Norway, Poland, Portugal, Republic of Korea, Republic of Moldova, Romania, San Marino, Slovakia, Slovenia, Spain, Sweden, Switzerland, Türkiye, Ukraine, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America

Abstaining:

Argentina, Barbados, Belize, Bhutan, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Botswana, Chile, Colombia, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Dominican Republic, Fiji, Guatemala, Guyana, India, Jamaica, Madagascar, Maldives, Mexico, Morocco, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Paraguay, Philippines, Saint Kitts and Nevis, Timor-Leste, Trinidad and Tobago

The fifteenth preambular paragraph was retained by 85 votes to 51, with 27 abstentions.

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

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour:

Algeria, Angola, Antigua and Barbuda, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Belarus, Bolivia (Plurinational State of), Brunei Darussalam, Burkina Faso, Burundi, Cambodia, Cameroon, Central African Republic, Chad, China, Comoros, Congo, Cuba, Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Djibouti, Dominica, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Equatorial Guinea, Eritrea, Eswatini, Ethiopia, Gambia, Ghana, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Jamaica, Jordan, Kazakhstan, Kenya, Kiribati, Kuwait, Kyrgyzstan, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lebanon, Lesotho, Libya, Malawi, Malaysia, Mali, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mongolia, Myanmar, Namibia, Nepal, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Oman, Pakistan, Peru, Philippines, Qatar, Russian Federation, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Singapore, Solomon Islands, South Africa, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Syrian Arab Republic, Tajikistan, Thailand, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkmenistan, Uganda, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Tanzania, Uruguay, Uzbekistan, Viet Nam, Yemen, Zambia, Zimbabwe

Against:

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

Abstaining:

Argentina, Barbados, Belize, Bhutan, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Botswana, Brazil, Chile, Colombia, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Dominican Republic, Fiji, Guatemala, Guyana, Haiti, India, Madagascar, Maldives, Mexico, Morocco, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Paraguay, Saint Kitts and Nevis, Timor-Leste

The sixteenth preambular paragraph was retained by 87 votes to 51, with 26 abstentions.

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

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour:

Algeria, Angola, Antigua and Barbuda, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Belarus, Bolivia (Plurinational State of), Brunei Darussalam, Burkina Faso, Burundi, Cambodia, Cameroon, Central African Republic, Chad, China, Comoros, Congo, Cuba, Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Djibouti, Dominica, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Equatorial Guinea, Eritrea, Eswatini, Ethiopia, Gambia, Ghana, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Jordan, Kazakhstan, Kenya, Kiribati, Kuwait, Kyrgyzstan, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lebanon, Lesotho, Libya, Malawi, Malaysia, Mali, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mongolia, Myanmar, Namibia, Nepal, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Oman, Pakistan, Peru, Qatar, Russian Federation, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Singapore, Solomon Islands, South Africa, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Syrian Arab Republic, Tajikistan, Thailand, Togo, Tunisia, Turkmenistan, Uganda,

United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Tanzania, Uruguay, Uzbekistan, Viet Nam, Yemen, Zambia, Zimbabwe

Against:

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

Abstaining:

Argentina, Barbados, Belize, Bhutan, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Botswana, Brazil, Chile, Colombia, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Dominican Republic, Fiji, Guatemala, Guyana, Haiti, India, Jamaica, Madagascar, Maldives, Mexico, Morocco, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Paraguay, Philippines, Rwanda, Saint Kitts and Nevis, Timor-Leste, Trinidad and Tobago

The seventeenth preambular paragraph was retained by 84 votes to 51, with 30 abstentions.

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

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour:

Algeria, Angola, Antigua and Barbuda, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Belarus, Bolivia (Plurinational State of), Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Burkina Faso, Burundi, Cambodia, Cameroon, Central African Republic, Chad, China, Comoros, Congo, Costa Rica, Cuba, Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Djibouti, Dominica, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Equatorial Guinea, Eritrea, Eswatini, Ethiopia, Gambia, Ghana, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Jamaica, Jordan, Kazakhstan, Kenya, Kiribati, Kuwait, Kyrgyzstan, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lebanon, Lesotho, Libya, Malawi, Malaysia, Mali, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mongolia, Myanmar, Namibia, Nepal, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Oman,

Pakistan, Peru, Qatar, Russian Federation, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Singapore, Solomon Islands, South Africa, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Syrian Arab Republic, Tajikistan, Thailand, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkmenistan, Uganda, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Tanzania, Uruguay, Uzbekistan, Yemen, Zambia, Zimbabwe

Against:

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

Abstaining:

Argentina, Barbados, Belize, Bhutan, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Botswana, Chile, Colombia, Côte d'Ivoire, Dominican Republic, Fiji, Guatemala, Guyana, Haiti, Madagascar, Maldives, Mexico, Morocco, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Paraguay, Philippines, Saint Kitts and Nevis, Timor-Leste

Operative paragraph 2 was retained by 87 votes to 52, with 24 abstentions.

The Chair: The Committee will now proceed to take action on draft resolution A/C.1/77/L.56, as orally revised, as a whole. A recorded vote has been requested.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour:

Algeria, Angola, Antigua and Barbuda, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Belarus, Bolivia (Plurinational State of), Brunei Darussalam, Burkina Faso, Burundi, Cambodia, Cameroon, Central African Republic, Chad, China, Comoros, Congo, Cuba, Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Djibouti, Dominica, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Equatorial Guinea, Eritrea, Eswatini, Ethiopia, Gabon, Gambia, Ghana, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Jamaica, Jordan, Kazakhstan, Kenya, Kiribati, Kuwait, Kyrgyzstan, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lebanon, Lesotho, Libya,

Malawi, Malaysia, Mali, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mongolia, Myanmar, Namibia, Nepal, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Oman, Pakistan, Peru, Qatar, Russian Federation, Rwanda, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Singapore, Solomon Islands, South Africa, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Syrian Arab Republic, Tajikistan, Thailand, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkmenistan, Uganda, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Tanzania, Uruguay, Uzbekistan, Viet Nam, Yemen, Zambia, Zimbabwe

Against:

Albania, Andorra, Australia, Austria, Belgium, Bulgaria, Canada, Croatia, Cyprus, Czechia, Denmark, Estonia, Finland, France, Germany, Greece, Honduras, Hungary, Iceland, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Japan, Latvia, Liberia, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Malta, Marshall Islands, Micronesia (Federated States of), Monaco, Montenegro, Nauru, Netherlands, New Zealand, North Macedonia, Norway, Palau, Poland, Portugal, Republic of Korea, Republic of Moldova, Romania, San Marino, Slovakia, Slovenia, Spain, Sweden, Switzerland, Türkiye, Ukraine, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America

Abstaining:

Argentina, Armenia, Barbados, Belize, Bhutan, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Botswana, Brazil, Chile, Colombia, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Dominican Republic, Fiji, Guatemala, Guyana, Haiti, India, Madagascar, Maldives, Mexico, Morocco, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Paraguay, Philippines, Saint Kitts and Nevis, Saint Lucia, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, Serbia, Timor-Leste

Draft resolution A/C.1/77/L.56, as a whole, as orally revised, was adopted by 88 votes to 54, with 31 abstentions.

The Chair: The Committee will now proceed to take action on draft resolution A/C.1/77/L.59, 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.1/77/L.59 was submitted on 19 October by the representative of India. The sponsors of the draft resolution are listed in document A/C.1/77/L.59. The additional sponsors are listed in the e-deleGATE portal

of the First Committee. Eritrea and Zambia have also become sponsors of the draft resolution.

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

Draft resolution A/C.1/77/L.59 was adopted.

The Chair: The Committee will now proceed to take action on draft resolution A/C.1/77/L.63, entitled “Objective information on military matters, including transparency of military expenditures”.

I give the floor to the Secretary of the Committee.

Ms. Elliott (Secretary of the Committee): Draft resolution A/C.1/77/L.63 was submitted on 13 October by the representatives of Germany and Romania. The sponsors of the draft resolution are listed in document A/C.1/77/L.63. The additional co-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.1/77/L.63 was adopted.

The Chair: The Committee will now proceed to take action on draft resolution A/C.1/77/L.66, 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.1/77/L.66 was submitted on 13 October by the representative of the Russian Federation. The sponsors of the draft resolution are listed in document A/C.1/77/L.66. The additional sponsors are listed in the e-deleGATE portal of the First Committee. Kyrgyzstan has also become a sponsor of the draft resolution.

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, Burkina Faso, Burundi, Cabo Verde, Cambodia, Cameroon, Canada, Central African Republic, Chad, Chile, China, Colombia, Comoros, Congo, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Croatia, Cuba, Cyprus, Czechia, Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Denmark, Djibouti, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Equatorial Guinea, Eritrea, Eswatini, Ethiopia, Finland, France, Gabon, Gambia, Germany, Ghana, Greece, Guatemala, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Haiti, Honduras, Hungary, Iceland, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Jamaica, Jordan, Kazakhstan, Kenya, Kiribati, Kuwait, Kyrgyzstan, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lebanon, Lesotho, Liberia, Libya, Liechtenstein, Luxembourg, Madagascar, Malawi, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mexico, Monaco, Mongolia, Montenegro, Morocco, Myanmar, Namibia, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, North Macedonia, Norway, Oman, Pakistan, Palau, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Portugal, Qatar, Republic of Korea, Russian Federation, Rwanda, Saint Kitts and Nevis, Saint Lucia, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, Samoa, San Marino, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Serbia, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Slovakia, Slovenia, Solomon Islands, Somalia, South Africa, Spain, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Sweden, Switzerland, Syrian Arab Republic, Tajikistan, Thailand, Timor-Leste, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Türkiye, Turkmenistan, Uganda, United Arab Emirates, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United Republic of Tanzania, United States of America, Uruguay, Uzbekistan, Viet Nam, Yemen, Zambia, Zimbabwe

Against:

Ukraine

Abstaining:

Bulgaria, Estonia, Fiji, Georgia, Japan, Latvia, Lithuania, Poland, Republic of Moldova, Romania

Draft resolution A/C.1/77/L.66 was adopted by 168 votes to 1, with 10 abstentions.

The Chair: The Committee will now proceed to take action on draft resolution A/C.1/77/L.73, entitled "Programme of action to advance responsible State

behaviour in the use of information and communications technologies 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.1/77/L.73 was submitted on 13 October by the representative of France. The sponsors of the draft resolution are listed in document A/C.1/77/L.73. 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:

Albania, Algeria, Andorra, Angola, Antigua and Barbuda, Argentina, Armenia, Australia, Austria, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belgium, Belize, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia (Plurinational State of), Bosnia and Herzegovina, Botswana, Brazil, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Burundi, Cambodia, Cameroon, Canada, Central African Republic, Chile, Colombia, Comoros, Congo, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Croatia, Cyprus, Czechia, Denmark, Djibouti, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Equatorial Guinea, Estonia, Eswatini, Fiji, Finland, France, Gabon, Gambia, Georgia, Germany, Ghana, Greece, Guatemala, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Haiti, Honduras, Hungary, Iceland, India, Iraq, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Kiribati, Kuwait, Kyrgyzstan, Latvia, Lebanon, Lesotho, Liberia, Libya, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Malawi, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Marshall Islands, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mexico, Micronesia (Federated States of), Monaco, Mongolia, Montenegro, Morocco, Myanmar, Namibia, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Niger, Nigeria, North Macedonia, Norway, Oman, Palau, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Paraguay, Peru, Poland, Portugal, Qatar, Republic of Korea, Republic of Moldova, Romania, Rwanda, Saint Kitts and Nevis, Saint Lucia, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, Samoa, San Marino, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Serbia, Slovakia, Slovenia, Solomon Islands, Somalia, South Africa, Spain, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Sweden, Switzerland, Tajikistan, Thailand, Timor-Leste, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Türkiye, Tuvalu, Uganda, Ukraine, United Arab Emirates, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United Republic of Tanzania,

United States of America, Uruguay, Uzbekistan, Vanuatu, Yemen, Zambia, Zimbabwe

Against:

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

Abstaining:

Azerbaijan, Belarus, Brunei Darussalam, Cuba, Eritrea, Ethiopia, Indonesia, Kazakhstan, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Madagascar, Pakistan, Philippines, Singapore, Viet Nam

Draft resolution A/C.1/77/L.73 was adopted by 157 votes to 6, with 14 abstentions.

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

The Chair: I shall now give the floor to delegations wishing to speak in explanation of vote or position on the draft resolutions and decisions just adopted.

Mr. Balouji (Islamic Republic of Iran): Iran supported and voted in favour of draft resolution A/C.1/77/L.66, entitled "Strengthening and developing the system of arms control, disarmament and non-proliferation treaties and agreements", for the following reasons.

First, while a specific nuclear-weapon State continuously violates the provisions of the treaties on disarmament and arms control, thereby weakening them one by one, the disarmament and arms control machinery also suffers immensely owing to such irresponsible behaviour. By highlighting the views of peace-loving nations that comply with international law and their commitments thereto, the adoption of this draft resolution sends a strong message to that country.

Secondly, the draft resolution recognizes the importance of disarmament and arms control within the context of international security and emphasizes the importance of the full and effective implementation of the related treaties. Given its non-compliance, the United States has brought about a complicated situation that undermines trust in the efficiency of these treaties in de-escalating international crises. A clear example of this is its non-compliance with its explicit obligation to engage in nuclear disarmament pursuant to article VI of the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons (NPT) and the recommendations of the NPT Review Conferences.

While draft resolution A/C.1/77/L.66 underlines the importance of strict compliance with the obligations enshrined in the related treaties, it correctly underscores the necessary strengthening of those treaties. In fact, without strengthening them, some treaties can lose their effectiveness over time. Such is the case, in particular, with the Biological and Toxin Weapons Convention wherein, so far, the United States of America has been opposed to its strengthening through negotiations, the adoption of a legally binding protocol and the implementation of all of its provisions, including a verification mechanism.

We believe that while the draft resolution contains a number of constructive elements, it can be further strengthened and expanded. For instance, the issue of the universalization of the disarmament and arms control treaties was not taken into account in the draft. The Israeli regime is not a member of any of the treaties on weapons of mass destruction, and it has been threatening the security of States members of these treaties in the Middle East.

On draft resolution A/C.1/77/L.59, entitled "Role of science and technology in the context of international security and disarmament", while facilitating and ensuring the fullest possible international transfers of dual-use and high-technology products, services and know-how for peaceful purposes is essential, there is also a need to regulate transfers of dual-use and high-technology products where there are reasonable grounds to believe that they would be used for developing weapons of mass destruction. This, in fact, requires striking a delicate balance between ensuring respect for the inherent right of each and every State to participate in the fullest possible exchange of dual-use and high-technology products, services and know-how for peaceful purposes and preventing their use in developing weapons of mass destruction.

In regulating such transfers, therefore, the concerns and interests of all States, in particular their legitimate defence requirements, have to be taken into account. This can be ensured only through an inclusive and transparent process, with the participation of all States, leading to the development of a set of multilaterally negotiated, universally applicable and non-discriminatory guidelines. The draft resolution continues to require further improvements to return to the right track if it is to become a balanced resolution.

Mr. Margaryan (Armenia): I take the floor to explain the position of the delegation of Armenia

on the draft resolutions contained in the documents A/C.1/77/L.4, A/C.1/77/L.5, A/C.1/77/L.9 and A/C.1/77/L.60 with regard to references to the eighteenth Summit of the Heads of State or Government of the Non-Aligned Movement (NAM), held in Baku on 25 and 26 October 2019. Paragraphs 662 and 663 of the final document of the NAM Summit contained biased and one-sided formulations distorting the root causes, essence and principles of the peaceful settlement of the Nagorno-Karabakh conflict. Those paragraphs of the final document also fall short in upholding the principles at the heart of the Movement, particularly the right of peoples to self-determination. In the light of the foregoing, the delegation of Armenia would like to register its reservation and disassociation from paragraphs of those draft resolutions of the First Committee containing references to the Summit of the Non-Aligned movement.

Mr. Sánchez Kiesslich (Mexico) (*spoke in Spanish*): Mexico acknowledges the adoption of draft decision A/C.1/77/L.54 submitted by Singapore, whereby the General Assembly welcomes the annual progress report of the Open-ended Working Group on security of and in the use of information and communications technologies (see A/77/275). This is a step forward that consolidates multilateral dialogue and confidence-building measures in the area of cybersecurity.

Furthermore, Mexico voted in favour of draft resolutions A/C.1/77/L.23/Rev.1 and A/C.1/77/L.73, but not without regretting that we have once again resorted to the practice of duplicating texts on the same subject. In general terms, we agree with the contents of each draft resolution, and we acknowledge the changes incorporated into the respective original texts during the negotiation process.

Both drafts have merits, as follows. Draft resolution A/C.1/77/L.23/Rev.1 reaffirms the General Assembly's political support for a much-desired process that addresses important challenges and issues essential for my delegation, such as modalities of civil society participation that we were able to agree upon in March of this year. Draft resolution A/C.1/77/L.73 could have constituted a process parallel to the Open-ended Working Group on Cybersecurity, which would eventually have an adverse effect on it, but we understand and support the substantive proposals that were at the origin of this initiative.

We appreciate the constructive spirit in which France conducted the consultations, and we are satisfied with the outcome. We hope that both draft resolutions can find common ground to generate the conditions for negotiating a United Nations action plan on cybersecurity at the appropriate time.

On draft resolution A/C.1/77/L.56, entitled "Promoting international cooperation on peaceful uses in the context of international security," there is no doubt that developments in science and technology should be employed exclusively for peaceful uses that contribute to the sustainable development of all peoples. Mexico defends the inalienable right of all countries to benefit from these advances. In that spirit, Mexico contributed constructively to the reporting exercise called for under resolution 76/234.

My delegation's main concerns about the draft resolution remain in the text submitted this year. International cooperation for peaceful purposes and the prevention and control of the proliferation of weapons of mass destruction and in the context of the fight against terrorism are protected by the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons, the Treaty on the Prohibition of Nuclear Weapons, the respective conventions on prohibitions of biological and chemical weapons, and in the obligations set forth in Security Council resolution 1540 (2004).

With every right comes an obligation. Exchanges in science and technology for peaceful purposes must be carried out in accordance with the aforementioned conventions. All parties to these instruments have a responsibility to comply with the obligations and commitments contained therein, in accordance with international law.

Agreements of a voluntary and political nature, such as those derived from export-control regimes, that is, the Nuclear Suppliers Group, the Wassenaar Arrangement and the Australia Group, all of which Mexico is a member, are a very important complements to our obligations. These mechanisms have contributed to the prevention of proliferation, and their usefulness is such that those of us who have voluntarily joined them can effectively control strategic and sensitive goods both within our countries and abroad by means of measures implemented in a sovereign manner, based on the provisions contained in the legally binding instruments.

Accordingly, export-control regimes contribute decisively to international peace and security and in no way constitute undue restrictions on trade. We regret that even though the content of the report of the Secretary-General (A/77/96) reflects a variety of positions, it continues to be asserted that these regimes are negative in nature. For these reasons and notwithstanding the good intentions of the draft resolution, my delegation abstained in the voting on it.

Mr. Asokan (India): I take the floor to explain our votes on the draft proposals under agenda items 107 and 94 and sub-item (gg) of agenda item 99. On draft resolution A/C.1/77/L.56, India supports the important role of international cooperation in science and technology for peaceful purposes in facilitating the economic and social development of Member States, particularly developing countries. We also recognize various provisions contained in the international treaties and mandatory obligations relating to the non-proliferation of weapons of mass destruction, including to non-State actors, which require the regulation of relevant transfers. Countries, including sponsors of the draft resolution themselves, exercise such controls on exports at the national level. There is a need for due recognition of those factors and their respective objectives in a careful manner. Undue tinkering with that balance may be fraught with risks. We therefore abstained in the voting on draft resolution A/C.1/77/L.56.

I will now deliver a combined explanation of vote for the proposals contained in draft resolutions A/C.1/77/L.23/Rev.1 and A/C.1/77/L.73 and draft decision A/C.1/77/L.54.

India is committed to promoting an open, secure, stable, accessible and peaceful information and communications technology (ICT) environment. India actively participated in the work of the Group of Governmental Experts and the 2018 Open-ended Working Group on Developments in the Field of Information and Telecommunications in the Context of International Security. The current Open-ended Working Group on Security of and in the Use of Information and Communications Technologies 2021–2025 provides an inclusive platform for intergovernmental discussions under United Nations auspices in that important area. India supports the work of the Group, particularly the outcome-oriented approach adopted by its Chair.

We welcome the consensus adoption of the first annual progress report of the group (see A/77/275),

which has now been endorsed by the First Committee. The consensus adoption of the Chair's draft decision A/C.1/77/L.54 provides a solid foundation for the work of the Group in the coming year. We also welcome the proposal contained in the draft decision to hold intersessional meetings, which we believe will provide opportunities for Member States to have detailed discussions on concrete and actionable proposals submitted by Member States to the Open-ended Working Group.

The Group has achieved significant progress in terms of carrying forward a broad understanding of the six pillars of the Group's mandate, further elaborating and building a common understanding on topics that have not yet achieved consensus. We reiterate that the Open-ended Working Group, during its tenure, should be the main platform for deliberations on ICT security issues, which are part of its mandate. Hence, India voted in favour of draft resolution A/C.1/77/L.23/Rev.1.

Our position on the language contained in the second preambular paragraph of this document has already been explained and our vote reflects the same.

The fourth preambular paragraph of the document also moves away from consensus language, highlighting only additional norms and ignoring the *acquis*. Hence, we were constrained to abstain in the voting on that paragraph.

On the future mechanism for regular institutional dialogue on ICT security, India supports a permanent, inclusive, transparent, consensus-based and results-oriented process, with specific objectives that will build on the previous outcome, including that of the Open-ended Working Group on Security of and in the Use of Information and Communications Technologies 2021–2025. Such a mechanism should also integrate various key aspects of the ICT environment, such as raising awareness, building trust and confidence and encouraging deeper study and discussion on areas where no common understanding has yet emerged. Our vote in favour of draft resolution A/C.1/77/L.73 is an indication of India's readiness to engage in constructive and meaningful discussions to that end.

On draft resolution A/C.1/77/L.18, India voted in favour, as the text fully supports the objective that the draft resolution seeks to promote. We were, however, constrained to abstain in the voting on the thirteenth preambular paragraph, which contains a reference to the Arms Trade Treaty (ATT). We believe that any

reference in this draft resolution to the ATT applies only to and among States parties to the Treaty.

Mr. Lagardien (South Africa): My delegation wishes to take the floor to explain our vote on draft resolution A/C.1/77/L.73, entitled “Programme of action to advance responsible State behaviour in the use of information and communications technologies in the context of international security”.

On numerous occasions, South Africa has welcomed efforts towards the elaboration of a programme of action as part of the work of the Open-ended Working Group on Security of and in the Use of Information and Communications Technologies 2021–2025, established pursuant to resolution 75/240.

We recall the recommendation from the consensus annual progress report of this working group (see A/77/275) to further elaborate the programme of action with a view towards its possible establishment as a mechanism to advance responsible State behaviour in the use of information and communication technologies (ICTs), which would, among other things, support the capacities of States in implementing commitments in their use of ICTs.

We acknowledge that the drafters of draft resolution A/C.1/77/L.73 made efforts, through an inclusive and transparent process of consultations, to take account of the views expressed by numerous delegations, specifically related to concerns around the prejudice of the establishment of the programme of action and setting up a parallel track to the current five-year Open-ended Working Group.

My delegation believes that the Open-ended Working Group made laudable progress to elaborate actionable proposals and find consensus on its annual progress report, and we welcome the adoption of this report. That is especially commendable and welcome given the complexity of the ICT and security landscape and the particularly challenging global security environment.

South Africa voted in favour of draft resolution A/C.1/77/L.73 on the understanding that the Open-ended Working Group would not be undermined and that the elements of the programme of action or its establishment would be prejudged. The Open-ended Working Group must be given room, under the able leadership of its Chair, to develop many of the actionable elements and proposals, including on further institutional dialogue.

We look forward to continuing engagement within this forum.

Ms. Minh Vu (Viet Nam): Our position today on draft resolutions A/C.1/77/L.23/Rev.1, A/C.1/77/L.73 and draft decision A/C.1/77/L.54 is an affirmation of our support for the joint efforts at the United Nations to promote an information and communication technology environment that is peaceful, safe, secure and open, underpinned by international law.

Viet Nam supports enhanced international legal frameworks on cyberspace, with the broad participation of Member States in the consultation process. Additional burdens and duplication should be avoided, especially when discussions about our current mechanism on this very issue are still in progress. With that in mind, we would like to emphasize that the establishment of a permanent mechanism should be discussed carefully and thoroughly on the basis of promoting consensus among Member States, taking into account all proposals and views of States. It is our hope that in future Member States will work together in a constructive spirit and arrive at a mechanism that meets the challenge of promoting responsible State behaviour in cyberspace.

Mr. Padilla González (Cuba) (*spoke in Spanish*): Cuba firmly supports the goal of ensuring responsible State action in the area of information and communication technologies in the context of international security. However, we believe that the proposal of creating a programme of action, as suggested in draft resolution A/C.1/77/L.73, despite its good intentions, would actually end up hindering its goals rather than advancing them. For that reason, the Cuban delegation abstained in the voting on draft resolution A/C.1/77/L.73, entitled “Programme of action to advance responsible State behaviour in the use of information and communication technologies in the context of international security”.

The mandate of the Open-ended Working Group on Security of and in the Use of Information and Communications Technologies 2021–2025 includes the consideration of State proposals. Any cybersecurity initiative, including the proposal of some States of creating a programme of action, should be discussed in the Open-ended Working Group, which must recommend the best courses of action to take on the basis of the consensus reached among Member States.

We do not support the creation of parallel, duplicative or substitutive mechanisms to the Open-ended Working Group unless they arise from the Group itself. In Cuba's view, the creation of a programme of action would be totally premature, as the initiative has not been closely considered, let alone agreed, in the Open-ended Working Group. We should not prejudge the results of such a discussion in the Open-ended Working Group or the recommendations that it would submit to the General Assembly. In practice, the adoption of draft resolution A/C.1/77/L.73 will involve establishing a parallel framework to the Open-ended Working Group, in addition to being extremely costly in terms of financial and human resources, and will include a regional-consultation component. It is our responsibility to make appropriate use of the limited financial resources at our disposal and to avoid the proliferation of parallel processes and meetings, with the consequent difficulties in covering their costs, especially for smaller delegations from developing countries. In addition, the adoption of a programme of action with voluntary standards would in practice have the damaging effect of leaving us even further away from the possibility of adopting a legally binding obligation, which Cuba considers the only truly effective way to achieve responsible behaviour by States in cyberspace.

The role of the Open-ended Working Group in engaging in regular institutional dialogue in the area of security and the use of information and communication technologies should be respected and preserved. We support the continuation of its work in that format, which will be able to provide consensus-based results for all States.

Mr. Gunaratna (Sri Lanka): Sri Lanka values the discussions in the Open-ended Working Group on the security of and in the use of information and communications technologies and recognizes it as an appropriate forum for considering and deliberating on the subject. Accordingly, we commend the consensus on the annual progress report (see A/77/275) and emphasize that the Open-ended Working Group should be allowed to continue its deliberations without hindrance during its assigned period from 2021 to 2025 and to make its recommendations for future action.

Although Sri Lanka voted in favour both of draft resolutions A/C.1/77/L.23/Rev.1 and A/C.1/77/L.73, because the sponsors of both draft resolutions showed flexibility in accommodating language to ensure that the work of the Open-ended Working Group is not

undermined, we would like to put it on record that extraneous attempts should not be made to put pressure on the work of the Working Group, whose mandate is clear and established by General Assembly resolutions 75/240 and 76/19.

Ms. Quintero Correa (Colombia) (*spoke in Spanish*): My delegation would like to explain its vote on draft resolution A/C.1/77/L.66, entitled "Strengthening and developing the system of arms control, disarmament and non-proliferation treaties and agreements". We have supported this resolution every year since it was first introduced, because we agree with its content. International law should always form the basis of international relations and be the governing principle in all physical and virtual arenas, applying to all means, tools and developments of science and technology and governing the conduct of States and their peoples. Only full, unconditional respect for the Charter of the United Nations, all legally binding instruments of customary international law and all the norms, rules and principles of international law in general can guarantee peace, security and prosperity for all peoples.

We reiterate the importance of safeguarding the legal instruments on disarmament, non-proliferation and arms control, effectively ensuring compliance with them and strengthening the regimes established in this area. As a peaceful country and founding State of the United Nations, Colombia has historically participated in the development of international law in general and specifically where it is applicable to disarmament, non-proliferation and arms control. We will continue to do so, as we firmly believe that the only path to preserving life and ensuring that humankind can flourish is that of dialogue, multilateralism, cooperation and solidarity.

Ms. Nam (New Zealand): I am taking the floor to explain New Zealand's votes on two draft resolutions under cluster 5. New Zealand has once again voted against draft resolution A/C.1/77/L.56, entitled "Promoting international cooperation on peaceful uses in the context of international security".

New Zealand strongly supports efforts to strengthen international cooperation with a view to advancing the implementation of the Sustainable Development Goals. We do not, however, support initiatives that would undermine efforts to prevent the proliferation of weapons and sensitive technologies. We regret that despite the changes made to the text this year, draft resolution A/C.1/77/L.56 remains one such initiative. It would undermine the export-control regimes that have

been established to uphold our shared non-proliferation objectives, regimes of which New Zealand is a member and strong supporter. The restrictions that such regimes impose on exporters of weapons, sensitive technologies and dual-use items make an important contribution to national, regional and global non-proliferation efforts and are the primary mechanisms through which we implement our own obligations and commitments in that regard. Undermining those restrictions would have negative implications for international peace and security and the global rules-based order. And we have seen no evidence, including in the responses collated in the Secretary-General's report (A/77/96), to suggest that draft resolution A/C.1/77/L.56 would have a positive impact on sustainable development. For those reasons, New Zealand opposes it, and accordingly voted against the draft resolution as a whole and against all the paragraphs voted on separately.

New Zealand voted in favour of draft resolution A/C.1/77/L.66, entitled "Strengthening and developing the system of arms control, disarmament and non-proliferation treaties and agreements", a resolution that we have joined the consensus on in the past and one that highlights the importance of ensuring that States comply with their respective obligations and commitments under arms-control, disarmament and non-proliferation treaties and agreements. This year, however, it has been difficult to reconcile the draft resolution's constructive message with the actions of its main sponsor, Russia, which has so flagrantly and at such a high humanitarian cost violated international law in its illegal invasion of Ukraine. It is also a challenge to support a draft resolution on safeguarding the integrity of existing disarmament and non-proliferation treaties and agreements when that draft resolution has been put forward by a country that is both practically and through a relentless campaign of myths and disinformation undermining the global architecture established for chemical and biological weapons.

New Zealand is also taken aback by the cynicism of references to the need to maintain the effectiveness, efficiency and consensus-bound nature of the relevant multilateral instruments in the field of disarmament, non-proliferation and arms control, when it is Russia that has blocked outcomes or substantive progress in meetings across this field, including at the 2022 Review Conference of the Parties to the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons. We are reminded, however, that the strength of the global disarmament, arms-control and non-proliferation

regime is not defined or determined by just one country. It is rather how the international community responds to challenges to the regime, whether by one State or many, that will ultimately decide its fate.

Against that backdrop and as a long-standing supporter of the disarmament and non-proliferation regime, New Zealand has voted in favour of A/C.1/77/L.66. We can only agree that actions that undermine the system of arms-control, disarmament and non-proliferation treaties and agreements also undermine global stability and international peace and security, and we urge all States parties to such treaties and agreements to implement all provisions in their entirety and with urgency.

Mr. Turner (United States of America): I would like to explain my delegation's position on draft resolutions A/C.1/77/L.4, A/C.1/77/L.5 and A/C.1/77/L.66.

On the first two, the United States did not participate in the Committee's action on either draft resolution. The United States believes that disarmament and development are two distinct issues. Accordingly, we do not consider ourselves bound by the final document of the International Conference on the Relationship between Disarmament and Development, adopted in September 1987.

Similarly, the United States sees no direct connection, as stated in draft resolution A/C.1/77/L.4, between general environmental standards and multilateral arms control and does not consider that matter germane to the First Committee. The United States operates under stringent domestic environmental impact regulations for many activities, including the implementation of arms control and disarmament agreements.

With respect to draft resolution A/C.1/77/L.66, I take the floor on behalf of Canada, Germany, Greece, Montenegro, Portugal, the United Kingdom and my own country. Our countries have chosen to vote in favour of strengthening and developing the system of arms control, disarmament and non-proliferation treaties and agreements because we remain devoted to the international arms control system and the principles contained in this draft resolution. Done correctly, arms control can help manage and stabilize strategic relationships and promote greater transparency and predictability.

We chose to vote in favour despite the egregious and deeply disingenuous actions of the draft resolution's author. As many have said before, a resolution belongs

to the General Assembly, not to its original author. It is nevertheless impossible to ignore the truly breathtaking hypocrisy of Russia putting this draft resolution forward. The Russian Federation's brutal and unprovoked invasion of Ukraine demonstrated its complete disregard for its international obligations, including under the Charter of the United Nations, and for the norms espoused in its own draft resolution. We condemn Russia's actions in the strongest possible terms and recall that indiscriminate attacks on innocent civilian populations constitute a war crime.

The General Assembly has spoken time and again against those actions, most recently on 12 October (see A/ES-11/PV.14), with the adoption by an overwhelming majority of resolution ES-11/4, entitled "Territorial integrity of Ukraine: defending the principles of the Charter of the United Nations". Our countries echoed the views of multiple other delegations and, most important, Ukraine in their explanations of vote. We absolutely respect Ukraine's position on this draft resolution and emphasize that we are united in our condemnation of the Russian Federation's behaviour, not just this year but for the last several years across all multilateral forums and, in particular, on matters related to international security.

The Russian Federation has consistently refused to fully comply with many of its international obligations, undermining some of the security benefits of those arms control, disarmament and non-proliferation agreements. In fact, all of our countries made very similar statements in 2020, the last time this draft resolution was submitted. We are very sorry to say that Russia's track record is even worse now than it was then. Since the European Union already comprehensively outlined those facts, there is no reason for us to repeat them.

We would, however, like to quote from the draft resolution itself, which reads:

"[u]nderlining that any weakening of confidence in and compliance with such treaties and agreements diminishes their contribution to global or regional stability and undermines the credibility and effectiveness of the international legal system and regime applicable to arms control, disarmament and non-proliferation" (*A/C.1/77/L.66, sixth preambular paragraph*).

It is a terrible irony that the Russian Federation, the penholder, has proven just how true those words are.

Nonetheless, we will not be the ones to turn our back on the international regimes and norms that the world needs today, now more than ever, not least because of Russia's reprehensible actions. As we all work towards a better future, arms control measures in the area of monitoring or verification or other vital pieces of the tool kit that we have worked so hard to build will need to be part of the solution. That is why our countries remain committed to not just maintaining, but strengthening, the international arms control, disarmament and non-proliferation architecture. Lives depend on it.

In sum, we support this draft resolution in spite of its author, and we call on the Russian Federation to immediately cease its illegal war against Ukraine and abide by its international legal obligations, including those set out in the United Nations Charter and international law — in short, to begin to live up to the draft resolution it wrote.

Mr. Kim Sunghoon (Republic of Korea): My delegation would like to provide an explanation of vote on two of the draft resolutions, namely, draft resolution A/C.1/77/L.66, entitled "Strengthening and developing the system of arms control, disarmament and non-proliferation treaties and agreements", and draft resolution A/C.1/77/L.23/Rev.1, entitled "Developments in the field of information and telecommunications in the context of international security".

Regarding the draft resolution on strengthening and developing the system of arms control, disarmament, and non-proliferation treaties and agreement, the Republic Korea voted in favour since we support its goal and purpose. We remain committed to strengthening the international disarmament and non-proliferation system and its relevant treaties and conventions. Having said that and having voted in favour of the draft resolution, we are against any actions that run counter to it.

We would like to quote from the draft resolution itself, which reads:

"[c]oncerned that any actions that undermine the existing system of arms control, disarmament and non-proliferation treaties and agreements affect the interests of the international community" (*A/C.1/77/L.66, eleventh preambular paragraph*).

In that regard, my delegation joins the international community's condemnation of Russia's armed invasion against Ukraine, which constitutes a flagrant violation

of the Charter of the United Nations and the principles of international law. We are also gravely concerned that Russia's dangerous and irresponsible nuclear rhetoric threatens the credibility and relevance of the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons and the international disarmament and non-proliferation regime.

Moreover, we express our deep concern about Russia's unfounded allegations regarding the development and possible use of chemical and biological weapons, which may impede the full implementation of the relevant conventions. We urge Russia to cease all military actions and withdraw all its forces from the Ukrainian territory, and we call on Russia to comply with its obligations under all relevant international law and its own draft resolution.

Regarding the resolution on developments in the field of information and telecommunications in the context of international security, my delegation believes that the Open-ended Working Group (OEWG) on Security of and in the Use of Information and Communications Technologies is contributing greatly to Member States' discussions to develop norms to advance the framework of responsible State behaviour in cyberspace. The Republic of Korea plans to continue to play a constructive role in the OEWG. In that respect, we support the OEWG Chair's decision.

In addition, as a co-sponsor of the draft resolution (A/C.1/77/L.73) submitted by France regarding the programme of action, my delegation would like to underscore the need to establish programmable action on an action-oriented mechanism within the United Nations in order to enhance practical implementation of the agreed norms and encourage the exchange of best practices and capacity-building.

My delegation would like to point out that draft resolution submitted by Russia is duplicative of the Chair's decision and that certain paragraphs in the draft resolution contain language that was not agreed by consensus. With that in mind, my delegation decided to vote against the draft resolution, as a whole, and against the individual paragraphs put to a vote.

Ms. Marchand (Belgium) (*spoke in French*): My delegation wishes to offer an explanation of vote in favour of draft resolution A/C.1/77/L.10, entitled "Effects of the use of armaments and ammunitions containing depleted uranium".

On 11 May 2007, Belgium passed a law that classified inert munitions and armour that

contains depleted uranium or any other industrially manufactured uranium as prohibited weapons. The law entered into force in 2009. Belgium has now become the first country in the world to have banned this type of weapon out of caution and prudence.

In fact, the adoption of the Belgian law was preceded by parliamentary hearings, in which expert scientists expressed their views. Divergent views were shared with regard to an assessment of the danger to health and the environment of the use of weapons containing depleted uranium.

Belgium closely follows all developments in the scientific analysis of the dangers related to the use of depleted uranium armaments, including international studies carried out on that issue.

Belgium remains at the service of the United Nations and its Member States for any information with regard to the definitions, goals and modalities of the law of 11 May 2007. Belgium hopes that the draft resolution that we adopted in the First Committee can contribute to a better understanding internationally of the effects caused depleted uranium armaments with a view to agreeing on a joint assessment in due course.

Mr. Sharoni (Israel): Israel voted in favour of draft resolution A/C.1/77/L.73, on the establishment of a programme of action to advance responsible State behaviour in the use of information and communication technologies in the context of international security.

While having some reservations, Israel recognized the aim of this initiative to create an important, inclusive and permanent venue for discussing cybersecurity issues. In particular, we appreciate the attempt to unite existing United Nations channels into one main forum.

During the discussions on the future programme of action, Israel emphasized the importance that we place on avoiding duplicative processes and considering the work that was done during the 2019-2021 Open-ended Working Group and the heavy workload, especially for small delegations.

Today Israel still believes that there are several potential advantages to the idea of establishing a programme of action as the sole United Nations mechanism for discussing cybersecurity issues at the global level. At the same time, we still have some reservations that we would like to briefly share.

First, we have persistently made it clear that it is imperative that all decisions in the new programme of

action be made based on the principle of consensus, applied both to the negotiation process leading to the establishment of the programme of action as well as to the decision-making process within it. It should be clearly reflected in the programme of action's modalities. Cybersecurity issues could affect the fundamental national security interests of all States. It is our expectation that that essential and widely observed principle be maintained and safeguarded in the text and put into practice in the next phases of the deliberations and the establishment of any future programme of action.

Secondly, going forward, it will be important for the programme of action to be objective and neutral. As past experiences demonstrate, its credibility will dependently in large part on ensuring that it is not to be politicized.

With regard to the thirteenth preambular paragraph, the last sentence reflects the deep disagreement among States, and it is far from consensual. Israel wishes to clarify and reiterate that, while some States hold the view that the further development of norms and the implementation of existing norms could take place in parallel, our view is that it would be more effective to exhaust a discussion on existing norms before embarking on the development of new ones. We recall that the norms of the 2015 Group of Governmental Experts are voluntary and non-binding and do not limit or prohibition action that is otherwise consistent with international law. They are meant to signal the expectations of the international community, and it is therefore natural, to a certain extent, that their understanding varies from one State to another. Still, from what we have seen thus far, their implementation has been broadly uneven. The programme of action's resources should therefore focus on confidence-building measures, capacity-building and enabling and promoting the implementation of those norms, which we worked so hard to agree upon.

Furthermore, we would like to emphasize that the language used in the last sentence of the thirteenth preambular paragraph reflects a deep disagreement and is far from consensual. As we and other States have said before, there is no consensus over the need to develop additional legally binding obligations at this time. In our view, that should have been stated in a clear way in the text of this draft resolution.

In that respect, Israel dissociates itself from the position that a need exists to develop at this stage a legally binding instrument. This past year demonstrated

the heightened responsibility of Government to provide security and protect States' interests with regard to malign actors. We are sceptical that that can happen through the introduction of new and untried principles.

Accordingly, we believe that the work of the programme of action should focus on the cautious application of time-proven and well-founded principles, confidence-building measures, inter-State cooperation and capacity-building. Israel remains ready to share its knowledge, further develop bilateral and multilateral collaboration and take further and take other pragmatic steps to improve cybersecurity across the globe.

Although some of our reservations remain unanswered, in the spirit of cooperation constructive dialogue, today Israel joins many States in supporting this draft resolution and the idea of starting discussions on establishing a programme of action. We ask that our concern be taken into account and reflected in future deliberations on the establishment of a programme of action, specially while discussing the modalities and mandate of the programme of action. We reiterate our call for consensus-based decision-making.

We wish to thank the delegations of France and the long list of sponsors for the initiative and for the flexibility in developing it further. We express our openness to working together with other States Members of the United Nations to see its success in the coming years.

Ms. Hendriksen (United Kingdom): France and the United Kingdom would like to explain their position on draft resolution A/C.1/77/L.4, entitled "Observance of environmental norms in the drafting and implementation of agreements on disarmament and arms control", followed by draft resolution A/C.1/77/L.5, entitled "Relationship between disarmament and development", on which we joined the consensus.

We wish to make it clear that France and the United Kingdom operate under stringent domestic environmental impact regulations for many activities, including the implementation of arms control and disarmament agreements. We see no direct connection, as stated in the draft resolution, between general environmental standards and multilateral arms control. Climate change is among the most serious challenges facing our world. It poses a threat to the environment, global security and economic prosperity. In that respect, France and the United Kingdom are strongly committed to the fight against climate change. The

2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development, the Paris Agreement on Change and the Glasgow Climate Pact constitute our common road maps to transform our economies and our energy models. We reaffirm our commitment to the full implementation of the 2030 Agenda, the Paris Agreement and the Glasgow Climate Pact, as well as our determination to intensify our efforts to live up to our ambitions and responsibilities towards future generations.

I will now explain our position on draft resolution A/C.1/77/L.5. France and the United Kingdom support the effective practical linkages between disarmament issues and development policy, particularly in the field of conventional weapons, small arms and light weapons and disarmament, demobilization and reintegration. Nonetheless, we feel it necessary to make our position clear on other aspects of this text. The notion of a symbiotic relationship between disarmament and development appears questionable to us, as the conditions conducive to effective arms control and disarmament are not registered are not necessarily dependent only on development, as seen with the increasing military expenditure of some developing country. There is no automatic link between the two, but rather a complex relationship that this notion does not accurately capture. Moreover, the idea according to which military expenditure directly diverts funding from development requirements would need to be nuanced, as defence investments are also necessary to deliver the peace and security that facilitate development, including through legitimate military operations, peacekeeping and an improved response to natural disasters and airborne and maritime equipment.

Mr. Brady (Ireland): I have asked for the floor to explain our vote on draft resolution A/C.1/77/L.66, entitled “Strengthening and developing the system of arms control, disarmament and non-proliferation treaties and agreements”, submitted by the Russian Federation.

Ireland once again voted in favour of this draft resolution. Our support for the principles and norms outlined in it remain steadfast. Ireland is fully committed to upholding and strengthening the global arms-control, disarmament and non-proliferation architecture. We want to make it clear, however, that our support for the draft resolution and its underlying values in no way implies support for the author of the draft text, the Russian Federation. As others have said, a resolution ultimately belongs to the General Assembly, not its original author.

The fact is that over the course of this year, the Russian Federation has blatantly and repeatedly contravened its international obligations and the principles of its own draft resolution. Russia’s illegal, unprovoked and unjustified war in Ukraine undermines the very principles set out in it. In addition, Russia’s actions, including the blocking of consensus at the Review Conference of the Parties to the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons, undermining the Organization for the Prohibition of Chemical Weapons and misusing the provisions of the Biological Weapons Convention for political purposes, also undermine the credibility and effectiveness of the international legal system and regime applicable to arms control, disarmament and non-proliferation. We urge the Russian Federation to end its war against Ukraine and to return to its obligations and commitments under the Charter of the United Nations, international law and disarmament and arms-control agreements. Russia should, in fact, actively respect the provisions of the draft resolution that it submitted.

Ms. Fitri (Indonesia): Indonesia would like to explain its position on a number of proposals under cluster 5. My delegation abstained in the voting on draft resolution A/C.1/77/L.73, entitled “Programme of action to advance responsible State behaviour in the use of information and communications technologies in the context of international security”, owing to several considerations.

First, we believe in the importance of maintaining a single and consensus process. The Open-ended Working Group on Security of and in the Use of Information and Communications Technologies 2021–2025 remains the main platform for States to discuss and consider proposals on the issue of regular institutional dialogue. The provision in operative paragraph 3 of the draft resolution regarding the mandate for a report by the Secretary-General has the potential to duplicate the discussion of a programme of action within the Open-ended Working Group framework. Moreover, many countries, especially those with smaller delegations, have a limited capacity to respond and attend to various processes and could be overburdened by additional reporting mechanisms outside the Open-ended Working Group process.

Secondly, we believe that regional consultations should be State-led in nature. With regard to the provision in operative paragraph 4 on regional consultation, we believe that that such consultations

should be held within the framework of the Open-ended Working Group and under the stewardship of its Chair. The consultations should be conducted with agreed modalities and in a transparent manner, with a view to producing an outcome that is impartial, relevant and contributes to the discussion. We commend the delegation of France for its initiative and active engagement, as well as the fact that the draft resolution was considerably revised following consultations with Member States.

Indonesia would like to remind the Committee of the adoption in July of the Open-ended Working Group's annual progress report (see A/77/275), which already included recommendations to discuss the programme of action initiative in the Group's upcoming fourth substantive session. We look forward to engaging constructively in that discussion. Furthermore, Indonesia supported resolution A/C.1/77/L.23/Rev.1 and joined the consensus on draft resolution A/C.1/77/L.54. Our position reflects our principled support for this Open-ended Working Group as the existing multilateral consensus and inclusive process, with a view to increasing the stability and security of the information and communications technologies (ICTs) environment. Indonesia reiterates its support for a multilateral, inclusive and consensus process that belongs to and is driven by all Member States. We look forward to continued constructive engagement on the future discourse on ICTs in the context of international security.

Indonesia voted in favour of draft resolution A/C.1/77/L.56, entitled "Promoting international cooperation on peaceful uses in the context of international security". We highlight the significant role played by international cooperation on materials, equipment and technology for peaceful purposes in facilitating the economic and social development of Member States, especially developing countries. We believe that regimes that are formulated in a selective, non-inclusive manner will undermine cooperation in the area of the peaceful uses of sensitive materials and technologies.

Finally, Indonesia would like to express its reservations about the thirteenth preambular paragraph of draft resolution A/C.1/77/L.18, entitled "Women, disarmament, non-proliferation and arms control". The paragraph makes a few references that do not align with our national legislation. We joined the consensus on the text of the draft resolution. However, that does not

imply that we accept some of its paragraphs being used as agreed language for future outcome documents of the General Assembly.

Ms. McIntyre (Australia): I am taking the floor briefly to explain Australia's vote in favour of draft resolution A/C.1/77/L.66, entitled "Strengthening and developing the system of arms control, disarmament and non-proliferation treaties and agreements". Our support stems from our decision to vote on the basis of the merits of the draft resolution itself. As is well known, Australia is committed to upholding the rules-based multilateral order, including in the field of disarmament. As such, we wholeheartedly support the sentiments expressed in the draft resolution. However, we feel compelled to take the floor because our work does not take place in a vacuum. The hypocrisy of the lead sponsor of the draft resolution is galling and cannot be ignored. As stated in the draft resolution itself, it is the responsibility and the obligation of all Member States to refrain from steps that negatively affect the security environment.

Australia condemns Russia's unilateral, illegal and immoral aggression against Ukraine. The invasion is a gross violation of international law, including the Charter of the United Nations. Russia has failed to fulfil the commitments it made in the 1994 Budapest Memorandum. Australia also condemns Russia's outrageous nuclear threats. None of those actions are consistent with the spirit of the draft resolution. Australia calls on Russia to withdraw from Ukraine and to halt its actions undermining the international nuclear non-proliferation architecture without delay.

Mr. Aydil (Türkiye): I am delivering Türkiye's explanation of its vote on draft resolution A/C.1/77/L.66, entitled "Strengthening and developing the system of arms control, disarmament and non-proliferation treaties and agreements". My delegation voted in favour of the draft resolution, in line with the importance we attach to the genuine implementation of the obligations by all States parties under the relevant arms-control, disarmament and non-proliferation instruments. Unfortunately, in recent years we have seen a negative trend that has strained the global arms-control and disarmament architecture and resulted in the demise of important international agreements.

In the current circumstances, ensuring our collective security is an urgent task that essentially requires full compliance with the instruments we have created in accordance with the purposes and principles enshrined

in the Charter of the United Nations. Türkiye shares the common aspiration of many countries that have voted in favour of draft resolution A/C.1/77/L.66, with a view to maintaining and strengthening the systems of arms-control, disarmament and non-proliferation treaties and agreements. We want to emphasize the importance of aligning our words and actions towards that goal if we are to ensure an effective and credible system.

Mr. Ogasawara (Japan): I would like to explain Japan's vote on two draft resolutions, A/C.1/77/L.23/Rev.1 and A/C.1/77/L.66.

First, Japan voted against draft resolution A/C.1/77/L.23/Rev.1, entitled "Developments in the field of information and telecommunications in the context of international security". Japan welcomes the annual progress report adopted by consensus in the Open-ended Working Group on Security of and in the Use of Information and Communications Technologies 2021–2025 (see A/77/275). We strongly support the Open-ended Working Group process and Singapore's efforts as its Chair. We also believe that draft resolution A/C.1/77/L.23/Rev.1 overlaps with A/C.1/77/L.54, which endorses the Open-ended Working Group's annual progress report, submitted by the Chair, and that there is no need to adopt another, similar draft resolution. In addition, there is some wording in draft resolution A/C.1/77/L.23/Rev.1 that was not agreed on by consensus. Japan is committed to promoting a free, fair and secure cyberspace and will continue to actively contribute to discussions and efforts to promote the rule of law in cyberspace, including at the United Nations.

With regard to draft resolution A/C.1/77/L.66, entitled "Strengthening and developing the system of arms control, disarmament and non-proliferation treaties and agreements", while Japan abstained in the voting on this draft resolution, we echo the views expressed in their explanations of vote by the United States, the European Union and others, most importantly Ukraine. We are united in our condemnation of the Russian Federation's aggressions against Ukraine. Such unilateral attempts to change the status quo by force undermine the very foundations of the international order and should not be happening anywhere in the world. Japan is determined to defend the Charter of the United Nations and multilateralism and urges the Russian Federation to honour its crucial commitment to the system of arms-control, disarmament and non-proliferation agreements, not in words but in its actions.

Ms. Lim (Singapore): Singapore would like to explain its vote on draft resolutions A/C.1/77/L.23/Rev.1, entitled "Developments in the field of information and telecommunications in the context of international security", and A/C.1/77/L.73, entitled "Programme of action to advance responsible State behaviour in the use of information and communications technologies in the context of international security".

Singapore is fully committed to the goal of achieving an open, secure, stable, accessible and peaceful information and communications technologies environment. At the same time, as the Committee is aware, Ambassador Burhan Gafoor of Singapore is currently Chair of the Open-ended Working Group on Security of and in the Use of Information and Communications Technologies 2021–2025, established pursuant to General Assembly resolution 75/240, adopted on 31 December 2020. Taking into account the role played by Ambassador Gafoor as Chair of the Open-ended Working Group, Singapore decided to abstain in the voting on the two draft resolutions in order to demonstrate a neutral, independent and balanced approach to both.

Ms. Lipana (Philippines): I am taking the floor to explain the Philippines' vote on draft resolutions A/C.1/77/L.56, entitled "Promoting international cooperation on peaceful uses in the context of international security", and A/C.1/77/L.73, entitled "Programme of action to advance responsible State behaviour in the use of information and communications technologies in the context of international security", on both of which we felt constrained to abstain.

With regard to draft resolution A/C.1/77/L.56, the Philippines appreciates China's initiative in submitting an updated proposal on peaceful uses. In its twelfth, thirteenth and fourteenth preambular paragraphs it captures positive language on political commitments and concrete efforts by Member States to promote international cooperation on peaceful uses, including initiatives involving the International Atomic Energy Agency (IAEA), the Organization for the Prohibition of Chemical Weapons (OPCW) and the Biological Weapons Convention (BWC). We abstained in the voting on this draft resolution because the Philippines is of the view that multilateral export-control regimes make international cooperation on responsible, peaceful uses possible, while the draft resolution creates doubt about such regimes. The report of the Secretary-General (A/77/96), issued pursuant

to General Assembly resolution 76/234, places an emphasis on improving the inclusivity of multilateral export control regimes, pursuing capacity-building and enhancing international cooperation and peaceful uses. The Philippines therefore sees merit in a dialogue on those issues that can be undertaken within the existing multilateral processes, including in the IAEA, OPCW and BWC review processes. In view of that, we abstained in the voting on the fifteenth and seventeenth preambular paragraphs, on operative paragraph 2 and on the draft resolution as a whole.

We have reviewed the submissions to the Secretary-General, particularly from developing countries, and have yet to be convinced that there are persistent undue restrictions imposed by multilateral export-control regimes on the export to developing countries of materials, equipment and technology for peaceful uses that justify a new dialogue mechanism. The Philippines is careful in categorizing undue restrictions imposed by multilateral export-control regimes, as the Philippines Strategic Trade Management Act in its domestic legislation expressly supports existing multilateral export-control regimes as an effective domestic control measure for the dual use of military goods, with a view to preventing their diversion towards the development of weapons of mass destruction.

With regard to draft resolution A/C.1/77/L.73, the Philippines sees merit in the cyber programme of action and thanks France for its initiative. The establishment of a programme of action is a positive and concrete step towards implementing what can be agreed and achieved in the Open-ended Working Group. We support the establishment of a cyber programme of action in principle. However, the Philippines is of the view that the Open-ended Working group on Security of and in the Use of Information and Communications Technologies (ICT) 2021–2025, established pursuant to General Assembly resolution 75/240, which was adopted by consensus in 2020, is the most appropriate platform for discussing such a programme of action, given the Group's mandate, inclusivity and transparency. We therefore welcome the decision submitted by Ambassador Burhan Gafoor of Singapore in his capacity as Chair of the Open-ended Working Group (A/C.1/77/L.54), which endorses the annual progress report of the Group and the decision to convene intersessional meetings to advance and deepen discussions on specific proposals for advancing State behaviours and the use of ICTs. The Philippines thanks France for expressing its general statement (see

A/C.1/77/PV.29), and for stating that the programme of action will not run parallel to the Open-ended Working Group during its outreach. My delegation would have preferred to see the assurance that the programme of action initiative would not run parallel to the Group's work or would follow its completion expressed in operative paragraphs 1 or 2.

Operative paragraph 3, whereby the Secretary-General is tasked with seeking the views of Member States, presupposes that the Open-ended Working Group on the programme of action will not be exhausted. It also seeks the view of Member States on the scope, structure and content for the programme of action and the preparatory work and modalities for its establishment, which pre-empts discussion within the Open-ended Working Group. For many delegations like that of the Philippines, we can best participate and engage within the Open-ended Working Group. It is important for us receive assurance that the views we expressed during its sessions will be accorded primary and substantial weight in the preparation of the Secretary-General's report and will in no way be diluted in the process. The language of operative paragraph 3 does not address those concerns. For these reasons, the Philippines was constrained to abstain in the voting on draft resolution A/C.1/77/L.73. Nevertheless, we want to express our appreciation to France for the transparency and inclusiveness of its consultations throughout the process. We look forward to further engagement on future iterations of the draft resolution.

Mr. Siddique (Pakistan): We joined the consensus on draft resolution A/C.1/77/L.59, 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 of States concerning the development, production, transfer and use of technologies for peaceful purposes, as mentioned in the draft resolution's fifth preambular paragraph. The role of science and technology remains central to advancing social and economic development, particularly in the case of developing countries. Science and technology have also been recognized as critical enablers of achieving the Sustainable Development Goals. In that regard, it is every country's inalienable right to develop, utilize and acquire technologies to overcome the challenges of climate change, disease, water scarcity and energy and food security. Pakistan believes that proliferation concerns should not become a pretext for denying advanced or dual-use technologies, especially in instances where recipient

States are ready to provide non-diversion assurances. There has been substantial evidence that such denials are often determined by political considerations. We reiterate the widely held view that the right to access technologies for socioeconomic development should be upheld, without discrimination on any grounds, for all States, especially developing countries.

Mr. In Den Bosch (Netherlands): I am taking the floor in explanation of vote on behalf of Norway and my own country, the Netherlands.

We voted in favour of draft resolution A/C.1/77/L.10, on the effects of the use of armaments and ammunition containing depleted uranium, which requested that the Secretary-General submit an updated report on the subject and once again seek the views of Member States and relevant international organizations on the effects of the use of such armaments and ammunition.

Norway and the Netherlands recognize the need for additional research on the effects of the use of armaments and ammunition containing depleted uranium and appreciate that the issue is being discussed in a forum of the United Nations. However, so far the draft resolution's reference to the "potential" harmful effects of the use of depleted uranium munitions on human health and the environment has not been substantiated by scientific studies conducted by relevant international organizations, including the World Health Organization. The most important aspect emerging from the scientific literature of the past 20 years is the disagreement among the various studies carried out on depleted uranium, characterized by strongly contrasting results.

The armed forces of Norway and the Netherlands do not use munitions containing depleted uranium. However, in the context of multinational missions, it is not impossible that service personnel of Norway and the Netherlands might operate in areas in which munitions containing depleted uranium are being used or have been used by allies. The health and well-being of our soldiers deployed on international missions is constantly scrutinized by the Governments of Norway and the Netherlands, and exposure to hazardous materials should be avoided as much as possible.

Mr. Li Sui (China) (*spoke in Chinese*): China has just voted against draft resolution A/C.1/77/L.73, entitled "Programme of action to advance responsible State behaviour in the use of information and communications technologies in the context of

international security". I would now like to explain our vote on the draft resolution.

First, China maintains a consistent position in support of the creation of a single permanent information security mechanism within the framework of the United Nations with the broad participation of interested parties. We support the Open-ended Working Group (OEWG) on Security of and in the Use of Information and Communications Technologies 2021–2025 in its efforts to establish, under the auspices of the United Nations, regular institutional dialogue with the broad participation of States, in accordance with its mandate under resolution 75/240, and fully consider the initiatives of States. States have reached consensus on the issue, which was recognized in the 2021 reports of the Open-ended Working Group and the Group of Governmental Experts on Advancing Responsible State Behaviour in Cyberspace in the Context of International Security. At present, the Open-ended Working Group discusses issues pertaining to institutional dialogue, including the programme of action. We do not understand why a particular country is bent on submitting draft resolution A/C.1/77/L.73 at this time.

Secondly, draft resolution A/C.1/77/L.73 both contradicts the existing consensus and is likely to cause the United Nations information security process to once again become divided. From successive Groups of Governmental Experts to the present Open-ended Working Group, the multi-year development of the United Nations information security process and the unique nature of cyberspace have made the vast majority of States realize that there should be only one such process at the United Nations, an inclusive process in which all States can participate equally in discussions.

Last year the General Assembly adopted resolution 76/19 by consensus, confirming the general support for the Open-ended Working Group process. In July of this year, the Group overcame the problems created by geopolitical tensions to successfully conclude its first annual progress report (see A/77/275), reflecting the common desire of all parties to advance the United Nations information security process. We should all welcome and preserve the hard-won momentum. Regrettably, some countries have ignored the discussion process and the adoption by consensus of resolution 76/19 by seeking a new programme of action outside the Open-ended Working Group and unilaterally defining it as a permanent mechanism

after the completion of the Group's work. The post-2025 United Nations process should be decided jointly by all States under the OEWG framework, rather than through a unilateral decision by the proponents of the programme of action that is then imposed on the OEWG process. Prejudging the outcome of the OEWG discussions will not only interfere with the Group's work but will also undermine the political will of the parties to build consensus and could once again lead to parallelism in the United Nations information security process, which is not in the common interests of the international community or any State.

Thirdly, draft resolution A/C.1/77/L.73 does not reflect the most recent consensus in the OEWG's first annual report, which reaffirms the observation and implementation of the framework for responsible State behaviour in the use of information and communications technology (ICT). However, the eleventh preambular paragraph of the draft resolution merely calls on Member States to be guided by the reports of the Group of Governmental Experts and the OEWG in their use of ICTs. That serves only to weaken the most recent United Nations consensus, which China is deeply concerned about. Furthermore, the framework of responsible State behaviour constitutes a whole, while the twelfth, thirteenth and fourteenth preambular paragraphs of the draft resolution make only references to part of the framework. China does not support such a selective approach.

China calls on all States to respect the existing consensus of the international community and the authority of the OEWG, as the only United Nations information security process, to take concrete action to support the work of the OEWG, in accordance with its mandate under resolution 75/240, to maintain the unity and solidarity of the United Nations information security process and to safeguard the security, stability and prosperity of cyberspace.

Mr. Hauri (Switzerland): I am taking the floor to explain our position on several draft texts under this cluster.

Switzerland greatly values the ongoing work of the Open-ended Working Group (OEWG) on Security of and in the Use of Information and Communications Technologies 2021–2025, based on the mandate set forth in resolution 75/240. The OEWG started its work only last year and has already made considerable progress, including the adoption by consensus of its first annual progress report (see A/77/275) this

year. We welcome the adoption by consensus of draft decision A/C.1/77/L.54, introduced by the Chair of the Open-ended Working Group, which provides for the endorsement and continuation of its work.

In view of that consideration, we believe there was no need to present a draft resolution on the ongoing OEWG this year. That is why Switzerland voted no on draft resolution A/C.1/77/L.23/Rev.1, "Developments in the field of information and telecommunications in the context of international security". It is not only unnecessary but raises a number of issues. It does not recognize that Member States have agreed on a framework for responsible State behaviour in cyberspace or that all States should be guided by the consensus-based reports of the OEWG and Group of Governmental Experts on Developments in the Field of Information and Telecommunications in the Context of International Security. We therefore take specific issue with language that suggests a need to shape a system of international information security. In addition, the emphasis we place on the importance of respecting human rights and fundamental freedoms in the use of information and communications technology is omitted. Furthermore, the draft resolution takes a pick-and-choose approach. It mentions only individual elements of the framework without naming the framework itself, so that norms and capacity-building are mentioned, while international law and confidence-building measures are omitted. We are concerned about the possibility that this approach could be detrimental to the important work of the OEWG and the results that have been achieved over the past few years.

Let me now turn to draft resolution A/C.1/77/L.66, "Strengthening and developing the system of arms control, disarmament and non-proliferation treaties and agreements". My delegation again voted yes on the draft resolution, as we believe firmly in the central importance of the rules-based international order in the preservation of international peace and security. But we are compelled to underscore that we see a stark contrast between the thrust of the draft resolution and actions taken by its lead author. We echo the views expressed in a number of explanations of vote delivered by other delegations and groups. We reiterate our strong concerns about and condemnation of the disregard for key international rules and norms demonstrated by the author of the draft resolution, including the sovereignty and territorial integrity of Ukraine and a number of disarmament-related agreements.

Finally, with regard to draft resolution A/C.1/77/L.10, entitled “Effects of the use of armaments and ammunitions containing depleted uranium”, I am taking the floor on behalf of Sweden and my own country, Switzerland. Our countries voted in favour of the draft resolution and would like to refer to the explanation of vote we made on the same draft resolution in 2016, which remains valid today and can be found in the meeting records (see A/C.1/71/PV.25).

Ms. Petit (France) (*spoke in French*): I have the honour to deliver an explanation of position on behalf of the United States, the United Kingdom and France on draft resolution A/C.1/77/L.59, entitled “Role of science and technology in the context of international security and disarmament”.

We support the draft resolution because we believe it appropriately recognizes the international efforts to understand the benefits and challenges of developing science and technology in the field of disarmament, non-proliferation and arms control. It rightly emphasizes the need for continued collective action in staying abreast of the latest scientific and technological developments, as well as recognizing the importance of international mechanisms for regulating the transfer of sensitive technologies for peaceful purposes. Only by developing and strengthening those mechanisms as technologies evolve can we preserve the free flow of technology while controlling the risk of proliferation by State or non-State actors. The ongoing discussions on the issue in many forums, including the Convention on Certain Conventional Weapons, the Chemical Weapons Convention (CWC), the Biological Weapons Convention (BWC) and the Conference on Disarmament, serve to ensure continued compliance with international law, including non-proliferation obligations, thereby advancing disarmament and strengthening international security.

While recognizing the benefits of the draft resolution, we also want to emphasize that the rights mentioned in its fifth preambular paragraph are those noted in the specific provisions of a small number of treaties, the CWC, the BWC and the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons. As the fifth preambular paragraph makes clear, States must abide by their international obligations in exercising those rights, including the obligations under those three treaties. As States parties to those treaties, the United Kingdom, the United States and France will comply with their respective international obligations and

expect all other States parties to do the same. It should be added that none of the three treaties recognize a right to technology or a right to sensitive materials.

I would also like to make a further explanation on behalf of France, the United States and the United Kingdom of our vote against draft resolution A/C.1/77/L.10, entitled “Effects of the use of armaments and ammunitions containing depleted uranium”. This is not a new issue. The long-term environmental and health effects of the use of depleted uranium ammunition have been thoroughly investigated by the World Health Organization, the United Nations Environment Programme, the International Atomic Energy Agency, NATO, the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention and the European Commission, among others. None of those investigations have documented any long-term environmental or health effects from the use of such munitions. It is therefore regrettable that the findings of those studies are being ignored and that the authors are calling for new studies without taking the existing research into account. In the absence of tangible evidence to the contrary, we do not recognize a presumed potential risk to health or the environment and therefore do not support any draft resolutions that presuppose that depleted uranium is harmful, or that Member States should be bound by specific obligations in that area other than those arising from international humanitarian law.

Mr. Shin (Russian Federation) (*spoke in Russian*): I would like to make a brief explanation of our position on draft decision A/C.1/77/L.54.

We welcome the adoption by consensus of the draft submitted by Singapore and express our full support for the efforts of the Chair of the Open-ended Working Group (OEWG) on Security of and in the Use of Information and Communications Technologies (ICT) 2021–2025. Thanks in large part to the wise leadership of Ambassador Burhan Gafoor, even amid today’s tense geopolitical circumstances, the OEWG was able to complete the first year of its activities by adopting the first annual progress report (see A/77/275). The Russian Federation joined the consensus with reservations, which are set out in the collection of statements on motives for supporting the text. We view it as a summary of discussions that took place, and it will continue to be considered at subsequent sessions of the OEWG. At the same time, the report contains important provisions that will enable a foundation to be laid for shaping an

international legal regime for regulating the use of ICTs and developing inter-State cooperation in that area.

We consider it crucial to consolidate the success achieved and to continue formulating specific agreements within the framework of the OEWG on the fulfilment of its mandate. One of the practical outcomes of the Group's work could be the creation of a global intergovernmental directory of points of contact, which would facilitate the establishment of mutual connections among State agencies authorized to address ICT security issues. We submitted a relevant concept paper to the OEWG and look forward to substantive discussions on that and other constructive proposals from States on the agenda during the intersessional meeting of the Group scheduled by the Chair for December.

In our view, one of the key conditions for ensuring the effectiveness of further work by the OEWG and the United Nations as a whole is the unhindered participation of State representatives with the necessary competence and authority. Unfortunately, we have been confronted with blatant and systematic violations by the United States of its obligations as the host country of United Nations Headquarters. Washington's unscrupulous actions are damaging not only to Russia, and indeed not so much to Russia, but to our Organization itself, as they undermine the ability to further its activities on an open, truly democratic and inclusive basis.

I would also like to take this opportunity to thank all the sponsors of the draft resolution, as well as all who supported draft resolution A/C.1/77/L.23/Rev.1, which we proposed. Members' support and cooperation is extremely valuable and important to us as a testament to the fact that they hold in high regard the prospects and effectiveness of the format of the Open-ended Working Group on Security of and in the Use of Information and Communications Technologies 2021–2025.

The Chair: The representative of Viet Nam has asked to make a further statement, but I have to respectfully remind her that as the sixth speaker on the list, she already exercised her right to explain her vote. I am afraid that we are running out of time, so I would be most grateful if she would reconsider her request and perhaps instead speak on the next cluster, when there will be not one but three opportunities to take the floor.

I ask for the representative of Viet Nam's understanding in my not giving her the floor a second time — an exception that I would have to make for all other delegations were I to extend it to her. Let us

therefore not make an exception to the rule, since we have enough time. I would also like to take the opportunity to remind speakers to economize on time, because it is running out. We have to try to finish tomorrow. If we can impose on ourselves a restriction by cutting down on the five minutes that we have, I would be deeply grateful, and we will be doing ourselves a favour that would substantially help to end the proceedings tomorrow. Otherwise we might even have to meet next week, and that is not something we want to be faced with. I will leave the Committee with that thought. If the representative of Viet Nam could hold her peace until the next cluster, I would be deeply grateful.

We have therefore heard the last speaker in explanation of vote or position after the voting on cluster 5, "Other disarmament measures and international security".

The Committee will now turn to informal paper No.3/Rev.1, beginning with cluster 6, "Regional disarmament and security". I shall give the floor to delegations wishing to make general statements or to introduce draft resolutions or decisions under cluster 6.

I now give the floor to the representative of the European Union in its capacity as observer.

Mrs. Schouw (European Union): This is a general statement under cluster 6. I have the honour to speak on behalf of the European Union (EU) and its member States. The candidate countries North Macedonia, Montenegro, Serbia, Albania, Ukraine and the Republic of Moldova, the country of the Stabilization and Association Process and potential candidate Bosnia and Herzegovina, and the European Free Trade Association countries Iceland and Norway and the members of the European Economic Area, as well as Georgia, Monaco and San Marino, align themselves with this statement.

With regard to draft resolution A/C.1/77/L.24, entitled "Strengthening of security and cooperation in the Mediterranean region", the EU would like to state the following.

Operative paragraph 5 of the draft resolution calls on all countries in the Mediterranean region to adhere to relevant multilateral negotiated legal instruments related to the field of disarmament and non-proliferation, thereby creating the conditions necessary for strengthening peace and cooperation in the region. We would like to underline that in our view the reference to relevant legal instruments includes the Comprehensive Nuclear-Test-Ban Treaty

(CTBT), which, regrettably, has not yet entered into force. Promoting the universalization and early entry into force of the CTBT are among the EU's top priorities. All 27 EU member States have ratified the Treaty and remain strongly committed to pursuing the achievement of that objective. 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. Confirming its member States' continued active engagement, the EU has become a supporter of the 10 actions of the Secretary-General's Agenda for Disarmament, among which action 4, bringing the Comprehensive Nuclear-Test-Ban Treaty into force, is a priority. In that context, we want to devote attention to promoting the CTBT's universalization and entry into force.

The EU reiterates its call on all States that have not yet done so to sign and ratify the CTBT without preconditions or delay. In particular, we address this call to the remaining eight annex 2 States whose ratification is essential to the Treaty's entry into force. We welcome the most recent ratifications by the Gambia, Tuvalu, Dominica, Timor-Leste, Equatorial Guinea and Sao Tome and Principe, increasing the number of State ratifications to 176. Pending the Treaty's entry into force, we call on all States to maintain moratoriums on nuclear-weapon-test explosions and any other nuclear explosions and to refrain from any actions that would undermine the Treaty's objectives and purpose. The EU calls on the Democratic People's Republic of Korea to refrain from testing nuclear weapons, to implement a full moratorium on all types of ballistic-missile launches and to sign and ratify the CTBT without delay. Nuclear-weapon test explosions or 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 State signatories adhere to the objectives of the Treaty.

Nonetheless, the fact that the CTBT has not entered into force prevents the use of on-site inspections, an important verification tool. Only its entry into force can outlaw nuclear-weapon test explosions and any other nuclear explosions in a verifiable way. We will therefore continue to take every opportunity to advocate for the Treaty's ratification and universalization, including during this session of the First Committee.

The Chair: The Committee will now listen to delegations wishing to explain their position before we take action on the draft proposals listed under cluster 6, "Regional disarmament and security".

Mr. Balouji (Islamic Republic of Iran): I am taking the floor to explain the position of my delegation on draft resolution A/C.1/77/L.24, entitled "Strengthening of security and cooperation in the Mediterranean region".

Iran will vote in favour of operative paragraph 2 of draft resolution A/C.1/77/L.24, which calls for the elimination of all causes of tension in the region along with the promotion of just and lasting solutions to its persistent problems. More importantly, our support for the paragraph is based on its call for ensuring the withdrawal of foreign occupation forces while respecting the sovereignty, independence and territorial integrity of all countries of the region, as well as the right of peoples to self-determination, including full adherence to the principles of refraining from the use or threat of use of force and from the acquisition of territory by force. Those are basic principles of international law, and we firmly support them.

My delegation will also vote in favour of operative paragraph 5 of the draft resolution, as it calls for adherence to all of the multilaterally negotiated legal instruments on disarmament and non-proliferation. Israel is the only applicable case here, and the paragraph is therefore in line with the repeated calls to Israel by successive Review Conferences of the Parties to the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons to accede to the Treaty without delay or preconditions as a non-nuclear-weapon party.

However, my delegation will not participate in the voting on the draft resolution as a whole, as it does not actually reflect the realities in the region and the situation in the occupied territory, including the continued killing of innocent Palestinian civilians in the occupied territory of Palestine and the Israeli regime's imposition of an extremely severe blockade on the Gaza Strip.

The Chair: We have heard the last speaker in explanation of vote or position before the voting.

I shall now call on those representatives who have requested the floor to speak in exercise of the right of reply.

Mr. Vorontsov (Russian Federation) (*spoke in Russian*): The Russian Federation categorically rejects

all accusations from the delegations of Western countries with regard to our country as entirely baseless and absurd.

We would like to repeat that the Russian Federation fully complies with its international obligations when it comes to arms control, disarmament and non-proliferation. We are entirely committed to all of the provisions of this international instrument and provide the necessary information about how we are honouring those obligations.

With regard to the special military operation in Ukraine, we have already given exhaustive explanations during First Committee meetings and do not see the need to repeat ourselves here. I will simply say once again that the military operation in Ukraine is being carried out in full accordance with international law, including international humanitarian law and the Charter of the United Nations.

Mr. Kim Soong (Democratic People's Republic of Korea): My delegation is compelled to take the floor to exercise its right of reply in response to the baseless allegation made by the representative of the European Union. Our national self-defence capabilities — the legitimate right of a sovereign State to safeguard its sovereignty and development — is fully recognized under the terms of the Charter of the United Nations.

Moreover, we totally reject the allegation made once again by the representative of the European Union. For the sake of ensuring the timely work of the First Committee, I am not going to reiterate what I said in previous interventions. However, I would like to emphasize that the key to ensuring peace and security on the Korean peninsula is the complete, verifiable and irreversible abandonment of the decades-long hostile policy of the United States against the Democratic People's Republic of Korea. The European Union is well

advised to refrain from making baseless accusations against the Democratic People's Republic of Korea in the exercise of its legitimate right to self-defence. The European Union should refrain from blindly following the hostile policy of the United States and maintain its independence in foreign policy.

The Chair: We have six proposals that we need to put to a vote, and we have approximately six minutes at our disposal. I take it that everyone would agree with me without demur that we can have lunch six minutes early and adjourn this meeting now. Is there any objection?

I call on the representative of Yemen on a point of order.

Mr. Al-Dobhany (Yemen) (*spoke in Arabic*): I apologize for taking the floor at this late hour, but I believe that we can continue and finish voting on the six proposals before the time is up. Maybe we can take two or three additional minutes to do so.

The Chair: That appears to be a great idea, provided I have the consensus of all.

After a brief consultation, we have been advised that the interpreters are willing to give us five minutes and no more. Out of an abundance of caution, I think it might be wise to adjourn the meeting and start at 10 a.m. tomorrow, since we have exhausted the time available to us this morning.

I thank the representative of Yemen for his idea, and the interpreters for their willingness to accommodate us.

The next meeting of the First Committee will be held tomorrow, Friday 3 November, at 10 a.m. in this conference room. We will take action on the draft proposals in cluster 6.

The meeting rose at 12.55 p.m.