

Meeting of the High Contracting Parties to the Convention on Prohibitions or Restrictions on the Use of Certain Conventional Weapons Which May Be Deemed to Be Excessively Injurious or to Have Indiscriminate Effects

22 November 2019

English

Original: French

Geneva, 13–15 November 2019

Summary record of the second part (public)* of the 6th meeting**

Held at the Palais des Nations, Geneva, on Friday, 15 November 2019, at 3 p.m.

Chairperson: Mr. Hasmi.....(Pakistan)

Contents

Consideration and adoption of the final document

* No summary record was issued for the first part (closed) of the meeting.

** No summary records were issued for the 1st to 5th meetings.

This record is subject to correction.

Corrections should be set forth in a memorandum and also incorporated in a copy of the record. They should be sent *within one week of the date of this document* to the Documents Management Section (DMS-DCM@un.org).

Any corrected records of the public meetings of the Committee at this session will be reissued for technical reasons after the end of the session.



The meeting was called to order at 5.20 p.m.

Consideration and adoption of the final document

1. **The Chairperson** said that a revised version of the final report had been drawn up under the symbol CCW/MSP/2019/CRP.2/Rev.1, taking account of the changes made during the informal negotiations. He urged the delegations to be flexible and maintain the spirit of compromise that had guided the negotiations, given the limited time available before the closing of the meeting. He suggested proceeding with the adoption of the final document section by section.

Section I, "Introduction"

2. *Section I was adopted.*

Section II, "Organization of and participation in the Meeting of the High Contracting Parties"

3. The representatives of Burkina Faso and Tunisia requested that the names of their countries should be added to the list of participants.

4. *Section II, as amended, was adopted.*

Section III, "Work of the Meeting of the High Contracting Parties"

5. **The Chairperson** said that, in the revised version of the document, the paragraphs had been renumbered from paragraph 20 onward. Square brackets had been placed at the end of paragraph 18 owing to lack of time, but the names of the delegations that had participated in the discussions would be added later.

6. **Mr. Liddle** (United Kingdom) pointed out that the last two sentences of paragraph 20 were repeated in paragraph 21.

7. **The Chairperson** said that the repetition had been unintentional and that the last two sentences of paragraph 20 would be deleted.

8. *Section III, as amended, was adopted.*

Section IV, "Conclusions and recommendations"

9. **The Chairperson** said that the word "agreed" had been replaced with "decided" in the new version of paragraph 32. In paragraph 34, "regularly" had been replaced with "yearly". In subparagraph (c) of paragraph 34, the two instances of "shall" had been replaced with "will". The start of paragraph 35 had been reworded to read: "The High Contracting Parties decided to establish". What had been paragraph 35 was now the last sentence of the amended paragraph 35. Paragraph 37 was a new paragraph, which had been adopted during the consultations. The dates appearing in subparagraphs (a), (b) and (c) of paragraph 39 had been amended and a footnote had been added. In paragraph 40, the word "agreed" had been replaced with "decided". In paragraph 41, the word "agreed" had been replaced with "adopted". The second sentence of paragraph 43 had been added following the informal consultations.

10. The representative of the United States of America, supported by the representatives of the Russian Federation and the United Kingdom, said that his delegation would like to review and adopt the section paragraph by paragraph.

11. *Paragraphs 28, 29 and 30 were adopted individually.*

Paragraph 31

12. **Mr. Vorontsov** (Russian Federation) said that "shall" should be replaced with "will" in the second point, in keeping with the rest of the document. It had also been agreed during discussions that "shall" should be replaced with "will" in the third point, but that had not been done. In the first line of the fifth point, he wished to add "potential" before "development" and replace "on" with "in relation to". And after "weapons systems", he

proposed adding “in accordance with Decision 1 of the Fifth Review Conference of the High Contracting Parties to the Convention (CCW/CONF.V/10), consistent with CCW/CONF.V/2”.

13. **Mr. Di Mascio** (France) said he wished to have details of the exact content of the documents whose symbols had been cited in the amendments proposed by the Russian Federation.

14. **Mr. Martínez Ruiz** (Mexico) said that his delegation had been prepared to accept the text previously agreed during the informal meeting. It was also prepared to approve the replacement of “shall” with “will” but not the other amendments proposed by the Russian Federation, as it believed that the final document would be weakened as a result and that the content of the proposed changes was already contained in the second point of the paragraph.

15. **Mr. Vorontsov** (Russian Federation) recalled that the documents whose symbols he had cited were the basic documents of the Conference, namely the Final Document of the Fifth Review Conference (CCW/CONF.V/10) and the Report of the 2016 Informal Meeting of Experts on Lethal Autonomous Weapons Systems (CCW/CONF.V/2), which set out the mandate and working methods of the Group of Governmental Experts on emerging technologies in the area of lethal autonomous weapons systems. In response to the comment made by the representative of Mexico, he added that the second point referred to the various activities of the Group of Governmental Experts in 2020 and 2021, whereas the fifth point concerned the outlook for the Group’s work in the medium term. In view of the Group’s mandate, it was therefore important to include that reference. Moreover, in August, the Group of Governmental Experts had approved its report (CCW/GGE.1/2019/3) with square brackets around the parts of the text not agreed on by the delegations. The idea was to use only previously approved texts as a basis.

16. **Mr. Stacey** (Ecuador) said that his country could accept the amendments proposed by the Russian Federation for the second and third points. However, like Mexico, it considered that the proposed changes to the fifth point would alter the meaning of the paragraph too much.

17. **Ms. Rodríguez Ramírez** (Panama) said that her delegation was prepared to approve the paragraph without the amendments made by the Russian Federation, in particular the addition of “potential” before “development”. It agreed with the delegation of Mexico that the proposed addition to the fifth point would weaken the paragraph.

18. **Mr. Delgado Sánchez** (Cuba) said that, while his delegation had no problem with citing previously approved documents in the fifth point, it believed that replacing “on” with “in relation to” would make the text unclear, as the consensus recommendations would no longer “concern” the subsequent elements of the sentence, but only “relate” to them, which was rather vague. However, if adding “potential” before “development” meant that the square brackets around the latter word could be removed in the Expert Group’s report, then that could be a workable solution.

19. **Ms. Serazzi** (Chile) said that his delegation was prepared to accept the draft text agreed in the informal meeting and the replacement of “shall” with “will” in the second and third points, but not the proposed amendment to the fifth point, particularly the addition of “potential” before “development”.

20. **Ms. Muñoz** (Costa Rica) said that she had not yet received instructions concerning the addition of “consensus” before “recommendations”. In addition, her delegation opposed the addition of “potential” before “development” and wished to revert to the wording agreed in the report of the Group of Governmental Experts.

21. **The Chairperson** proposed replacing “shall” with “will” in the second, third and fourth points of the paragraph. For the fifth point, he suggested replacing “on” with “in relation to” and inserting “in accordance with Decision 1 of the Fifth Review Conference of the High Contracting Parties to the Convention (CCW/CONF.V/10), consistent with CCW/CONF.V/2” after “weapons systems”, but not adding “potential” before “development”.

22. *It was so decided.*

23. *Paragraph 31, as amended, was adopted.*

Paragraph 32

24. *Paragraph 32 was adopted.*

Paragraph 33

25. *Paragraph 33 was adopted.*

Paragraph 34

26. **Mr. Vorontsov** (Russian Federation) proposed replacing “yearly” with “annual” at the start of the paragraph.

27. *It was so decided.*

28. *Paragraph 34, as amended, was adopted.*

Paragraph 35

29. *Paragraph 35 was adopted.*

Paragraph 36

30. *Paragraph 36 was adopted.*

Paragraph 37

31. **Mr. Liddle** (United Kingdom), supported by **Mr. Di Mascio** (France), said that he would like the paragraph to be deleted and reviewed the following year, since the delegations had not had enough time to consider it.

32. **Mr. Vorontsov** (Russian Federation) said that he wished to have clarification on the funding priorities for the next year within the framework of the Convention, which it was important to set out as clearly as possible. The Russian Federation believed that the contracts of staff in the Implementation Support Unit should be funded as a priority, failing which it would be impossible to organize certain activities.

33. **Mr. Francese** (Italy), endorsing the statement by the United Kingdom, said that paragraph 37 was new and needed to be analysed. While staff salaries and funding for activities were both very important budget items, a balance must be struck between them.

34. **The Chairperson** said that he was somewhat surprised at the reactions to paragraph 37, on which he thought consensus had been reached at the informal meeting prior to the current discussion. In the light of the apparent difficulties, he suggested deleting the paragraph, or instructing the next Chairperson to consult the High Contracting Parties with a view to taking a decision during the intersessional period or at the next Meeting of the High Contracting Parties. He proposed that the paragraph should be reworded to read: “The High Contracting Parties decided to mandate the incoming Chairman of the MSP to consult on the priority to be given to fund the contracts of the staff of the ISU and report to the MSP next year.”

35. **Mr. Liddle** (United Kingdom) said that his delegation was not aware that any consensus had been reached on the paragraph under consideration. The Chairperson’s proposal would be acceptable subject to the addition of the words “should the need arise”, since the paragraph, as it currently stood, referred to a hypothetical situation which would not materialize if all High Contracting Parties paid their contributions in full and on time.

36. **Mr. Di Mascio** (France) said that his delegation had not approved the paragraph at any point. In fact, it had repeatedly expressed its dissatisfaction with it. However, it supported the Chairperson’s proposal.

37. **The Chairperson** said that consideration of the paragraph would be resumed later.

Paragraph 38

38. *Paragraph 38 was adopted.*

Paragraph 39

39. **Mr. Vorontsov** (Russian Federation) said that in subparagraph (a), the word “from” was superfluous. As to subparagraph (c), his delegation considered it unnecessary to indicate two possible dates for holding the meeting of the Group of Governmental Experts, and that a final decision should be taken in that regard.

40. **Mr. Beerwerth** (Germany) said that if the meeting of the Group of Governmental Experts was held from 15 to 19 June 2020, it would clash with the Fourth United Nations Conference to Review Progress Made in the Implementation of the Programme of Action to Prevent, Combat and Eradicate the Illicit Trade in Small Arms and Light Weapons in All Its Aspects.

41. **The Chairperson** said that, as that Conference was due to be held in New York, it should not affect the meeting of the Group of Governmental Experts. Footnote 11 clarified that the meeting would only be held in June if it could not be held from 30 March to 3 April 2020.

42. **The Chairperson** said that the discussions would continue in English only.

The meeting proceeded without interpretation and no summary record was prepared for the rest of the meeting.