



CONFERENCE A

National Model United Nations • New York
22-26 March 2015 (Conf. A)



Documentation of the Work of the General Assembly First Committee
(GA1)

General Assembly First Committee (GA1)

Committee Staff

Director	Clara Demon
Assistant Director	Auric Kaur
Chair	Khrystian Pereira
Rapporteur	Vitaliy Savenkov

Agenda

- I. Prohibiting Lethal Autonomous Weapons Systems
- II. The Control of Biological Weapons in Today's Modern Era
- III. Confidence-Building Measures in a Regional and Subregional Context

Resolutions / Report Segments adopted by the Committee

Code	Topic	Vote
Resolution GA1/1/1	Prohibiting Lethal Autonomous Weapons Systems	78 votes in favor, 29 votes against, 31 abstentions
Resolution GA1/1/2	Prohibiting Lethal Autonomous Weapons Systems	45 votes in favor, 43 votes against, 50 abstentions
Resolution GA1/1/3	Prohibiting Lethal Autonomous Weapons Systems	78 votes in favor, 38 votes against, 22 abstentions

Summary Report

The General Assembly First Committee (GA1) held its session to consider the following agenda items:

- I. Prohibiting Lethal Autonomous Weapons Systems
- II. The Control of Biological Weapons in Today's Modern Era
- III. Confidence-Building Measures in a Regional and Subregional Context

The session was attended by representatives of 147 Member States, and 2 Observer States. Committee began with 144 delegations present in the General Assembly First Committee. After the first session, the topic order was set to 1, 2, 3. Delegations immediately began working on working papers.

In the middle of the second session, we had the pleasure of introducing Dr. Matthew Bolton, a prominent political scientist with a specialty in international security. He addressed the topic under discussion by explaining the issues at stake with Lethal Autonomous Weapons Systems (LAWS) and the role of the International Committee for Robot Arms Control (ICRAC). He made it apparent that the work of the delegates during this body would matter while ICRAC would be meeting later in April.

After tough negotiations, the Dais received eight working papers. Their ideas regarding the topic varied from a universally accepted definition of LAWS and reporting on its usage to concluding an international treaty and/or imposing a ban on LAWS usage. Other proposals included interaction with nongovernmental organizations and the United Nations Secretariat, particularly the Office for Disarmament Affairs. Moreover, the Dais received four additional working papers during the session, resulting in a total of twelve working papers brought forward for this topic.

Due to the high number of similar proposals among the working groups, the delegates started the process of merging some of the working papers. The sixth session ended with one working paper being approved as Draft Resolution 1/1.

At the end of the seventh session, there was a total of seven draft resolutions approved by the Dais during this session, including four, which came from merged working papers. The body adopted three resolutions during voting procedure. The vote stood as follows for all resolutions that were passed: (GA1/1/1) with 78 votes in favor, 29 votes against and, 31 abstentions by a roll call; (GA1/1/2) with 45 votes in favor, 43 votes against and, 50 abstentions by placards; and finally the (GA1/1/3) with 78 votes in favor, 38 votes against and, 22 abstentions by placards. GA1/1/2 establishes an Autonomous Weapons Convention (AWC) to monitor the use of LAWS while GA1/1/3 focuses on the inclusion of LAWS within the scope of the Convention on Certain Conventional Weapons (CCW) and a specific meeting of experts to establish a universal definition of LAWS.



National Model United Nations • NY

Code: GA1/1/1

Committee: The General Assembly First Committee

Topic: Prohibiting Lethal Autonomous Weapons Systems

1 *The General Assembly First Committee,*

2
3 *Reaffirming* Chapter 1, Article 1 of the Charter of the United Nations expressing that the global community urges to
4 spread peace and security,

5
6 *Recalling* the principles of national sovereignty and the importance of non-interference in the internal affairs of any
7 Member States in respect of self-defense,

8
9 *Basing itself* on the principle of proportionality and distinction, the principle of International Humanitarian Law
10 (IHL) and the Law of War, as stated in the 1925 Geneva Convention, to not choose methods of warfare which cause
11 superfluous casualties, unnecessary suffering, and do not properly distinguish between civilians and combatants,

12
13 *Appreciating* the role of public conscience in furthering the principles of humanity and the efforts made by the
14 International Committee of the Red Cross (ICRC) and the Campaign to “Stop Killer Robots,” among other non-
15 governmental organizations (NGOs),

16
17 *Reaffirming* the importance of Martens Clause and more recently the 1925 Geneva Convention First Additional
18 Protocol, Paragraph 1 (1), in which weapons lacking a proper established framework are subject to the principles of
19 humanity and public conscience,

20
21 *Acknowledging* that Lethal Autonomous Weapons Systems (LAWS) are not subject to be held accountable for the
22 deaths and casualties of others, therefore reversing the intended effects in the 1925 Geneva Convention Protocol Part
23 III, Article 32, and 33 which state that protected persons are granted freedom from indiscriminate and unnecessary
24 physical suffering,

25
26 *Further recalling* the 1949 Geneva Conventions Protocol Part III, Article 3, which highlights the prohibition of
27 violence to life and person, in particular murder of all kinds, mutilation, cruel treatment, and torture to persons
28 taking no active part in the hostilities as well as the passing of sentences and the carrying out of executions without
29 previous judgment pronounced by a regularly constituted court, affording all the judicial guarantees which are
30 recognized as indispensable by civilized people,

31
32 *Recognizing* the 1949 Geneva Conventions Additional Protocol, Part III, Article 43 and 44 on the responsibility of
33 actions on battleground, and how LAWS endanger the legitimacy of military leadership due to the diffusion of
34 responsibility,

35
36 *Expressing* our deep concern of Artificial Intelligence making decisions where to kill, whom to kill, and when to kill
37 - all without significant human control,

38
39 *Reconfirming* the concerns raised with LAWS at the 69th Session of the GA1 in its Resolution A/RES/69/184 and
40 the 23rd Session of the Human Rights Council (HRC) (A/HRC/23/2) and having considered the Report of the
41 Special Rapporteur on extrajudicial, summary, or arbitrary executions focused on lethal autonomous robotics
42 (2013),

43
44 *Expressing its appreciation* to the 2014 Meeting of Experts on LAWS in Geneva and the general consensus of
45 Member States on the importance of tackling the LAWS dilemma,

46
47 *Noting also,* A/RES/61/55 on the role of science and technology in the context of international security, drawing a
48 distinguished boundary between technology that is used for peaceful purposes and that which is used for LAWS,

49

50 *Underlining* how the deployment and further development of LAWS can lower the threshold of going to war,
51 reducing it no longer to a measure of last resort as Member States using LAWS would not suffer repercussions, and
52 therefore pose a threat to international peace and security,
53

54 *Recognizing* the need for the implementation of regulatory safeguards and international frameworks in order to
55 address evolving technologies within the scope of the Convention on Certain Conventional Weapons (CCW),
56

57 *Recalling* the European Parliament Resolution 2014/2567 (RSP) on the Use of Drones, which clearly states that
58 drones have to be in accordance with IHL and contains a ban of the production and development of fully
59 autonomous weapons,
60

61 *Further recalling* the need for Confidence-Building Measures (CBMs) in order to promote transparency, to prevent
62 the use of LAWS, and to promote cooperation among Member States as established in the Vienna Documents in
63 promoting peace and security,
64

65 *Deeply disturbed* by the possibility of the numerous terrorist groups and non-Member State radicals acquiring the
66 systems themselves or technology to produce, distribute, and implement LAWS,
67

68 *Acknowledging* the previous difficulties in defining LAWS,
69

- 70 1. *Defines* LAWS as considered to be weapons that can select and attack targets independently - without
71 meaningful human input or control - in the critical functions of acquiring, tracking, selecting and attacking
72 targets;
73
- 74 2. *Further defines* “autonomous weapons systems” as systems capable of enforcing either lethal or non-lethal
75 force; lethal implying a deadly threat to human life and non-lethal implying any non-deadly threats to human
76 well-being;
77
- 78 3. *Further defines* meaningful human input and control as the direct decision of an accountable commander taking
79 place before each engagement decision, and the control of an accountable operator over every Partially
80 Autonomous System;
81
- 82 4. *Urges* the holding of a review session of the CCW in which experts deal with the exact terminology of LAWS
83 to outline what constitutes meaningful human control and the distinction between both operational and
84 decisional control;
85
- 86 5. *Recommends* that every Member State implement a tamper-free verification system into national policies that
87 would verify after the act that an attack in question was under direct control by a human operator that can be
88 held accountable;
89
- 90 6. *Further recommends* prohibiting the development, trade, and deployment of LAWS technology and LAWS
91 through an additional Protocol VI to the CCW;
92
- 93 7. *Strongly suggests* the implementation of moratorium into national policies in all Member States on the
94 production, development, and deployment of LAWS for as long as necessary for the formation of Protocol VI
95 under the CCW related to LAWS:
96
 - 97 a. As a measure to motivate Member States that are willing to conduct active research and development
98 in LAWS before establishing ethical and legal bases on the technology;
99
 - 100 b. As a temporary moratorium subject to being lifted through a consensus of the General Assembly once
101 a clear agreement on the boundaries of peaceful use of autonomous technology has been established;
102
- 103 8. *Suggests* to extend the contents discussed at the annual CCW Meeting of Experts on LAWS reporting to the
104 CCW, including but not limited to:
105

- 106 a. Topics pertaining to CBMs regarding LAWS, including enforcement mechanisms for Member State
107 moratoriums;
108
- 109 i. Encourages Member States to utilize the International Association of Democratic Lawyers
110 (IADL) for the purpose of facilitating the monitoring process concerning autonomous
111 weapons and their manufacturers;
112 ii. Invites all Member States to cooperate through the exchange of information in order to create
113 transparency amongst Member States;
114
- 115 b. Ways of promoting and regulating transparency measures in the development of autonomous and AI-
116 based systems for civil use;
117
- 118 c. Facilitating communication amongst Member States Parties, as well as non-governmental and
119 international organizations;
120
- 121 d. Goals such as specific percentage increases in Member State attendance for expert meetings;
122
- 123 e. Definitive stances from individual Member States to effectively shape international discussion with a
124 diversity of experts;
125
- 126 9. *Further invites* the Fifth Review Conference of the CCW in 2016 to set the legal framework;
127
- 128 10. *Calls* for the CCW Implementation Support Unit to assist all Member States in order to regulate any kind of
129 future development programs of LAWS in alliance with IHL through:
130
- 131 a. Facilitating communication among Member States Parties, as well as non-governmental and
132 international organizations;
133
- 134 b. Supporting Member States implementing the principles of the CCW and its protocols in their
135 respective domestic legislation;
136
- 137 11. *Further suggests* Member States implement international transparency by means of CBMs between Member
138 States, similar to the *Vienna Documents*, in order to prevent the escalation of conflicts and thus prevent the use
139 and development of LAWS through measures such as but not limited to:
140
- 141 a. Sharing data on extreme non-state actors in order to coordinate any preventable measures based on the
142 information gathered;
143
- 144 b. Providing information regarding current implementation of transparency measures and developing of
145 armaments, specifically LAWS;
146
- 147 c. Reporting unusual military activities that can affect the security of Member States;
148
- 149 d. Forming military agreements between Member States in order to tackle any threat to the Member
150 States' national security;
151
- 152 e. Hosting multi-level discussions on current state relations mediated by third-party conciliators for
153 expert opinion such as, but not limited to, the International Committee for Robot Arms Control
154 (ICRAC);
155
- 156 12. *Further recommends* all Member States prevent terrorists from acquiring LAWS through the implementation of
157 specific measures in the surveillance and control of the programs and institutions that may start any type of
158 investigation in the creation of these weapons by means such as but not limited to:
159
- 160 a. Endorsing the United Nations to support the International Cyber Security Organization in preventing
161 terrorist groups from acquiring LAWS by cyber-attack;

- 162
163
164
165
166
167
168
169
170
171
172
173
174
175
176
177
178
179
180
181
182
- b. Encouraging Member States to follow through with CBMs to prevent terrorist attacks;
 - c. Recommending Member States provide security programs to organizations with the technological capabilities;
13. *Emphasizes* the work and expertise of civil societies such as The Campaign To “Stop Killer Robots” and the ICRC in bringing the topic of LAWS to the forefront of today’s domestic agenda and in educating the public about the possible threats LAWS pose in regards to Human Rights Law, International Humanitarian Law, and regional stability;
14. *Encourages* Member States seek out ways to utilize technology for peaceful purposes whereas at the same time supporting the prohibition of proliferation of autonomous weapons by means such as:
- a. Dispatching autonomous devices incorporated with medical technology;
 - b. Facilitating rescue missions in areas that are inaccessible for medical personnel to approach;
15. *Suggests* that in the event of a prohibited deployment of LAWS, deployment by non-state actors, or by terrorist groups, the activator of the respective unit should be held accountable for the damage done by such devices.



National Model United Nations • NY

Code: GA1/1/2

Committee: The General Assembly First Committee

Topic: Prohibiting Lethal Autonomous Weapons Systems

1 *The General Assembly First Committee,*

2
3 *Approving of A/RES/63/677 and its emphasis on the aspect of responsibility and the Charter of the United Nations*
4 *of the mandate for the committee to ensure international security and disarmament,*

5
6 *Guided by the past work of the Conventions of Certain Conventional Weapons (CCW), the Convention on the*
7 *Prohibition of the Development, Production and Stockpiling of Bacteriological (Biological) and Toxin Weapons and*
8 *on their Destruction (BWC),*

9
10 *Expressing concern for the ambiguous nature and responsibility of automated weapon systems and disarmament, as*
11 *stated in A/RES/51/39 also noting of the rapidly changing cyber technology that constantly make cyber security*
12 *measures already in place ineffective at stopping hackers who may attempt to take control of Lethal Autonomous*
13 *Weapons Systems (LAWS) in Member States,*

14
15 *Having examined the document A/RES/68/234 on that regional and subregional integration of ideas and resources in*
16 *order to achieve a better global community,*

17
18 *Recognizing the success of the Treaty on Conventional Armed Forces in Europe (CFE) in establishing effective*
19 *limits on offensive weaponry and the ability of similar strategies to apply to new weapons systems,*

20
21 *Recognizing that scientific and technological developments can have both civilian and military applications and that*
22 *progress in science and technology for civilian applications needs to be maintained and encouraged, as stipulated in*
23 *A/RES/69/204,*

24
25 *Emphasizing that internationally negotiated guidelines for the transfer of advanced technology with military*
26 *applications should take into account the legitimate defense requirements of all Member States and the maintenance*
27 *of international peace and security, while ensuring that access to high-technology and services as stated in*
28 *A/RES/51/40,*

29
30 *Observing the existence of international and domestic terrorist organizations that would actively seek to obtain*
31 *LAWS technology and vulnerability to hacking and the need to combat such groups in accordance with*
32 *S/RES/2129,*

- 33
34 1. *Calls for the establishment of the Autonomous Weapons Convention (AWC) to be held in Vilnius jointly by the*
35 *Lithuanian Foreign Affairs Ministry and United Nations Disarmament Commission (UNDC), and all interested*
36 *Member States calling upon the High Representative for Disarmament Affairs to head the Convention, for the*
37 *purpose of bringing LAWS before the international community as an immediate threat and create groups to*
38 *address the various issues of autonomous weapon systems;*
39
40 2. *Approves the creation by the AWC of the Autonomous Systems Classification Framework for LAWS and other*
41 *unmanned systems that includes all existing definitions to distinguish between the many types of autonomous*
42 *weapon systems, and autonomous systems in collaboration with groups like the International Law Commission*
43 *(ILC) focusing on aspects such a the difference between operational and decisional autonomous weapons;*
44
45 3. *Moves to establish the United Nations Working Group for Research and Monitoring of LAWS, which will*
46 *convene groups who have assisted in and have valuable contribution to the research of LAWS including but not*
47 *limited to the Campaign to Stop Killer Robots, the United Nations Institute for Disarmament and Research, and*
48 *International Commission for Robot Arms Control (ICRAC); this group will:*
49

- 50 a. Include a section for Member States to work towards examining national policy to assist Member
51 States in ensuring their laws are compatible with that of international instruments on LAWS;
52
- 53 b. Further research and of LAWS related issues worldwide monitoring primarily global events having to
54 do with LAWS and LARS;
55
- 56 c. Operate under the purview of the United Nations Office of Disarmament Affairs (UNODA);
57
- 58 4. *Requests* the establishment of a suggestive and theoretical limit on the number of offensive oriented LAWS that
59 any Member State should create and maintain, that will work in conjunction with the UNDC in order to:
60
- 61 a. Apply universally to all Member States and work to ensure the world has a healthy limit for these
62 systems;
63
- 64 b. Base this limit on research done at a later date by the Working Group on the research and Monitoring
65 of LAWS;
66
- 67 c. Prevent stockpiling, future proliferation and over production while allowing technological
68 advancements to satisfy defensive interests of Member States;
69
- 70 5. *Recommends* Member States modify unmanned weapons systems to utilize advancements such as precision-
71 guided munition (PGMs) and laser guided munitions to ensure only targets intended by the human operator are
72 engaged, which will work to:
73
- 74 a. Ensure human dignity in warfare;
75
- 76 b. Minimize collateral damage during warfare;
77
- 78 c. Implement accountability of Member States that use current unmanned weapons as they have a
79 commitment to minimize the rate of hostilities in the international community;
80
- 81 6. Urges Member States to configure unmanned systems to comply with International Humanitarian Law (IHL)
82 and international human rights by preventing unintended casualties and superfluous damage through equipping
83 weapons systems with high-resolution optics, such as electro optical/infrared sensors, to allow human operators
84 to differentiate between noncombatants and targets;
85
- 86 7. *Encourages* Member States to utilize non-weaponized and de-weaponized autonomous systems in unarmed
87 roles including but not limited to agrarian sectors, command and control communications, unilateral and
88 multilateral training operations, civilian emergency response;
89
- 90 8. *Endorses* developing and implementing anti-tampering technologies that can be implemented into non-lethal
91 autonomous systems so that they cannot be weaponized by hostile groups utilizing the Non-Governmental
92 Organization (NGO) Technology Consulting Group to orchestrate a think tank called the Autonomous Systems
93 Safeguard Technologies Institute that will invite Member States to develop and implement anti-tampering
94 technologies.



National Model United Nations • NY

Code: GA1/1/3

Committee: The General Assembly First Committee

Subject: Prohibiting Lethal Autonomous Weapons Systems

1 *The General Assembly First Committee,*
2
3 *Endorsing* Article 11 and Chapter 6 of the Charter of the United Nations, which states the mandate of the General
4 Assembly to address questions of international security, disarmament, and threats to global peace,
5
6 *Recalling* the Convention on Prohibitions or Restrictions on the Use of Certain Conventional Weapons which May
7 Cause Loss of Life or Have Indiscriminate Effects (CCW) as the original reference for regulation of lethal
8 autonomous weapons systems,
9
10 *Acknowledging* that Lethal Autonomous Weapons Systems (LAWS) must be subject to international humanitarian
11 laws that are already set in place, based on human values, morals and ethics,
12
13 *Recognizing* the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights (1966), which confirms that the use of the type
14 of technology included in LAWS inhibits an individual's inherent right to life,
15
16 *Convinced* of the pertinence of the Arms Trade Treaty (ATT) in the control of LAWS across the world and in the
17 prevention of their proliferation,
18
19 *Deeply convinced* that nuclear disarmament and the humanitarian and environmental impact of lethal weapons, such
20 as nuclear weapons and landmines, should be part of all discussions,
21
22 *Recognizing* the need for a clear and just definition of LAWS and semi-LAWS endorsed by the international
23 community,
24
25 *Expressing* its concern for the lack of framework to regulate the development of military LAWS technology,
26 disarmament and social reconstruction,
27
28 *Stressing* the importance of an overview process on new military technologies to ensure conformity to an ethical
29 framework,
30
31 *Fully aware* that LAWS could affect the decision-making process to enter into conflicts as the risks of casualties can
32 be reduced, thereby leading to decreased peace and security,
33
34 *Deeply disturbed* that non-state or state actors can use LAWS against civilian targets and then deny accountability,
35
36 *Emphasizing* the UN Institute for Disarmament Research (UNIDIR) documents considering legal and ethical issues
37 associated with the development and use of LAWS,
38
39 *Taking into consideration* the precedence set forward by the International Humanitarian Law (IHL) and Law of
40 Armed Conflicts (LOAC),
41
42 *Deeply concerned* about the soldier and civilian lives that are at risk because of the development and proliferation of
43 lethal and autonomous weapons systems,
44
45 *Calling attention* to the UN Special Rapporteur on extrajudicial, summary or arbitrary executions which defines
46 LAWS as “robotic weapon systems that, once activated, can select and engage targets without further intervention
47 by a human operator”,
48
49 *Deeply concerned* about Artificial Intelligence being used to select targets, make decisions on choosing when,
50 where, and who to kill without significant human control for its actions, and the question of its ability to
51 discriminate combatants from civilians,

52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65
66
67
68
69
70
71
72
73
74
75
76
77
78
79
80
81
82
83
84
85
86
87
88
89
90
91
92
93
94
95
96
97
98
99
100
101
102
103
104
105
106
107

Keeping in mind Article 36 to the CCW, which suggests that the term “meaningful human control” and the issue of autonomous targeting must be included in any debate on LAWS,

Welcoming the fact that Humans Rights Watch and Campaign to Stop Killer Robots have brought the issue of LAWS and questions on LAWS’ technical, ethical, sociological, legal and military aspects to the broad attention of the international community, in the 2013 Report “Losing Humanity: The Case against Killer Robots” (2012),

Affirming the potential benefits of the peaceful use of autonomous technology in the civilian field, especially in healthcare, agriculture, and rescue operations,

Recalling its Resolution A/RES/61/55, which encourages UN bodies to contribute, within existing mandates, to promoting the application of science and technology for peaceful purposes,

Considering the fact that production and manufacturing of LAWS is a source of potential environmental destruction,

Recognizing that all Member States have a duty to protect their environment with regard to air and water pollution,

Expressing concern on environmental and human impact of discarded LAWS materials,

1. *Defines* LAWS as systems that, once activated, can autonomously identify, select and attack human targets without significant interaction between the machine and a human, thereby making it difficult or impossible to determine the person or group of persons held accountable for the actions of said system;
2. *Further defines* “lethal” as a capability to violently cause harm, injury, damage, or destruction to both people and property, including, but not limited to, anti-personnel and anti-tank mines along with systems that detect body heat and pre-described target identification factors;
3. *Further defines* “intervention by a human operator” as the conscious, deliberate, and willing choice by a human being leading up to and including making the decision to engage any target;
4. *Defines* “non-lethal autonomous systems” as being incapable of violently causing harm, injury, damage, or destruction to both people and property as any system that provides any kind of humanitarian, agricultural, reconnaissance, or nonviolent aid to peoples or places;
5. *Defines* “fully autonomous weapons systems” as systems which activate without any human intervention and include landmines and stand-alone systems that detect body heat;
6. *Defines* “semi-autonomous weapons systems” as any robotic device capable of lethality as defined above but that demands intervention by a human operator as defined above;
7. *Urges* Member States to have a multilateral dialogue with drafting a report on any new development within the field of LAWS to the Secretary General;
8. *Condemns* operationalization, production, stockpiling, possession, sale, or development of LAWS by both non-state as well as state actors, due to the:
 - a. Lack of accountability to prosecute any responsible actor, including but not limited to the owner, operator, or manufacturer;
 - b. Fact that LAWS could fall into the hands of state and non-state actors that can potentially lead to severe acts of violence;
9. *Encourages* Member States to participate in the Meeting of Experts related to the 2015 CCW Meeting in Geneva and to include in negotiations the issues of prohibiting production, distribution, and usage of fully autonomous lethal weapons systems;

- 108
109
110
111
112
113
114
115
116
117
118
119
120
121
122
123
124
125
126
127
128
129
130
131
132
133
134
135
136
137
138
139
140
141
142
143
144
145
146
147
148
149
150
151
152
153
154
155
156
157
158
159
160
161
162
163
10. *Invites* the negotiations in the 2015 CCW Meeting in Geneva to address the potential for non-state actors to hack and utilize LAWS for their own gain;
 11. *Recommends* a renewable five year moratorium on the use of LAWS, as defined above;
 12. *Proposes* to start negotiations on the possibility of implementing a moratorium on semi-autonomous weapons for 3 to 5 years, and to use this measure for the purpose of:
 - a. Closely monitoring individual Member States' production via yearly inspections;
 - b. Designing specialized programs to dispose of outdated semi-autonomous LAWS when they become obsolete to prevent them from being leaked to non-state actors;
 - c. Advocating global transparency in their use;
 13. *Calls on* Member States to regulate future autonomous military technology within its own framework, in order to include measures for drones, LAWS, mechanical augmentations, and Unmanned Aerial Vehicles;
 14. *Recommends* the United Nations Office for Project Services to suggest the prohibition of LAWS to the Board on the 1925 Geneva Convention;
 15. *Further recommends* that Member States prevent the rapid proliferation of LAWS;
 16. *Condemns* the modification or alteration of autonomous systems to implement small arms weapons within the system to produce lethality as defined above;
 17. *Approves of* the production, stockpiling, possession, sale, and development of non-lethal autonomous systems presenting potential benefits to populations;
 18. *Encourages* Member States to update the United Nations Register of Conventional Arms on an annual basis by actualizing the situation of new or evolving technologies pertaining to lethal and non-lethal autonomous weapons systems in order to be transparent about the use of technologies related to autonomous robotic systems for the purposes of research, experimentation, or development;
 19. *Proposes* to launch the non-LAWS program, representing an initiative to redirect robotic advances for peaceful purposes, which:
 - a. Will work together with health professionals, scientists, engineers, non-armed security policy counsellors, and other relevant experts as well as non-governmental organizations, with the aim of introducing the benefits of the autonomous technology in the non-military sectors;
 - b. Will use robotics in the field of agriculture for infrastructure maintenance and field work;
 - c. Will aim to encourage health administrations, agriculture associations, emergency services, research centers and other concerned actors to integrate the non-militarized technological aspects of LAWS into the labor market, to familiarize workers with this type of technology, and to increase their production;
 - d. Will be managed by the UNIDIR;
 - e. Will be reviewed yearly in order to adjust the approach continuously;
 20. *Affirms* that for Island States and Small Island Developing States, environmental destruction is a significant and life threatening security matter, as their borders and sovereignty are affected by rising sea levels and climate change, partly because the environment is polluted by the mass production processes of Lethal

164 Autonomous Weapons Systems, including the production of heavy metals, anti-personnel and anti-tank
165 mines and their nuclear yield, nuclear warheads, incendiary warheads and chemical weapons;
166

167 21. *Endorses* the need for each Member State to express its own sovereignty in regards to the signing of a
168 convention;

169 22. *Encourages* the future establishment of a new convention specifically concerning LAWS, which will:
170

- 171
- 172 a. Endorse the need for each state to express its own sovereignty in regards to the signing of a
173 convention;
 - 174 b. Establish an adjoined commission with the mandate of monitoring the compliance of States
175 Parties;
 - 176 c. Include the creation of a new database with the aim of summarizing the information based on the
177 reports submitted by the Member States regarding the progress made on the field of LAWS.
178
179
180