



WASHINGTON, DC
31 October - 2 November 2014
nmun.org/nmun_dc.html



GENERAL ASSEMBLY FIRST COMMITTEE BACKGROUND GUIDE 2014

Written By: Cyril Philip, Director; Jessie-Lynn Anik Mace, Assistant Director



NATIONAL MODEL UNITED NATIONS



NMUN•DC Position Papers Guidelines

Due 1 October 2014

Each committee topic should be addressed in a succinct policy statement representing the relevant views of your assigned country. You should identify and address international and regional conventions, treaties, declarations, resolutions, and programs of action that are relevant to the policy of your country. You should also include recommendations for action to be taken by your committee. A delegate's role as a Member State, Observer State, or NGO should affect the way a position paper is written. The [Delegate Preparation Guide](#) will provide you with additional information.

A position paper should be submitted for each assigned committee.

- The two page position paper should cover all the topics in the background guide, not a separate paper for each topic.
- Do not submit papers for committees not assigned to your country (see [DC matrix](#)).
- No more than two delegates can represent a single country in a committee. If you assign two delegates to represent a country on a committee, they submit one position paper jointly, not separate position papers from each individual.
- NMUN position papers are not cited as is required for an academic paper. They are written as if they are a policy statement coming from the foreign ministry. While they may reference UN data or past UN Resolutions, like in our samples, formal citations are not used.

Please pay careful attention to the following guidelines when drafting and submitting your position papers. Only those delegations that follow the guidelines and meet the submission deadline will be eligible for [position paper awards](#).

Follow the layout in our [Sample Position Paper](#) using the standards below:

- Length must not exceed two pages
- Margins must be set at 1 inch or 2.54 cm. for the whole paper
- Font must be Times New Roman sized between 10 pt. and 12 pt.
- Country/NGO name, school name, and committee name must be clearly labeled on the first page
- Agenda topics must be clearly labeled in separate sections
- National symbols (headers, flags, etc.) are deemed inappropriate for NMUN position papers
- Convert your paper to pdf format

Please note that position papers must be comprised of entirely original writing. **NMUN will not tolerate plagiarism**, including copying from Committee Background Guides. Violation of this policy may result in dismissal from the conference. Although United Nations documentation is considered within the public domain, we do not allow the verbatim re-creation of these documents.

How to Submit Your Position Papers

- One person, preferably the faculty advisor or head delegate, should submit all papers from your delegation.
- Complete a separate form for each country/assignment.
- Use the committee name and your assignment in the filename (example: GA1_Cuba).
- Submit all papers as pdf documents.

Use the link on the [DC position paper page](#), following the guidelines above, to submit your position papers. If you have questions or concerns about the position paper submission process, please email the Secretary-General at secgen.dc@nmun.org. Please do not submit position papers to this email account.

If you are requesting an [Embassy Briefing](#), we encourage your delegation to also submit a copy of your position papers to the embassy for the country you've been assigned along with an explanation of the conference.

Many, many papers will be read by the Secretariat. Your patience and cooperation in adhering to the above guidelines is greatly appreciated.



Official Welcome

The 2014 National Model United Nations Washington D.C. (NMUN•DC) Conference team and your Director, Cyril Philip, and Assistant Director, Jess Mace, would like to welcome you to the General Assembly First Committee. Cyril works in the Finance industry and has been a staff member for eight years with National Model United Nations. Jess has been a staff member with NMUN for five years and holds an undergraduate and a graduate degree in Political Science with a focus on LGBT rights. Everyone at NMUN•DC has worked diligently to prepare for this conference, and we hope that you will conclude the weekend at the conference with a greater appreciation for the work of the General Assembly.

With our years of experience in NMUN, we believe that this conference will improve upon your own skill set and passion towards international affairs. This background guide is the culmination of our work over the past year to provide insights on the three topics before this committee. The goal of this guide is to be a starting point for your own research. Through advanced preparation, you will be able to provide a true representation of your respective Member States.

The First Committee is the principal organ of the United Nations that addresses security issues outside of the Security Council. As such, this year, the First Committee focuses on recent challenges such as advanced weapons and past challenges such as nuclear weapons. We hope that as passionate representatives of your Member States, you will come prepared to engage in fascinating debates about the committee topics.

In addition to this preparation, please take note of the [NMUN Policies and Codes of Conduct](#) on the website and in the [Delegate Preparation Guide](#) regarding plagiarism, codes of conduct/dress code/sexual harassment, awards philosophy/evaluation method, etc. Adherence to these guidelines is mandatory. We look forward to working with you in Washington, D.C. in October.

The NMUN•DC Staff

History of the General Assembly First Committee

The United Nations (UN) General Assembly (GA) was established in 1945 under the *Charter of the United Nations* and was designed to act as the main deliberative, policymaking, and representative body of the UN. All 193 Member States are included within the GA, allowing for topics to be discussed multilaterally. The GA contains six Main Committees, which each address a different theme and are allocated different agenda items according to that theme. The First Committee is tasked with addressing issues that pertain to disarmament and international security and will be further developed within this guide. The Second Committee is responsible for economic and financial matters. The Third Committee oversees topics in relation to social, humanitarian, and cultural matters. The Fourth Committee addresses special political and decolonization topics. The Fifth Committee is allocated subjects related to administrative and budgetary matters. Finally, the Sixth Committee oversees all legal matters for the GA.

The First Committee is mandated with addressing topics related to disarmament, the regulation of arms, and threats to international peace and security. It is tasked with finding solutions to global security threats and promoting stability through international cooperation between Member States. In addition, the First Committee may be called upon to address an immediate threat to peace and security if the Security Council is unable to take action due to a negative vote from one of the five permanent Member States.

In order to address a wider variety of topics, the First Committee also contains a number of subsidiary organs that are divided into five categories: boards, commissions, committees, councils and panels, and working groups and others. These bodies allow for specific discussions related to peace and security to be had outside of the First Committee; examples of such committees include: the Committee on the Peaceful Uses of Outer Space, the UN Scientific Committee on the Effects of Atomic Radiation, and the Open-ended Working Group on the Causes of Conflict and the Promotion of Durable Peace and Sustainable Development in Africa. All work produced by these subsidiary organs is then presented to a plenary meeting of the GA First Committee for further consideration.

Additionally, the First Committee works in close cooperation with other UN organs beyond those involved directly with the GA First Committee including the UN Disarmament Commission (UNDC) and the Conference on Disarmament (CD). The UNDC was created in 1978 and is composed of all Member States. It focuses on a limited amount of agenda items each session that pertain directly to the field of disarmament and produces an annual report to the GA First Committee. The CD was established in 1979 and was originally composed of 40 members. Membership has since grown to 65 Member States and the Conference itself covers a wide variety of topics including prevention of nuclear war, prevention of an arms race in outer space, and new types of weapons of mass destruction. Both these bodies remain extremely important to further the work of the GA First Committee because they allow Member States to debate in more depth topics related to issue areas that the First Committee may not otherwise be able to address due to the high volume of issues discussed at each session. As such, the reports produced by these bodies allow for more concrete action to be taken by the GA First Committee on vital security issues.

The First Committee's current areas of focus vary significantly and touch upon topics such as military expenditure, the prevention of an arms race in outer space, establishing a nuclear weapons free-zone in the Middle East and South-East Asia, as well as the relationship between disarmament and development. In addition, the First Committee oversaw the most recent conference on the *Arms Trade Treaty* which was adopted on 2 April 2013 and will serve to help regulate the international trade of conventional weapons, including small arms, tanks, combat vehicles, and warships.

The First Committee remains the primary source of discussion on topics related to security amongst every Member State at the UN and, as such, remains vital to the maintenance of peace globally. Moreover, given the high priority in recent years in reaching consensus, it also has the potential to create lasting and far reaching resolutions to solve some of the world's biggest security threats, as is exemplified by the *Arms Trade Treaty* coming into force and the ramifications of the document on arms trafficking worldwide. Resolutions that are adopted by consensus also highlight areas of agreement within the international community, which can lead to the creation of new treaties or to the establishment of new international legal norms. As such, the First Committee remains at the forefront of the maintenance of international peace and security within the international system and will continue to provide a key forum for dialogue and cooperation in the future.

I. Addressing the Reality of Emerging Weapon Systems

- What are the potential benefits and shortcomings of the evolving landscape of advanced emerging weapons systems compared to traditional warfare?
- What should be the role of the global community in the potential regulation of these weapon systems and the future use of them?
- What is the potential for future fully automated weapon systems that may result from the current use of unmanned weapon systems? How can the global community preemptively react to the development and possible deployment of these systems?

Over the course of the 21st century, the global community has witnessed a stark change in the methods of modern warfare. The time of thousands of men and women engaged on battlefields using conventional weapons is being replaced by the “war from a distance” with the emerging use of new technologies. Emerging Weapon Systems (EWS) such as armed combat drones represent this growing trend in modern warfare and a new set of potential dangers for the global community. In many recent military conflicts remote piloted vehicles/unmanned air vehicles (RPV/UAV) were utilized in targeted strikes against military combatants, including in strikes in Pakistan against targeted terrorists by the United States and its allies. This new form of warfare has raised significant ethical debates on the positives and negatives of its use. Underlying the discussion about the current EWS is the future it predicts in which potentially fully automated robotic weapon systems have control over life and death and what impact this will have on the world. These new technologies represent a challenge for existing frameworks for arms regulation, such as the *Arms Trade Treaty* (ATT), as less than a decade ago these technologies might have been considered science fiction. The First Committee is therefore tasked with addressing this nascent and evolving issue of advanced weapons systems in order to begin key dialogue for the international community as a whole.

One major issue that has been discussed by the international community is whether the use of targeted aerial drone strikes is legal according to international law. Reports by international organizations have reacted with skepticism regarding the legality of the current use of armed drones in targeted killings of individuals associated with terrorism in Pakistan, Yemen, Afghanistan, and other countries. A report by United Nations Special Rapporteur on extrajudicial, summary or arbitrary executions, Christof Heyns, specifically cautioned against the relatively undefined rules of engagement that are used by states, which carry out drone strikes. Given this, one of the recommendations of the report was the establishment of an international legal framework specifically for the use of drone strikes based on international human rights and humanitarian law. He also concludes that transparency is needed by states using armed drones regarding acquisition of drones and their use in combat. He calls for regulated trade of drones and international oversight. For the United Nations (UN) General Assembly (GA), the effectiveness of drone strikes in engaging adversaries' needs to be balanced with humanitarian and international law.

Beyond the aforementioned legality of EWS, there is concern around their use because of their potential for abuse and collateral damage. For certain organizations, the human cost, both in lives and rights, is viewed as too high. Non-governmental organizations such as Humans Rights Watch and Amnesty International have continued to highlight what they view as an increased disregard for human life through the use of the targeted killings by UAVs/RPVs to date. A report by Amnesty International specifically discusses the impact of United States drone strikes in Pakistan and the potential for many of these strikes to be considered war crimes. The report analyzes 45 specific drone strikes in the Northwest region of Pakistan and concludes that current use of the drones has resulted in significant civilian harm and casualties. According to government and external organization sources, there have been approximately 330-374 drone strikes in Pakistan between 2004 and 2013. Yet, there is no clear estimate on civilian casualties as a result of these strikes. The GA should focus on ensuring a framework for the use of drones that will include provisions, which accurately measure the impact of drone strikes. The framework may suggest that Member States, which use these weapons, provide details regarding each strike to ensure minimal collateral damage.

However, in spite of the negative connotations associated with drones by organizations like Amnesty International, security experts highlight the use of drones as a beneficial tool in the realm of combat scenarios. Ben Emmerson, the UN Special Rapporteur on the promotion and protection of human rights and fundamental freedoms while countering terrorism, in an addendum to his most recent report (A/HRC/25/59/Add.2) concluded that the proper use of the RPVs could reduce the "risk[s] of civilian casualties in armed conflict by significantly improving the situational awareness of military commanders." Moreover, Emmerson stresses that some of the negatives of EWS and RPV specifically can be checked; for example, if civilian harm does occur, the state that caused the harm must conduct a "prompt, independent and impartial fact-finding inquiry and [to] provide a detailed public explanation." Included in his conclusions is reflection on the lack of a definition of targeting rules. At present, there is no clear definition of who can be targeted by these weapon systems; certain countries limit it to "active combatants" while others stretch the definition to include any individual that is affiliated with a combatant. These inconsistencies need to be addressed by the international community when discussing EWS.

Ultimately, both the positives and the negatives of drone use means current work hinges on defining the aforementioned framework on the issue. In this, the international community must consider at what point a drone infringes on human rights. This is particularly problematic when discussing the potential use of drones for civilian police or intrastate policing as drones can be used as an effective policing tool. Mexico's use of drones to collect intelligence on the movement of drugs is evidence of this. Only a few key players currently have the technology needed to build and use drones. When this technology expands because the materials become easier to obtain and the weapons easier to re-create, the international community will be forced to address the reality of widespread autonomous warfare.

Although the discussion regarding the use of armed drones has been at the forefront of international debate on EWS, there are other potential next generation Full Autonomous Weapon systems (FAW) which will bring about a whole different set of regulations and debate. For example, recently there have been discussions regarding the use of automated robotic land-based weapon systems with the ability to kill individuals without a trigger person. Currently most weapon systems, including aerial drones, have a person who initiates the strike. There is a strong potential as drone use expands, however, that this trigger person could be eliminated with advances in technology. The GA First Committee first discussed FAW in its 2013 session, where 16 countries expressed their concerns around the developing technology. However, only 30 countries have specifically addressed FAW in public statements, so the dialogue is in a nascent stage.

Like with EWS, the international community has discussed several key issues and concerns regarding FAW. One of the major questions posed is the potential unpredictability in how these systems will operate in new scenarios that are not predicted by the programmers of the technology. The underlying debate is whether a fully independent machine should have the right to decide the life and death of humans, even if those humans are lawful targets. The GA must address the issue of whether a non-sentient machine should have the ability to destroy human life. Additionally, the swift development of this technology has raised concerns throughout the international community. In some countries there are already functional systems close to full automation. For example, the Republic of Korea has developed a precursor technology to a FAW called the SGR-1 Sentry Robot. This robot can detect when there are unauthorized individuals in the Demilitarized Zone at its border with the Democratic People's Republic of Korea. While the SGR-1 still has a trigger person that can initiate the order for shooting its weapons, the core technology to automate this process is readily available. As the technology for FAW becomes more widespread, the GA should take note of this issue in the overall realm of international security.

In conclusion, EWS are generating highly contentious debates throughout the international community. As their presence in the world is nascent, the international community must look to shape the way in which they will operate, keeping in mind international legal norms and human rights. Developing a framework for the use of these emerging weapon systems represents a challenge for the international community, one that is growing every day as new technologies and innovations arise. Limited discussion has been made at the international level to reach consensus on the best way forward on EWS. A potential framework has yet to be created that can both assuage fears and concerns presented by this type of technology. The eventual implementation of a framework for the use of these technologies will also remain difficult as the field is continually evolving with new technologies that may require revisions of regulations and oversight. As such, in developing this framework, it is important that it address not only current needs, but that it is also designed to grow, adapt, and address future technological advances. This is to say the framework must be "future-proof." Though this will prove difficult, this is critical to the work of the First Committee to protect international peace and security not just for the present, but also for future generations.

II. Establishment of a Nuclear-Weapon-Free Zone in the Region of the Middle East

- What is a potential realistic timeline for the implementation of a NWFZ in the Middle East given the current volatile situation?
- How can previous obstacles, which have thus far prevented a successful completion of a NWFZ, be averted in the future?
- What are the long-term implications for not achieving a NWFZ in the region? Are there alternatives that could be implemented as intermediary to a NWFZ?

The Middle East has been riddled with conflicts for the past 50 years; it remains today as one of the most volatile regions in the world. Most recently, the internal conflict in the Syrian Arab Republic as well as continued threats to Iraq's stability have overshadowed much of the international discussion about the region. Yet, the issue of establishing a Nuclear Weapon Free Zone (NWFZ) is still crucial and still unresolved. While a NWFZ in the Middle East does not exist, its establishment could significantly help prevent future conflicts in the region including those that develop into wider, external conflicts. As well, the establishment of a NWFZ has the potential to create a framework for cooperation between key stakeholders in the region towards eventual peace.

NWFZs were defined in December 1975 by United Nations (UN) General Assembly (GA) resolution 3472 B as any regional area where there is a total absence of nuclear weapons and an international system of control set up to make sure that no nuclear weapons enter the region. It is important to note that the establishment of a NWFZ does not prohibit the development of nuclear technology for peaceful purposes. At present, there are five established NWFZs in the world: the Latin America and the Caribbean, South Pacific, Southeast Asia, Africa, and parts of Central Asia through a series of treaties.

Twenty years after the definition of NWFZs, the Extension and Review Conference of the *Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons* (NPT) took place in New York in 1995. The Review Conference took place 25 years after the entry into force of the NPT, and the result was an extension of the NPT indefinitely. The 1995 Review Conference endorsed the goal of a Middle East Nuclear-Weapon-Free Zone (MENWFZ) specifically to

address the tensions in the region between Israel, Iran, and the Arab League. It also issued a resolution titled “Resolution on the Middle East” (NPT/CONF.1995/32), which urged practical steps toward the establishment of the MENWFZ. Although the idea was well received, little progress has yet to be made across the three subsequent NPT Review Conferences. The Middle East Resolution did reappear at the 2010 NPT Review Conference. Five practical steps were endorsed at the 2010 Review Conference and a separate conference, independent of the NPT Review Conferences, was scheduled for 2012 specifically to discuss a MENWFZ. At a 2011 two-day Forum on MENWFZ at the International Atomic Energy Agency (IAEA), 97 Member States heard presentations from current NWFZ states. Ultimately, the conference resolved to continue working towards a MENWFZ and was considered a first step in breaking the existing stalemate.

However, the 2012 conference on the MENWFZ never occurred, and as of July 2014 it has been delayed indefinitely. This is in part due to lack of participation by Israel. Israel decided not to commit to the 2012 conference as well as other proposed replacement conferences because they felt there were more pressing issues with respect to increasing stability in the region and their own internal issues. In contrast, the sponsors of the conference, the Arab League and Iran have all stated specifically that they would be willing to attend the 2012 or a replacement conference. The sponsors of the conference did not want to continue if key stakeholders did not attend, thus they suspended the conference altogether without plans to reschedule. The next global platform for discussion on the MENWFZ is the 2015 NPT Review Conference, which will focus on the progress made since the 20th anniversary of the indefinite extension of the NPT in 1995. However, discussion at the 2015 Review Conference may not be successful if no further progress is made independently on the MENWFZ.

Despite the lack of the 2012 conference, the international community continues to discuss a MENWFZ. GA resolution 67/28 of 11 December 2012, again called for the establishment of the MENWFZ, but also urged incremental steps towards reaching the goal including some of the features needed for a NWFZ such as limiting the testing of nuclear weapons. Particularly, the Resolution urged all parties concerned to adhere to the NPT and encouraged them to open themselves to IAEA safeguards in the use of nuclear technology. The Resolution also called again for the ceasing of testing, developing, producing, or acquiring nuclear weapons. A small step toward implementing safeguards will not establish a MENWFZ. However, they will make the eventual transition to a NWFZ easier as the region will follow tenets for existing NWFZs.

Small steps towards the establishment of a MENWFZ have been made. The 2013 report of the UN Secretary-General on the “Establishment of a nuclear-weapon-free zone in the region of the Middle East” (A/68/124 (Part I)) outlined the progress to date and primarily focused on the achievements of the IAEA in the region including initiatives towards recommending and implementing safeguards for the region in advance of further discussions. The report also called upon states with a “special responsibility for the maintenance of international peace and securing” to continue to facilitate discussions. Although not mentioned specifically, these states are considered to be the sponsors of the failed 2012 conference.

While the international community has continued to push forward on a MENWFZ over the past five years, the existing stalemate in the region has been the biggest roadblock in its establishment. Currently, this stalemate is centered on a divide between Arab states, Iran, and Israel, each with a unique perspective on the situation and seeking to protect their interests. Israel, despite publically denying it, is widely believed to possess nuclear capabilities. The Arab states view Israel’s suspected nuclear capabilities as a threat to their power in the region. Iran has traditionally viewed a nuclear arsenal as key to their security in the region against Israel and threats from the Arab states.

Iran has been developing nuclear capabilities for many years. However, Iran has publically stated that the development of these capabilities is peaceful – nuclear power and the associated peaceful applications – and not for nuclear weapons. Despite Iran’s public stance, many states view the development of nuclear capabilities as a cover for nuclear weapons development, which has traditionally been a cause for stalemate in discussion. The new Iranian administration though, which was elected in October 2013 and is led by Hassan Rouhani, has signaled a potential move away from these nuclear weapons ambitions amid growing sanctions and their negative effect on its economy. Furthermore, shifts in the United States policies on negotiations with Iran have played a significant role in opening up a dialogue within the international community. At the end of 2013, Iran signed a pact known as the Joint Plan of Action (also known as the Geneva interim agreement) with the five permanent Member States of the UN Security Council and Germany (P5+1). The agreement provides relief from some economic sanctions in exchange for Iran

halting progress on its uranium-enriching activities. Specifically, Iran will receive no additional sanctions for up to six months following the signing of this deal. The eventual goal, as determined by the P5+1, is to have partial dismantlement of the existing Iranian uranium-enriching capabilities and facilities. It is important to note that results of this agreement have not yet come to fruition and there is always the possibility that the deal could be suspended. While there is very little to show at this point in terms of progress the significance of Iran's willingness to work with the international community in any capacity regarding nuclear weapons is generally seen as a positive step in the overall process.

Yet in spite of Iran's recent public desire to cooperate, Israel is still critical of the discussions, and particularly of the Joint Plan of Action. Israel viewed the Plan of Action as a mistake since it allowed the progress of the Iranian nuclear program to remain at its current level instead of calling for the immediate dismantling of the entire program. This is because Israel has said that the deal will leave a program that is still capable of producing a bomb. As such, Israel feels as though the threat to their security interests from Iran's nuclear program will only be absolved with the total dissolution of the program. However, many in the international community have highlighted Israel's unwillingness to move away from their own nuclear weapons as being hypocritical. Israel maintains that possession of nuclear weapons is a last resort defense (unofficially known as the "Samson Option") and can be used as deterrent for attacks against its state, which due to Israel's geography it feels is necessary to maintain. In response to the Joint Plan of Action Israel specifically

This disparity in perspectives on the security situation in the region affects negotiations on nuclear disarmament heavily. Israel views a broad Arab-Israeli peace, including with Palestine, as a precursor to any real discussions. However, it's the conflict with Palestinians is continually ongoing and has seen few signs of progress. As a result, Israel risks further separation from the international community by not involving itself in, or committing to nuclear disarmament, even under the pretense of seeking an initial peace with Palestine.

In conclusion, the international community has discussed a MENWFZ for many decades but it has not yet come to fruition. The development of a plan that brings all parties to the table with a goal towards sustainable peace must thus be developed through practical approaches that recognize the limitations and barriers to negotiations that have consistently prevented success. The challenges of such a plan range from bringing all requisite parties to the table to continuing the nascent support of Iran's new leadership while also limiting its nuclear arsenal. Despite these challenges, the international community should look to continue progress, even if at a slower pace, on achieving a MENWFZ. The GA First Committee thus, can bring the issue to the forefront of discussions and push for such progress and the development of achievable goals of a MENWFZ.

III. Curbing the Illicit Trafficking of Small Arms and Light Weapons

- How can the international community adequately address the challenges posed by SALW in conflict areas, including the difficulties related to data collection and differing national and regional processes?
- How can the international community help further regulate large borders, so as to minimize arms trafficking in these areas?
- What steps must be taken at a national and regional level to ensure consistent marking, tracking, and record-keeping of these types of weapons?

Small Arms and Light Weapons (SALW) are inexpensive to acquire, use, and maintain, and are produced by over 1,000 companies in over 100 countries around the world. The impact of these weapons on the peace and security of communities around the world is significant. From terrorist organizations and insurgent groups to pirates and gang members, the illicit trafficking of these types of weapons costs the lives of an estimated 500,000 people every year. However, the issue is difficult to address for many reasons. The term SALW is used to signify a wide variety of weapons, which includes anti-tank and anti-aircraft guns and missile launchers, assault rifles, handguns, grenade launchers, machine guns, revolvers, and rifles and mortars of less than 100mm caliber, although no official definition has been established by the international community. Additionally, a lack of data in relation to both the trade of SALW and the current number of weapons in existence poses a significant difficulty in establishing comprehensive tracking measures at the national and international level, and this causes additional difficulties in establishing measures to limit the flow of weapons globally. In fact, in comparison to other weapons systems,

SALW are the least well tracked of any weapon, creating a unique security threat and leading the international community to focus a significant amount of attention on addressing this issue.

Both the ease of acquisition of SALW and their transport remain vital issues for the international community to address. Shipments of SALW often avoid detection and therefore render many border security initiatives inadequate. The means by which SALW enter Member States differ, however. Shipments of weapons from abroad are often limited in size to avoid detection or are transported through porous borders. Domestically, these weapons are often acquired through theft, leakages, divergence, pilferage, or resale. Decreasing access to, and trafficking of, this type of weapon will also lead to fewer attacks and help governments better control the weapons trade within their borders.

The presence of SALW in post-conflict zones in particular has led to difficulties in maintaining peace and security. As such, according to the 2005 Small Arms Survey, almost half of all states in post-conflict situations relapse back into conflict within five years of signing a peace agreement. Moreover, a lack of data in relation to both the trade of SALW and the current number of weapons in existence poses an added difficulty in establishing comprehensive tracking measures, as well as effective brokering mechanisms. The ease of access to these weapons around the world and their relatively easy to operate nature has also been linked to the rise in deaths among humanitarian and non-governmental worker in recent years, posing increased risk for aid workers particularly in conflict zones. In addition, as SALW are easy to conceal and transport, they have often been utilized as a means of aggression towards unarmed individuals and have been linked to a wide breadth of human rights violations, including rape and other forms of sexual violence, torture, and the forced recruitment of child soldiers. What is more, the United Nations (UN) Office for Disarmament Affairs has noted that SALW trafficking has also been associated with an increased level of poverty in regions plagued by armed conflict, as well as a heightened risk of food insecurity as resources are diverted away from attaining development goals, towards sustaining armed conflicts.

Given all of these problems associated with SALW, in recent years the UN General Assembly (GA) has taken several measures to address the illicit trafficking of SALW. One such example is the UN Programme of Action, which was adopted by all UN Member States in 2001. It provides a foundation for Member States to counter the unlawful trade of these types of weapons and step-by-step measures that must be followed. Such measures include the introduction of more robust laws and regulations of these weapons, as well as the implementation of a marking system on all weapons created within national borders. Since 2001, the GA has continued to address this issue at a national, regional, and international level by hosting a Review Conference in 2006, two biennial meetings of states in 2008 and 2010, one meeting of government experts in 2011, and a second Review Conference in 2012. These talks have led to measures being adopted to address the growing threat of SALW such as the International Tracing Instrument as well as the recommendations of a Group of Governmental Experts on arms brokering. Brokers are often utilized in order to assist in the legal trade of arms across borders, bringing all involved parties together, including buyers, sellers, transporters, financiers, etc. As such, more comprehensive measures that serve to regulate arms brokering, will directly affect all aspects of the legal trade of SALW.

In addition to these measures, the GA adopted the landmark *Arms Trade Treaty* (ATT) on 2 April 2013 by a vote of 154 in favor, three against, and 23 abstentions. This treaty serves to both establish the highest possible common international standards for regulating or improving the regulation of the international trade in conventional arms, and to prevent and eradicate the illicit trade in conventional arms and prevent their diversion. Specifically, the treaty notes that each state must establish and maintain a national control system, including a national control list, which encompasses all possible items or technological advancements that the government has deemed as requiring oversight when being exported, as well as designate a competent national authority. Those states that have become parties to the ATT may also seek assistance from a voluntary trust fund, set up by and with funding contributed by these states, to begin implementing more robust regulations within their borders. At the present time, 118 states have signed onto the treaty, although only 41 have ratified it; 50 states must ratify the treaty before it is to enter into force.

Despite the significant progress that has occurred on this topic at the international level, several challenges must still be considered, including those associated with the implementation of the ATT. Although 80% of UN Member States voted in favor of the ATT, the remaining 20% that voted against or abstained demonstrate a significant need for continued efforts in promoting higher standards for weapon transfers. In regards to the abstentions, which include two of the largest weapons exporters in the world, China and Russia, several issues were raised including the notion that arms exporters were favored in this treaty over importers, and the document itself failed to specifically target

arms transfers to rebel forces. More importantly, each Member State must self-verify that the weapons being transported from their state are not being used to commit serious violations of international human rights, terrorism, or transnational crime, an act that may be difficult for some states to truly commit to or execute. Additionally, in order to gain widespread support for the treaty, many expectations that were previously established through multilateral dialogue were not included in the final product, including specific difficulties states will have in meeting the measures established. As a result, continued development of the document itself, once states are able to amend the treaty within the next few years, as well as national implementation of the ATT, and other such measures to stem the illicit trafficking of SALW, will require continued efforts by both Member States individually and the collective effort of the international community.

More specifically, at the national level, several regions are finding the implementation of the ATT and other measures to curb the trafficking of SALW more difficult than others. One such example is in the case of Africa. African states will need to assess the resources they have available to implement the ATT, which will include amalgamating other reporting mechanisms already in place, such as those implemented by the United Nations Programme of Action and the International Tracing Instrument. Additionally, border security remains a significant problem for many African countries and increased levels of protection in these areas may not be economically feasible. Likewise, most African countries are not producing weapons but they are heavily affected by SALW due to the high-level of trafficking across their borders. Consequently, this issue remains endemic to a wider problem of violence and corruption within their borders. Strengthening border security will not be sufficient to address those states that already possess weapons within their own borders and increasing patrols and checkpoints along all borders may not be a viable option for all states; nor will it completely stem the flow of weapons into the country, as the violence that lead to the acquisition of these weapons must also be addressed.

Another example of a region having difficulties tackling this issue of SALW trafficking is Southeast Asia. This region contains large stockpiles of weapons stemming from past conflicts. Although Southeast Asia has an extensive weapons collection and confiscation program in place, it is estimated that between 273,000 and 600,000 weapons remain in civilian possession. The trafficking of SALW has led to these weapons being possessed by numerous anti-government groups in countries such as Indonesia, the Philippines, Thailand, Myanmar, Sri Lanka, and India, thus increasing security threats in the region. On the opposite side, pro-government organizations in the region have also acquired many SALW through trafficking. However, these groups are often seen as being positive forces for the governments they support in spite of the lack of formal training in both military matters and in human rights. Southeast Asia has no regional standards established to adequately monitor arms trading across borders and many states in the region have yet to establish robust measures to curb the illicit trafficking of SALW nationally. In terms of national policies, small arms policies vary extensively from very restrictive (Brunei, Cambodia, and Vietnam) to highly lenient (Laos, Myanmar, Philippines, and Thailand), which can also pose an added difficulty in addressing both the legal and illegal trade of weapons across borders, as different restrictions are placed on SALW, allowing some weapons transfers to fall into the hands of unlawful individuals, perpetuating the cycle of violence.

In conclusion, curbing the illicit trade of SALW remains a significant challenge for the international community to address. Although great strides have been made at the international level to reach consensus on measures to be implemented at the national level, the implementation of such procedures remains a daunting task in many regions of the world. Further strides must be made in order to tackle some of the challenges, including addressing lapses in border security, differing national policies in terms of arms manufacturing and trade, as well as addressing weapons stockpiles stemming from post-conflict areas. A regional focus may also need to be taken to adequately address the problems associated with border security, as well as the specific issues associated with conflict zones. The ATT, as the GA's landmark document on the arms trade, still also needs improvement, but, until it achieves full ratification, true improvements cannot be made. Still, the areas of compromise within this document offer further avenues for the GA to continue expanding upon this topic. The work then of the First Committee towards addressing SALW is far from complete.

Annotated Bibliography

History of the General Assembly First Committee

The Nuclear Threat Initiative. (2013). *United Nations First Committee*. Retrieved 5 May 2014 from: <http://www.nti.org/treaties-and-regimes/un-first-committee/>

This resource provides a detailed assessment of recent developments that have come from the GA First Committee. It contains important information regarding the discussions that have occurred and issues raised by various Member States in chronological order. Moreover, this resource highlights many important issue areas that have been discussed by the committee and the work currently being done on each topic.

United Nations, General Assembly. (n.d.). *Main Committees*. Retrieved 5 May 2014 from:

<http://www.un.org/en/ga/maincommittees/index.shtml>

This Website should serve as the main starting point for all research in relation to the GA First Committee, as it not only provides a background on the committee itself, but it also provides links to the other GA committees, subsidiary organs, and important documents that have come from the work done within the committee. As the main UN resource for this committee, it also highlights press briefings from the committee and the current agenda items to be discussed within the committee. Delegates should familiarize themselves with this source, as it provides easy access to important resources pertaining to the topics discussed.

United Nations, Office of Disarmament Affairs. (n.d.). *United Nations Disarmament Commission*. Retrieved 20 May 2014 from: <http://www.un.org/disarmament/HomePage/DisarmamentCommission/UNDiscom.shtml>

This resource provides a unique vantage point in understanding how the GA First Committee works with other UN bodies on similar topics. As the GA and the UN Office of Disarmament Affairs share a similar mandate, it remains important to understand what work is produced by organizations like the UN Office of Disarmament Affairs, and how that work is transmitted to the GA. In addition, this Website provides background information on the topic of disarmament and links to past sessions, as well as recommendations that have been made to the GA as a result of discussions on these topics.

I. Addressing the Reality of Emerging Weapon Systems

Amnesty International. (October 2013). *Will I be next? US drone strikes in Pakistan*. Retrieved 9 May 2014 from:

<http://www.amnesty.org/en/library/asset/ASA33/013/2013/en/041c08cb-fb54-47b3-b3fe-a72c9169e487/asa330132013en.pdf>

Amnesty International explores the recent targeted killings by United States drones in northwest Pakistan and the lack of transparency with which the United States operates its drone program. Hundreds of drone strikes have occurred in this particular region over the course of one and half years, and this organization views many of the attacks as potential violations of international law. The organization recommends full disclosure by the United States on its attacks and the creation of avenues for civilians to find reparations if they have been harmed in attacks.

International Committee of the Red Cross. (2014). *Report of the ICRC Expert Meeting on 'Autonomous weapon systems: technical, military, legal and humanitarian aspects,' 26-28 March 2014, Geneva*. Retrieved 9 May 2014 from: <http://www.icrc.org/eng/assets/files/2014/expert-meeting-autonomous-weapons-icrc-report-2014-05-09.pdf>

The International Committee of the Red Cross outlines its key findings regarding the potential exploitation of future fully automated robotic weapon systems. This represents more of an ethical debate about the future use of these systems, and this source is important to contextualize how the current debate on the use of drones will evolve when the fully automated robotic systems of the future come to fruition. There are key details on the use of this technology today in states around the world, which can serve as case studies towards the analysis of the issue.

United Nations, Office for Disarmament Affairs. (2013). *Arms Trade Treaty*. Retrieved on 5 May 2014 from:

<http://www.un.org/disarmament/ATT/>

The Arms Trade Treaty is important to understand with respect to the potential development of regulation regarding the trade of armed drones and advanced technology. The global community regulates most current dangerous weapon systems heavily; however, the trade of technology in the creation and use of military drones is far behind. Utilizing frameworks used in recent documents such as the Arms Trade Treaty is critical to success for a new framework.

United Nations, Special Rapporteur on the promotion and protection of human rights and fundamental freedoms while countering terrorism. (2013). *Promotion and protection of human rights and fundamental freedoms while countering terrorism, Addendum, Mission to Chile* (A/HRC/25/59/Add.2). Retrieved 15 June 2014 from: http://www.un.org/ga/search/view_doc.asp?symbol=A/HRC/25/59/Add.2

UN Special Rapporteur Ben Emmerson highlights many potential advantages and the current disadvantages of the use of drones in international counter-terrorism. He outlines several recommendations regarding the current shortcomings in the methodology used by the states involved with this form of warfare. This is a useful report as it outlines some of the positives of the weapon systems and how to improve their use.

United Nations, Special Rapporteur on extrajudicial, summary or arbitrary executions. (2013). *Report of the Special Rapporteur on extrajudicial, summary or arbitrary executions* (A/HRC/23/47). Retrieved 15 June 2014 from: http://www.un.org/ga/search/view_doc.asp?symbol=A/HRC/23/47

Christof Heyns, the UN Special Rapporteur on extrajudicial, summary executions, outlines the current situation regarding the use of armed drones in combat. He outlines recommendations to the global community that can be used and cited in the development of resolutions on the issue. His recommendations revolve primarily around interpretations of human rights law and humanitarian law to develop a potential regulatory solution to the growing use of armed drones in conflict. Delegates should consider the humanitarian effect of drone strikes in any resolutions, as the impact will go beyond traditional parties at war.

II. Establishment of a Nuclear-Weapon-Free Zone in the Region of the Middle East

Conference of the Parties to the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons. (1995). *Resolution on the Middle East*. Retrieved 5 May 2014 from: http://www.un.org/disarmament/WMD/Nuclear/1995-NPT/pdf/Resolution_MiddleEast.pdf

The NPT Conference in 1995 reflected the desire of the international community for a Middle East Nuclear-Weapons-Free Zone (MENWFZ). The Conference outlined key steps towards the development of the NWFZ such as preliminary benchmarks including initial discussions on what issues need to be resolved first and foremost, which were echoed in the 2010 NPT Review conference and continue today. This Conference should be considered the first time that a MENWFZ was truly put forth.

International Atomic Energy Agency. (2011). *IAEA Forum on Experience of Possible Relevance to the Creation of a Nuclear-Weapon-Free Zone in the Middle East*. Retrieved 5 May 2014 from: <http://www.iaea.org/newscenter/statements/misc/2011/petersen221111.pdf>

The IAEA Forum on the Middle East Nuclear-Weapons-Free Zone (MENWFZ) in 2011 was one of the more recent steps forward in the establishment of the zone. It highlighted a gathering of key decision makers from all sides and resulted in the acknowledgement by the international community that this will be a complicated solution. Analysis of the past NWFZ treaties revealed that they grew in complexity over time and that the establishment of the MENWFZ will most likely be a very constructive process that the international community should pursue.

Schenker, H. (2010). *A Nuclear Free Zone in the Middle East: the Background*. Palestine-Israel Journal, 16(34). Retrieved 5 May 2014 from: <http://www.pij.org/current.php?id=73>

This journal outlines Israel's current stance on the Middle East Nuclear-Weapons-Free Zone (MENWFZ) and what it objects to with respect to its establishment. It is important to understand the position of Israel with respect to the MENWFZ as it has been a major voice in opposition of the zone. Understanding all sides of the argument is the only way to move discussions forward. The journal also has similar articles from the viewpoint of Iran as well, which offer contrasting, but equally significant, ideas concerning the MENWFZ.

United Nations, General Assembly. (2013). *Establishment of a nuclear-weapon-free zone in the region of the Middle East- Report of the Secretary-General (A/68/124 (Part I))*. Retrieved on 5 May 2014 from: [https://disarmament-library.un.org/UNODA/Library.nsf/a45bed59c24a1b6085257b100050103a/e12c3fdee123f66e85257bc000516a1c/\\$FILE/A%2068%20124%20Part%20I.pdf](https://disarmament-library.un.org/UNODA/Library.nsf/a45bed59c24a1b6085257b100050103a/e12c3fdee123f66e85257bc000516a1c/$FILE/A%2068%20124%20Part%20I.pdf)

This report outlines many responses by states on the current status of the establishment of a Nuclear-Weapons-Free Zone (NWFZ) in the Middle East. It is a good starting place for delegates to see what their respective state's view is on the current situation and further research views. Also, the report outlines many of the remaining obstacles left to be overcome in pursuit of the establishment a NWFZ in the Middle East.

United Nations, Office for Disarmament Affairs. (1996). *African Nuclear Weapon Free Zone Treaty (Treaty of Pelindaba)*. Retrieved 5 May 2014 from: <http://disarmament.un.org/treaties/t/pelindaba/text>

The Treaty of Pelindaba established a Nuclear Weapon Free Zone for Africa in 1996. The treaty has 50 signatories and is a great example of a functioning NWFZ treaty. It is important to analyze the existing NWFZ treaties in order to discuss best practices for the future NWFZ in the Middle East.

III. Curbing the Illicit Trafficking of Small Arms and Light Weapons

African Union. (2011). *Peace and Security Agenda: Small Arms and Light Weapons*. Retrieved 5 May 2014 from: http://www.africa-union.org/root/au/AUC/Departments/PSC/Small_Arms.htm

The peace and security section of the African Union's Website allows readers to gain a better understanding of the illicit trade of small arms and light weapons worldwide, and more specifically within Africa. It highlights the difficulties in implementing widespread policies on weapons trafficking, as well as areas of focus for the future. It also notes progress that has been made on this topic in several parts of the African Union, citing clear examples and areas of growth.

ArmsNetAfrica. (2013). *Small Arms and Light Weapons*. Retrieved 5 May 2014 from: <http://www.issafrica.org/armsnet africa/?q=content/small-arms-and-light-weapons>

This resource should serve as a primary source of information regarding small arms and light weapons trafficking in Africa. It provides detailed information on the current situation, as well as links to major documents that have been drafted to address this issue. In addition, it provides a background on civil society's involvement within the region, as well as other major African organizations, such as the East African Community and the Economic Community of West African States, as well as their work in the area of small arms and light weapons trafficking.

Doermann, K. (16 April 2013). *Adoption of a Global Arms Trade Treaty: Challenges Ahead*. Chathamhouse. Retrieved 21 May 2014 from:

<http://www.chathamhouse.org/sites/default/files/public/Research/International%20Law/160413summary.pdf>

Doermann presents a comprehensive overview of the challenges pertaining to the implementation of the Arms Trade Treaty. Prior to addressing the difficulties of such a treaty, a brief overview of how the treaty was established is noted. Further, the means by which the treaty gained such popularity is discussed. This document allows delegates to understand the history of the treaty and the concrete problems that must be addressed by the international community to establish effective national regulations in the arms trade.

Institute for Security Studies. (3 April 2013). *Making the Arms Trade Treaty Work in Practice is the Real Challenge for Africa*. Retrieved 21 May 2014 from: <http://www.issafrica.org/iss-today/making-the-arms-trade-treaty-work-in-practice-is-the-real-challenge-for-africa>

This article highlights the main challenges that Africa faces in addressing small arms and light weapons as well as in the implementation of the Arms Trade Treaty. The article also touches on problems surrounding the adoption of the treaty, which may pose future problems in terms of universal implementation. Several main issue areas are raised within this text. In particular, problems surrounding corruption and violence, which lead African states to be vulnerable to this type of illicit trade, are discussed. In addition, special geographical considerations are noted, leading to a better understanding of the specific problem of small arms and light weapons in Africa.

United Nations, Office for Disarmament Affairs. (2013). *The Arms Trade Treaty*. Retrieved 5 May 2014 from: <http://www.un.org/disarmament/ATT/>

The Arms Trade Treaty is considered to be a landmark document in the fight against weapons trafficking worldwide and, as such, the treaty itself should serve as a basis for future research and development in the field of small arms and light weapons trafficking. What is more, this particular source also has an up-to-date count on treaty ratification, a brief overview of the treaty's significance, as well as additional links to

documents pertaining to the drafting of the treaty. This document also allows one to better understand the lapses that currently exist in terms of addressing the arms trade at the international level and should be used as a basis for future innovations in the field.

Rules of Procedure of the General Assembly First Committee (GA 1st)

Introduction

1. These rules shall be the only rules that apply to the General Assembly First Committee (hereinafter referred to as “the Committee”) and shall be considered adopted by the Committee prior to its first meeting.
2. For purposes of these rules, the Director, the Assistant Director, and the Director of Conference Services are designates and agents of the Secretary-General and Deputy Secretary-General, and are collectively referred to as the “Secretariat.”
3. Interpretation of the rules shall be reserved exclusively to the Secretary-General and the Deputy Secretary-General or her/his designate. Such interpretation shall be in accordance with the philosophy and principles of the National Model United Nations (NMUN) and in furtherance of the educational mission of that organization.
4. For the purposes of these rules, “President” shall refer to the chairperson or acting chairperson of the Committee, which can be any member of the Secretariat or their designate.
5. The practice of striving for consensus in decision-making shall be encouraged. NMUN also acknowledges it may sometimes be necessary for a Member State to abstain or vote against a resolution it cannot support for policy reasons.

I. SESSIONS

Rule 1 - *Dates of convening and adjournment*

The Committee shall meet every year in regular session, commencing and closing on the dates designated by the Secretary-General.

Rule 2 - *Place of sessions*

The Committee shall meet at a location designated by the Secretary-General.

II. AGENDA

Rule 3 - *Provisional agenda*

The provisional agenda shall be drawn up by the Deputy Secretary-General and communicated to the members of the Committee at least sixty days before the opening of the session.

Rule 4 - *Adoption of the agenda*

The agenda provided by the Deputy Secretary-General shall be considered adopted as of the beginning of the session. The order of the agenda items shall be determined by a majority vote of those present and voting.

The vote described in this rule is a procedural vote and, as such, observers are permitted to cast a vote. For purposes of this rule, those present and voting means those Member States and observers, in attendance at the meeting during which this motion comes to a vote. Should the Committee not reach a decision by conclusion of the first night’s meeting, the agenda will be automatically set in the order in which it was first communicated.

Rule 5 - Revision of the agenda

During a session, the Committee may revise the agenda by adding, deleting, deferring or amending items. Only important and urgent items shall be added to the agenda during a session. Debate on the inclusion of an item in the agenda shall be limited to three speakers in favor of, and three against, the inclusion. Additional items of an important and urgent character, proposed for inclusion in the agenda less than thirty days before the opening of a session, may be placed on the agenda if the Committee so decides by a two-thirds majority of the members present and voting. No additional item may, unless the Committee decides otherwise by a two-thirds majority of the members present and voting, be considered until a commission has reported on the question concerned.

For purposes of this rule, the determination of an item of an important and urgent character is subject to the discretion of the Deputy Secretary-General, or his or her designate, and any such determination is final. If an item is determined to be of such a character, then it requires a two-thirds vote of the Committee to be placed on the agenda. The votes described in this rule are substantive votes, and, as such, observers are not permitted to cast a vote. For purposes of this rule, —the members “present and voting” — means members (not including observers) in attendance at the session during which this motion comes to vote.

Rule 6 - Explanatory memorandum

Any item proposed for inclusion in the agenda shall be accompanied by an explanatory memorandum and, if possible, by basic documents.

III. SECRETARIAT

Rule 7 - Duties of the Secretary-General

1. The Secretary-General or her/his designate shall act in this capacity in all meetings of the Committee.
2. The Secretary-General, in cooperation with the Deputy Secretary-General, shall provide and direct the staff required by the Committee and be responsible for all the arrangements that may be necessary for its meetings.

Rule 8 - Duties of the Secretariat

The Secretariat shall receive and distribute documents of the Commission to the Members, and generally perform all other work which the Committee may require.

Rule 9 - Statements by the Secretariat

The Secretary-General or her/his designate, may make oral as well as written statements to the Committee concerning any question under consideration.

Rule 10 - Selection of the President

The Secretary-General or her/his designate shall appoint, from applications received by the Secretariat, a President who shall hold office and, *inter alia*, chair the Committee for the duration of the session, unless otherwise decided by the Secretary-General.

Rule 11 - Replacement of the President

If the President is unable to perform her/his functions, a new President shall be appointed for the unexpired term at the discretion of the Secretary-General or her/his designate.

IV. LANGUAGE

Rule 12 - Official and working language

English shall be the official and working language of the Committee during scheduled sessions (both formal and informal) of the Committee.

Rule 13 - Interpretation (oral) or translation (written)

Any representative wishing to address any body or submit a document in a language other than English shall provide interpretation or translation into English.

This rule does not affect the total speaking time allotted to those representatives wishing to address the body in a language other than English. As such, both the speech and the interpretation must be within the set time limit. The language should be the official language of the country you are representing at NMUN.

V. CONDUCT OF BUSINESS

Rule 14 - Quorum

The President may declare a meeting open and permit debate to proceed when representatives of at least one-third of the members of the Committee are present. The presence of representatives of a majority of the members of the Committee shall be required for any decision to be taken.

For purposes of this rule, members of the Committee means the total number of members (not including observers) in attendance at the first night's meeting (session).

Rule 15 - General powers of the President

In addition to exercising the powers conferred upon him or her elsewhere by these rules, the President shall declare the opening and closing of each meeting of the Committee, direct the discussions, ensure observance of these rules, accord the right to speak, put questions to vote and announce decisions. The President, subject to these rules, shall have complete control of the proceedings of the Committee and over the maintenance of order at its meetings. He or she shall rule on points of order. The President may propose to the Committee the closure of the list of speakers, a limitation on the speakers time and on the number of times the representative of each member may speak on an item, the adjournment or closure of the debate, and the suspension or adjournment of a meeting.

Included in these enumerated powers is the power to assign speaking times for all speeches incidental to motions and amendment. Further, the President is to use her/his discretion, upon the advice and at the consent of the Secretariat, to determine whether to entertain a particular motion based on the philosophy and principles of the NMUN. Such discretion should be used on a limited basis and only under circumstances where it is necessary to advance the educational mission of the Conference and is limited to entertaining motions.

Rule 16 - Authority of the Committee

The President, in the exercise of her or his functions, remains under the authority of the Committee.

Rule 17 - Voting rights on procedural matters

Unless otherwise stated, all votes pertaining to the conduct of business shall require a favorable vote by the majority of the members "present and voting" in order to pass.

For purposes of this rule, the members present and voting mean those members (including observers) in attendance at the meeting during which this rule is applied. Note that observers may vote on all procedural votes; they may, however, not vote on substantive matters (see Chapter VI). Every delegation must cast a vote in procedural votes. Further, there is no possibility to abstain or pass on procedural votes

Rule 18 - Points of order

During the discussion of any matter, a representative may rise to a point of order, and the point of order shall be immediately decided by the President in accordance with the rules of procedure. A representative may appeal against the ruling of the President. The appeal shall be immediately put to the vote, and the President's ruling shall stand unless overruled by a majority of the members present and voting. A representative rising to a point of order may not speak on the substance of the matter under discussion.

Such points of order should not under any circumstances interrupt the speech of a fellow representative. They should be used exclusively to correct an error in procedure. Any questions on order arising during a speech made by a representative should be raised at the conclusion of the speech, or can be addressed by the President, sua sponte (on her/his own accord), during the speech. For purposes of this rule, the members present and voting mean those members (including observers) in attendance at the meeting during which this motion comes to vote.

Rule 19 - Speeches

No representative may address the Committee without having previously obtained the permission of the President. The President shall call upon speakers in the order in which they signify their desire to speak. The President may call a speaker to order if his remarks are not relevant to the subject under discussion.

In line with the philosophy and principles of the NMUN, in furtherance of its educational mission, and for the purpose of facilitating debate, the Secretariat will set a time limit for all speeches which may be amended by the Committee through a vote if the President, at his or her discretion, decides to allow the Committee to decide. In no case shall the speaker's time be changed during the first scheduled session of the Committee. Consequently, motions to alter the speaker's time will not be entertained by the President. The content of speeches should be pertinent to the agenda as set by the Committee.

Rule 20 - List of Speakers

Members may only be on the list of speakers once but may be added again after having spoken. During the course of a debate, the President may announce the list of speakers and, with the consent of the Committee, declare the list closed. Once the list has been closed, it can be reopened upon by a vote of the Committee. When there are no more speakers, the President shall declare the debate closed. Such closure shall have the same effect as closure by decision of the Committee.

The decision to announce the list of speakers is within the discretion of the President and should not be the subject of a motion by the Committee. A motion to close the speakers list or reopen (if the list has already been closed) is within the purview of the Committee and the President should not act on her/his own motion.

Rule 21 - Right of reply

If a remark impugns the integrity of a representative's State, the President may permit that representative to exercise her/his right of reply following the conclusion of the controversial speech, and shall determine an appropriate time limit for the reply. No ruling on this question shall be subject to appeal.

For purposes of this rule, a remark that impugns the integrity of a representative's State is one directed at the governing authority of that State and/or one that puts into question that State's sovereignty or a portion thereof. All interventions in the exercise of the right of reply shall be addressed in writing to the Secretariat and shall not be raised as a point of order or motion. The reply shall be read to the Committee by the representative only upon approval of the Secretariat, and in no case after voting has concluded on all matters relating to the agenda topic, during the discussion of which, the right arose. The right of reply will not be approved should it impugn the integrity of another State.

Rule 22 - Suspension of the meeting

During the discussion of any matter, a representative may move the suspension of the meeting, specifying a time for reconvening. Such motions shall not be debated but shall be put to a vote immediately, requiring the support of a majority of the members present and voting to pass. Delegates should not state a purpose for the suspension.

This motion should be used to suspend the meeting for lunch or at the end of the scheduled board session time. Delegates should properly phrase this motion as "suspension of the meeting," and provide a length of time when making the motion.

Rule 23 - Adjournment of the meeting

During the discussion of any matter, a representative may move to the adjournment of the meeting. Such motions shall not be debated but shall be put to the vote immediately, requiring the support of a majority of the members present and voting to pass. After adjournment, the Committee shall reconvene at its next regularly scheduled meeting time.

As this motion, if successful, would end the meeting until the Committee's next regularly scheduled session the following year, and in accordance with the philosophy and principles of the NMUN and in furtherance of its educational mission, the President will not entertain such a motion until the end of the last meeting of the Committee.

Rule 24 - Adjournment of debate

During the discussion of any matter, a representative may move the adjournment of the debate on the item under discussion. Two representatives may speak in favor of, and two against, the motion, after which the motion shall be immediately put to the vote. The President may limit the time to be allowed to speakers under this rule.

Rule 25 - Closure of debate

A representative may at any time move the closure of debate on the item under discussion, whether or not any other representative has signified her/his wish to speak. Permission to speak on the motion shall be accorded only to two representatives opposing the closure, after which the motion shall be put to the vote immediately. Closure of debate shall require a two-thirds majority of the members present and voting. If the Committee favors the closure of debate, the Committee shall immediately move to vote on all proposals introduced under that agenda item.

Rule 26 - Order of motions

Subject to Rule 18, the motions indicated below shall have precedence in the following order over all proposals or other motions before the meeting:

1. To suspend the meeting;
2. To adjourn the meeting;
3. To adjourn the debate on the item under discussion;
4. To close the debate on the item under discussion.

Rule 27 - Proposals and amendments

Proposals and amendments shall normally be submitted in writing to the Secretariat. Any proposal or amendment that relates to the substance of any matter under discussion shall require the signature of twenty percent of the members of the Committee [sponsors].

The Secretariat may, at its discretion, approve the proposal or amendment for circulation among the delegations. As a general rule, no proposal shall be put to the vote at any meeting of the Committee unless copies of it have been circulated to all delegations. The President may, however, permit the discussion and consideration of amendments or of motions as to procedure, even though such amendments and motions have not been circulated.

If the sponsors agree to the adoption of a proposed amendment, the proposal shall be modified accordingly and no vote shall be taken on the proposed amendment. A document modified in this manner shall be considered as the proposal pending before the Committee for all purposes, including subsequent amendments.

For purposes of this rule, all proposals shall be in the form of working papers prior to their approval by the Secretariat. Working papers will not be copied, or in any other way distributed, to the Committee by the Secretariat. The distribution of such working papers is solely the responsibility of the sponsors of the working papers. Along these lines, and in furtherance of the philosophy and principles of the NMUN and for the purpose of advancing its educational mission, representatives should not directly refer to the substance of a working paper that has not yet been accepted as a draft resolution during formal speeches. After approval of a working paper, the proposal becomes a draft resolution and will be copied by the Secretariat for distribution to the Committee. These draft resolutions are the collective property of the Committee and, as such, the names of the original sponsors will be removed. The copying and distribution of amendments is at the discretion of the Secretariat, but the substance of all such amendments will be made available to all representatives in some form. Should delegates wish to withdraw a working paper or draft resolution from consideration, this requires the consent of all sponsors.

Rule 28 - Withdrawal of motions

A motion may be withdrawn by its proposer at any time before voting has commenced, provided that the motion has not been amended. A motion thus withdrawn may be reintroduced by any member.

Rule 29 - Reconsideration of a topic

When a topic has been adjourned, it may not be reconsidered at the same session unless the Committee, by a two-thirds majority of those present and voting, so decides. Reconsideration can only be moved by a representative who voted on the prevailing side of the original motion to adjourn. Permission to speak on a motion to reconsider shall be accorded only to two speakers opposing the motion, after which it shall be put to the vote immediately. The President may limit the time to be allowed to speakers under this rule.

Rule 30 - Invitation to silent prayer or meditation

Immediately after the opening of the meeting and immediately preceding the closing of the final meeting, the President shall invite the representatives to observe one minute of silence dedicated to prayer or meditation with the motion to do so by a representative.

VI. VOTING

Rule 31 - Voting rights

Each member of the Committee shall have one vote.

This rule applies to substantive voting on amendments, draft resolutions, and portions of draft resolutions divided out by motion. As such, all references to member(s) do not include observers, who are not permitted to cast votes on substantive matters.

Rule 32 - Request for a vote

A proposal or motion before the Committee for decision shall be voted upon if any member so requests. Where no member requests a vote, the Committee may adopt proposals or motions without a vote.

For purposes of this rule, proposal means any draft resolution, an amendment thereto, or a portion of a draft resolution divided out by motion. Just prior to a vote on a particular proposal or motion, the

President may ask if there are any objections to passing the proposal or motion by acclamation, or a member may move to accept the proposal or motion by acclamation. If there are no objections to the proposal or motion, then it is adopted without a vote. Adoption by “acclamation” or “without a vote” is consistent not only with the educational mission of the conference but also the way in which the United Nations adopts a majority of its proposals.

Rule 33 - Majority required

1. Unless specified otherwise in these rules, decisions of the Committee shall be made by a majority of the members present and voting.
2. For the purpose of tabulation, the phrase “members present and voting” means members casting an affirmative or negative vote. Members which abstain from voting are considered as not voting.

All members declaring their representative States as “present and voting” during the attendance roll-call for the meeting during which the substantive voting occurs, must cast an affirmative or negative vote, and cannot abstain on substantive votes.

Rule 34 - Method of voting

1. The Committee shall normally vote by a show of placards, except that a representative may request a roll-call, which shall be taken in the English alphabetical order of the names of the members, beginning with the member whose name is randomly selected by the President. The name of each member shall be called in any roll-call, and one of its representatives shall reply “yes,” “no,” “abstention,” or “pass.”

Only those members who designate themselves as present or present and voting during the attendance roll-call, or in some other manner communicate their attendance to the President and/or Secretariat, are permitted to vote and, as such, no others will be called during a roll-call vote. Any representatives replying pass must, when requested a second time, respond with either a yes or no vote. A pass cannot be followed by a second pass for the same proposal or amendment, nor can it be followed by an abstention on that same proposal or amendment.

2. When the Committee votes by mechanical means, a non-recorded vote shall replace a vote by show of placards and a recorded vote shall replace a roll-call vote. A representative may request a recorded vote. In the case of a recorded vote, the Committee shall dispense with the procedure of calling out the names of the members.
3. The vote of each member participating in a roll-call or a recorded vote shall be inserted in the record.

Rule 35 - Explanations of vote

Representatives may make brief statements consisting solely of explanation of their votes after the voting has been completed. The representatives of a member sponsoring a proposal or motion shall not speak in explanation of vote thereon, except if it has been amended, and the member has voted against the proposal or motion.

All explanations of vote must be submitted to the President in writing before debate on the topic is closed, except where the representative is of a member sponsoring the proposal, as described in the second clause, in which case the explanation of vote must be submitted to the President in writing immediately after voting on the topic ends. Only delegates who are sponsors of a draft resolution that has been adopted with an unfriendly amendment, whom subsequently voted against the draft resolution may explain their vote.

Rule 36 - Conduct during voting

After the President has announced the commencement of voting, no representatives shall interrupt the voting except on a point of order in connection with the actual process of voting.

For purposes of this rule, there shall be no communication among delegates, and if any delegate leaves the Committee room during voting procedure, they will not be allowed back into the room until the Committee has convened voting procedure. Should a delegate who is also serving as Head Delegate leave the room, they may reenter but they may not retake their seat and participate in the vote.

Rule 37 - Division of proposals and amendments

Immediately before a proposal or amendment comes to a vote, a representative may move that parts of a proposal or of an amendment should be voted on separately. If there are calls for multiple divisions, those shall be voted upon in an order to be set by the President where the most radical division will be voted upon first. If an objection is made to the motion for division, the request for division shall be voted upon, requiring the support of a majority of those present and voting to pass. Permission to speak on the motion for division shall be given only to two speakers in favor and two speakers against. If the motion for division is carried, those parts of the proposal or of the amendment which are approved shall then be put to a vote. If all operative parts of the proposal or of the amendment have been rejected, the proposal or amendment shall be considered to have been rejected as a whole.

For purposes of this rule, most radical division means the division that will remove the greatest substance from the draft resolution, but not necessarily the one that will remove the most words or clauses. The determination of which division is most radical is subject to the discretion of the Secretariat, and any such determination is final.

Rule 38 - Amendments

An amendment is a proposal that does no more than add to, delete from, or revise part of another proposal. Permission to speak on the amendment shall be given only to two speakers in favor and two speakers against.

An amendment can add, amend, or delete entire operative clauses, but cannot in any manner add, amend, delete, or otherwise affect preambular clauses or sub-clauses of operative clauses. The President may limit the time to be allowed to speakers under this rule. These speeches are substantive in nature.

Rule 39 - Voting on amendments

When an amendment is moved to a proposal, the amendment shall be voted on first. When two or more amendments are moved to a proposal, the amendment furthest removed in substance from the original proposal shall be voted on first and then the amendment next furthest removed there from, and so on until all the amendments have been put to the vote. Where, however, the adoption of one amendment necessarily implies the rejection of another amendment, the latter shall not be put to the vote. If one or more amendments are adopted, the amended proposal shall then be voted on.

For purposes of this rule, furthest removed in substance means the amendment that will have the most significant impact on the draft resolution. The determination of which amendment is furthest removed in substance is subject to the discretion of the Secretariat, and any such determination is final.

Rule 40 - Order of voting on proposals

If two or more proposals, other than amendments, relate to the same question, they shall, unless the Committee decides otherwise, be voted on in the order in which they were submitted.

Rule 41 - The President shall not vote

The President shall not vote but may designate another member of her/his delegation to vote in her/his place.

VII. CREDENTIALS



Rule 42 - Credentials

The credentials of representatives and the names of members of a delegation shall be submitted to the Secretary-General prior to the opening of a session.

Rule 43 - Authority of the General Assembly

The Committee shall be bound by the actions of the General Assembly in all credentials matters and shall take no action regarding the credentials of any member.

VII. PARTICIPATION OF NON-MEMBERS OF THE COMMITTEE

Rule 44 - Participation of non-Member States

The Committee shall invite any Member of the United Nations that is not a member of the Committee and any other State, to participate in its deliberations on any matter of particular concern to that State.

A sub-board or sessional body of the Committee shall invite any State that is not one of its own members to participate in its deliberations on any matter of particular concern to that State. A State thus invited shall not have the right to vote, but may submit proposals which may be put to the vote on request of any member of the body concerned.

If the Committee considers that the presence of a Member invited, according to this rule, is no longer necessary, it may withdraw the invitation. Delegates invited to the Committee according to this rule should also keep in mind their role and obligations in the Committee that they were originally assigned to. For educational purposes of the NMUN Conference, the Secretariat may thus ask a delegate to return to his or her board when his or her presence in the Committee is no longer required. Delegates may request the presence of a non-member of their board simply by informing the President that this is the desire of the body, there is no formal procedural process.

Rule 45 - Participation of national liberation movements

The Committee may invite any national liberation movement recognized by the General Assembly to participate, without the right to vote, in its deliberations on any matter of particular concern to that movement.

National liberation movements are only represented at NMUN in two ways: (1) if their delegation has been assigned explicitly the national liberation movement itself; or (2) should the Security Commission wish to hear from a representative of the movement in their deliberations, the Secretariat shall provide the appropriate representative.

Rule 46 - Participation of and consultation with specialized agencies

In accordance with the agreements concluded between the United Nations and the specialized agencies, the specialized agencies shall be entitled: a) To be represented at meetings of the Committee and its subsidiary organs; b) To participate, without the right to vote, through their representatives, in deliberations with respect to items of concern to them and to submit proposals regarding such items, which may be put to the vote at the request of any member of the Committee or of the subsidiary organ concerned.

NMUN does not assign delegations to Specialized Agencies.

Rule 47 - Participation of non-governmental organization and intergovernmental organizations

Representatives of non-governmental organizations/intergovernmental organizations accorded consultative observer status by the Economic and Social Council and other non-governmental organizations/intergovernmental organizations designated on an ad hoc or a continuing basis by the Committee on the recommendation of the Bureau, may participate, with the procedural right to vote, but not the substantive right to vote, in the deliberations of the Committee on questions within the scope of the activities of the organizations.

NMUN will assign delegations an NGO instead of a Member State upon request.