

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

18 February 2019

English

Original: French

Summary record (partial)*of the 6th meeting**

Held at the Palais des Nations, Geneva, on Friday, 23 November 2018, at 3 p.m.

Chairperson: Mr. Kārklīns (Latvia)

Contents

Consideration and adoption of the final report (*continued*)

-
- * No summary record was prepared for the rest of the meeting.
** No summary records were issued for the 1st to 5th meetings.

This record is subject to correction.


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

Any corrected records will be reissued for technical reasons after the end of the session.

GE.18-20221 (E) 180219 180219



* 1 8 2 0 2 2 1 *

Please recycle 



The meeting was called to order at 3.05 p.m.

Consideration and adoption of the final report (*continued*) (CCW/MSP/2018/CRP.1 and CCW/MSP/2018/CRP.1/Rev.1)

1. **The Chairperson** invited the participants to resume their consideration of the draft final report, as revised (CCW/MSP/2018/CRP.1/Rev.1), whose paragraphs 1 to 30, with the exception of paragraph 20, had been provisionally adopted at the previous meeting.

2. *Paragraph 20, as amended, was adopted.*

Paragraph 20 bis

3. **Mr. Hwang** (France) said that the topic covered at the fourth plenary meeting had been broader than was suggested by the wording of paragraph 20 bis. The discussion had addressed how to strengthen respect for international humanitarian law when conventional weapons were used in armed conflicts. Moreover, paragraph 20 bis also introduced the new concept of “explosive weapons in populated areas”, together with its acronym, EWIPA. Given that there had been no unanimity as to the definition of that term or in respect of the concept of “populated area”, an objective account of the discussion should not include the acronym. He therefore proposed to reformulate the paragraph based on paragraph 2 of the final report of the 2017 meeting, adopted by consensus, so that it would read “Under the same agenda item, delegations also addressed the issue of strengthening the respect for international humanitarian law and addressing, in the context and objectives of the Convention and its annexed Protocols, the challenges presented by the use of conventional arms in armed conflicts and their impact on civilians, particularly in areas where there are concentrations of civilians.” The acronym EWIPA would thus be deleted, as would the words “on EWIPA” in the following sentence.

4. **Mr. Ji Haojun** (China) said that although China had made some comments on the use of explosive weapons in densely populated areas, it had not participated in the discussion and therefore should not be listed as a participant. Furthermore, the issue had been considered under the agenda item on emerging issues in the context of the objectives and purposes of the Convention, even though it was not an emerging issue at all. During the Second World War, some Chinese cities had been wiped off the map, and it was in the wake of those events that the Geneva Conventions had been adopted. The Convention on Certain Conventional Weapons had a humanitarian dimension, but its focus was on disarmament. Issues related to acts of war were covered by the Geneva Conventions, whose depositary was the International Committee of the Red Cross. China therefore considered that it was for the International Conference of the Red Cross and Red Crescent to examine the use of explosive weapons in densely populated areas, and that examining the issue in the framework of the Convention would set a bad precedent.

5. **Mr. Yermakov** (Russian Federation) said that the French proposal was to reuse the account of a debate that had taken place in 2017 on a completely different topic, whereas the report under consideration should give an account of the discussions that had taken place during the 2018 Meeting. Two issues had been raised under the agenda item, namely the initiative put forward by Switzerland and India on consideration of developments in science and technology that might be relevant to the work of the Convention (CCW/MSP/2018/WP.2), and the paper submitted by Germany on mitigation of the civilian harm from the use of explosive weapons in populated areas (CCW/MSP/2018/WP.1). The question of respect for international humanitarian law in the context of the Convention and its annexed Protocols had not been addressed. The Russian Federation wished to keep paragraph 20 bis as it stood.

6. **The Chairperson** suggested that the paragraph should read “Under the same agenda item, delegations also addressed the working paper submitted by Germany on ‘Mitigating the civilian harm from the use of explosive weapons in populated areas’. The following delegations participated in the discussions:” The delegations would be listed immediately thereafter, without mention of China.

7. **Mr. Ji Haojun** (China), reiterating that the topic was not an emerging issue, proposed replacing “Under the same agenda item” with “During the meeting, some delegations also addressed issues”.
8. **Mr. Ağacikoğlu** (Turkey) said that the Chairperson’s proposal, which only mentioned the paper submitted by Germany, was not acceptable as it stood.
9. **Mr. Ji Haojun** (China) proposed deleting the initial phrase “Under the same agenda item” and beginning the sentence with “Some delegations”.
10. **Ms. Yaron** (Israel) said that the words “and to related issues” might be added to the formulation suggested by the Chairperson. To address the concerns expressed by the Chinese delegation, she proposed replacing “participated in the discussions” with “gave statements and comments”.
11. **Ms. Donnelly** (New Zealand) said that New Zealand wished to retain “Under the same agenda item” at the beginning of the sentence because the discussions had addressed an emerging issue. Otherwise, the amendments proposed by China were acceptable.
12. **Mr. de Aguiar Patriota** (Brazil) said that Brazil did not accept the Chairperson’s proposal, as the delegation of Brazil had not made a statement on the paper submitted by Germany, but it had taken the floor on the issue of the use of explosive weapons in populated areas. He would like the final report to include the list of delegations that had addressed that issue under the agenda item on emerging issues, thereby factually reflecting what had occurred during the meeting.
13. **Ms. Ledesma Hernández** (Cuba) said that all the views expressed by the various delegations were relevant. Cuba shared many of the concerns that had been expressed by the Chinese delegation. The Cuban delegation proposed the following wording: “*Las delegaciones tuvieron ante sí un working paper sobre el tema [title]. Las siguientes delegaciones presentaron comentarios al respecto:*” [Delegations were presented with a working paper on the issue of [title]. The following delegations made comments on that subject:].
14. **The Chairperson** suggested that the new wording should read “Likewise, delegations also addressed the working paper submitted by Germany on ‘Mitigating the civilian harm from the use of explosive weapons in populated areas’ and related issues. The following delegations made statements and comments: [list of delegations]. Some delegations were of the view that the Convention on Certain Conventional Weapons was not the right framework to address these issues.”
15. **Mr. Incarnato** (Italy) said that his country endorsed the statement made by the representative of Brazil. However, his delegation hoped that the final report would take into account all the opinions expressed during the current meeting.
16. **The Chairperson** suggested adding a sentence to clarify that some delegations had made statements specifically about the use of explosive weapons in populated areas.
17. **Ms. Fitzmaurice** (Ireland) said that she endorsed the statements made by the representatives of Brazil and Italy. It should also be stated that the delegations had considered not only the paper submitted by Germany, but also many other issues.
18. **Mr. Martínez Ruiz** (Mexico) said that Mexico aligned itself with the position of Brazil, Italy and Ireland. The use of explosive weapons in populated areas was a long-standing issue, as the representative of China had observed, but it was an emerging issue in the context of the Convention, as reflected by the title of the agenda item. Mexico supported the Chairperson’s proposal, with the amendment proposed by Israel.
19. **Ms. Moraga** (Chile) said that her delegation aligned itself with the statements made by Brazil, Ireland, Italy and Mexico, and emphasized the importance of the issue of the use of explosive weapons in populated areas.
20. **Ms. Hammer** (Austria) said that the report should reflect the fact that many delegations had addressed the issue of the use of explosive weapons in populated areas. Her delegation was grateful to the representative of France for the proposal to use the wording from 2017, which she proposed should be incorporated into the sentence referring to the

paper submitted by Germany, thus addressing the concerns of delegations that wished to clarify that the discussion had proceeded in a broader context. She also supported the proposal of the Chinese delegation to make it clear that the issue should not be addressed in the framework of the Convention.

21. **Mr. Hwang** (France) said that France would not accept that the final report should give the impression that all High Contracting Parties shared a common understanding of the concept of the use of explosive weapons in populated areas.

22. **Mr. Ji** Haojun (China) proposed inserting the words “delegations expressed differing views” in the first sentence of paragraph 20 bis and mentioning at the end of the paragraph that some delegations were of the view that the Meeting of the High Contracting Parties to the Convention was not the appropriate forum to consider the issue of the use of explosive weapons in populated areas.

23. **Mr. Yermakov** (Russian Federation) said that discussions on the use of explosive weapons in populated areas had taken place only because Germany had submitted a working paper on the issue. The High Contracting Parties had not decided in 2017 that the matter would be discussed under the agenda item on emerging issues. Accordingly, in the first sentence it would be sufficient to state that the delegation of Germany had submitted a working paper on the use of explosive weapons in populated areas. The Russian Federation supported the proposal of China regarding the end of the paragraph.

24. **The Chairperson** suggested that, in order to give an objective account of the discussions that had taken place and the positions of the various delegations, paragraph 20 bis should be amended to read “Likewise, delegations also addressed the working paper submitted by Germany, ‘Mitigating the civilian harm from the use of explosive weapons in populated areas’, and related issues. The following delegations made statements and comments: [list of delegations]. Some of them specifically addressed the issue of explosive weapons in populated areas. Some other delegations were of the view that the Convention on Certain Conventional Weapons was not the right framework to address the issue.”

25. **Mr. Beerwerth** (Germany) said that his delegation wished to reserve its position in respect of the paragraph.

26. **The Chairperson** said that he took note of the reservation.

27. *Paragraph 20 bis, as amended, was provisionally adopted, on the understanding that Germany had entered a reservation.*

Paragraphs 19 and 31

28. **The Chairperson** said that at the 5th meeting, the Russian Federation had proposed that the first sentence of paragraph 31 of the draft final report (CCW/MSP/2018/CRP.1) should be moved to paragraph 19, where it would follow the words “A number of High Contracting Parties raised concerns over”. That proposal had been provisionally adopted. Paragraphs 19 and 31 of the amended draft (CCW/MSP/2018/CRP.1/Rev.1) should therefore be considered together.

29. **Mr. Yermakov** (Russian Federation) said that the reference to the agenda item in paragraph 31 should be deleted. Moreover, he noted that some changes had been made which differed from the document circulated that morning and considered that it would be advisable to revert to the original wording, which read thus: “The Meeting decided to ask the Chairperson-elect to consult on informal meeting formats suitable to discuss issues related to the universalization and implementation of Protocol III and report back to the 2019 Meeting of the High Contracting Parties.” If that wording did not suit some delegations, it should be possible to delete the whole of the sentence, since paragraph 28 already contained a call for the universalization and implementation of the Convention and its annexed Protocols.

30. **Mr. Ji** Haojun (China) said that since there were no annual meetings specifically devoted to Protocols I, III and IV, a reference only to Protocol III was questionable. It would be preferable to be more inclusive and to refer to all the Protocols.

31. **Ms. Donnelly** (New Zealand) said that her delegation supported the proposal to move part of paragraph 31 to paragraph 19 and was prepared to accept the wording of paragraph 31 of the revised draft, with the deletion of the reference to the agenda. However, she was not in favour of deleting the last sentence of paragraph 31, which envisaged that High Contracting Parties that so wished could take part in informal consultations on universalization, as paragraph 28 referred only to the Secretary-General of the United Nations and the Chairperson-elect.

32. **Mr. Yermakov** (Russian Federation) said that his delegation still failed to understand the value of holding informal consultations. It was undesirable that a small number of High Contracting Parties should attempt to place an issue on the agenda of the Meeting, thus giving the impression that the issue in question was a priority for all the High Contracting Parties. The Russian Federation shared the view of China concerning the undue emphasis given to Protocol III and therefore proposed the deletion of the last sentence of paragraph 31.

33. **Mr. Dorosin** (United States of America) said that if the phrase in square brackets were to be deleted, it would also be necessary to delete the reference to Protocol III in the agenda contained in annex I. Furthermore, the United States considered that the first version of paragraph 31 would have been appropriate and it asked the other delegations to consider returning to it.

34. **The Chairperson** proposed deleting the reference “[under agenda item Protocol III]” in paragraph 31 and the item “Protocol III” in the provisional agenda contained in annex I.

35. **Ms. Donnelly** (New Zealand) said that she wondered when the many delegations that had spoken about Protocol III in 2018 would be able to do so in 2019 if there was no longer an agenda item set aside for it. One solution might be to place a new item on the agenda under the title “Issues related to other Protocols”.

36. **Mr. Ji Haojun** (China) proposed either amending the beginning of paragraph 31 to read “The Meeting reaffirmed the importance of Protocols I, III and IV and their provisions” or deleting the whole of paragraph 31 and adding at the end of paragraph 28 “and, if necessary, hold informal open consultations in this regard”.

37. **Mr. Prakash** (Australia) proposed amending the last sentence of paragraph 31 as follows: “The Meeting decided to ask the Chairperson-elect to consult High Contracting Parties on issues related to the universalization and implementation of Protocol III and other Protocols as appropriate and report back to the 2019 Meeting of the High Contracting Parties.”

38. **Mr. Yermakov** (Russian Federation) said that his delegation supported the proposal by China to merge paragraphs 28 and 31, which dealt with the same topics.

39. **Ms. Hammer** (Austria) said that she deeply regretted that there was no consensus to keep Protocol III on the agenda. Her delegation supported the proposal of New Zealand concerning a new agenda item.

40. **The Chairperson** said that the question was whether Protocols I, III and IV should have a specific place on the agenda of the Meeting of the High Contracting Parties. He proposed deleting the second sentence of paragraph 31 and indicating that the High Contracting Parties had decided to introduce a new agenda item concerning the implementation of Protocols I, III and IV.

41. **Mr. Yermakov** (Russian Federation), supported by **Mr. Delgado Sánchez** (Cuba), said that items 11 and 13 of the provisional agenda of the 2019 Meeting already allowed for discussion of the universalization and implementation of the Convention and all its annexed Protocols. Therefore, it was not necessary to include a new item on the agenda.

42. **Mr. Martínez Ruiz** (Mexico) said that his country was among those that had expressed concern about the implementation of Protocol III; a concern that still existed and which, although not a priority, was no less relevant to certain realities on the ground. While the Mexican delegation was among those that wished to include an agenda item devoted to the consideration of Protocol III, it was willing to accept the proposal by Australia. The

issue should not be considered solely from the perspective of the equal treatment of the Protocols; a consensus should be found so that the High Contracting Parties could undertake informal consultations on the subject.

43. **Ms. Donnelly** (New Zealand) said that her delegation was prepared, in a spirit of consensus, to accept that paragraph 31 should end after “as soon as possible” and to approve the new wording of paragraph 28 proposed by the Russian Federation.

44. **Mr. Dorosin** (United States) asked for clarification of the proposal by the Russian Federation, which in his view suggested that consultations would be conducted not by the Chairperson-elect, but by the Secretary-General. He therefore proposed the addition, at the end of the first sentence of paragraph 31, of the words “, and decided to ask the Chairperson-elect to hold open informal consultations, as appropriate, on issues related to the universalization and implementation of it and other protocols of the Convention on Certain Conventional Weapons”. The phrase “as appropriate” was an important reminder that mechanisms concerning amended Protocol II and Protocol V were already in place and that the activities of the Chairperson-elect ought not to encroach on the efforts undertaken under those mechanisms.

45. **The Chairperson** suggested, by way of compromise, that in paragraph 31, everything that followed “as soon as possible” should be deleted. The following sentence would be inserted in paragraph 19: “A number of High Contracting Parties raised concerns over the recent growing number of reports of use of incendiary weapons against civilians and condemned any use of incendiary weapons against civilians or civilian objects, and any other use incompatible with relevant rules of international humanitarian law, including the provisions of Protocol III, where applicable.” At the end of paragraph 28, the following text would be added: “; the Meeting also decided to ask the Chairperson-elect to hold informal consultations on issues related to universalization and implementation of the Convention and its Protocols, as appropriate.” In addition, item 9 would be deleted from annex I.

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

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

48. *Paragraph 19, as amended, was adopted.*

49. *Annex I, as amended, was adopted.*

Paragraph 32

50. **Mr. Yermakov** (Russian Federation) said that he was unconvinced of the added value of holding two sessions of the Group of Governmental Experts, given the results achieved in 2018. The Russian Federation did not consider it necessary to hold two five-day sessions, as the substance of such meetings hardly differed. In the current difficult financial situation, such a practice was of little use. Therefore, the Russian Federation considered that a single five-day session per calendar year would suffice and that thus limiting the time allocated would have the advantage of elevating the Group’s discussions and making them more results-oriented and focused solely on the issues on the agenda. In that spirit, he proposed deleting, in the first subparagraph of paragraph 32, the reference to the date of the Group’s meeting, so that it would read “The Group of Governmental Experts related to emerging technologies in the area of lethal autonomous weapons systems (LAWS) in the context of the objectives and purposes of the Convention on Prohibitions or Restrictions on the Use of Certain Conventional Weapons, shall meet consistent with CCW/CONF.V/2.” He added that his country fully supported the appointment of Mr. Gjorgjinski as Chairperson of the Group.

51. **The Chairperson** said that, for reasons of room availability at the Palais des Nations, it would be useful for delegations to give preference to the periods announced in paragraph 42 of the draft final report, which had been tentatively reserved for the holding of discussions on lethal autonomous weapon systems.

52. **Mr. Ji Haojun** (China) said that although the current financial situation was important, lethal autonomous weapon systems constituted an evolving and particularly salient issue that was unlikely to be addressed in all its aspects in just one session.

Therefore, it was advisable to ensure the deepening and continuity of the process as the basis for achieving results. China was in favour of the Group of Governmental Experts meeting for five days in 2019, ideally in August.

53. **Mr. Yermakov** (Russian Federation) said that it had been proposed that the Group should meet in September, on a purely indicative basis and taking into account the statistics provided on the payment of contributions during the year, which had caused uncertainty as to whether sufficient resources would be available 90 days before the dates proposed in August. However, if the High Contracting Parties were convinced that they would be able to pay their contributions in due time, the Russian Federation was willing to support the idea of holding the session in August.

54. **Ms. Dallafi** (Switzerland), supported by the representatives of the Netherlands, the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, Ireland, Germany, France, Australia, Finland, the United States of America and Sweden, said that, in accordance with the recommendations of the Group of Governmental Experts, the Group should hold 10 days of meetings, in two sessions. Financial issues were certainly important, but they should not impede the work of the High Contracting Parties.

55. **Mr. Vogelaar** (Netherlands) said that the main financial challenge was not so much the size of the budget as the proportion of contributions that the High Contracting Parties effectively paid.

56. **Mr. Ji Haojun** (China) said that a budget should first be adopted before a decision was taken on the practical arrangements. China was not in a position where it could afford continual budget increases, considering that the level set for 2018 already posed problems. It should not be taken for granted that the High Contracting Parties would pay their share of contributions, irrespective of the arrangements made.

57. **The Chairperson** said that the number of meeting days had no impact on the budget estimate for 2019, which had been prepared on the basis that the Group of Governmental Experts would meet for 10 days and that the Implementation Support Unit would be operational. The budgeted amounts were roughly the same as expenditure in 2018.

58. **Mr. Dorosin** (United States of America) said that some delegations wished to make recruitment and assignments a priority in 2019, which could have an impact on the ability to hold meetings. He proposed adding a footnote at the end of the first subparagraph of paragraph 32 to indicate that the schedule of meetings would be decided in light of the financial situation.

59. **Mr. Yermakov** said that he was not convinced by any of the arguments put forward in favour of holding two sessions totalling 10 meeting days. The report adopted at the end of August provided a solid foundation for the future work of the Group of Governmental Experts and the Group's agenda had changed little in the past two years. The same positions were likely to be repeated, with disagreements becoming entrenched. A total of five days would be more than enough for the meeting of the Group, provided that the time allocated was turned to good account.

60. He took issue with the statements according to which the report of the 2018 session of the Group of Governmental Experts reflected a decision, supposedly taken by consensus, that a 10-day session would be held in 2019. In fact, if it had been agreed that the Group would meet for 10 days in 2019, that was the outcome of an oral agreement; it had also been stated that the meeting of the Group in 2019 should be rationalized and reduced to 5 days.

61. With regard to the proposal by the United States a footnote risked being overlooked by the High Contracting Parties, who in 2019 would no doubt be keen to go by what some were presenting as a consensus decision. He therefore proposed to clearly state, in the first subparagraph of paragraph 32, the dates of the five meeting days of the Group.

62. **Ms. Muñoz Zumbado** (Costa Rica) said that the work of the Group of Governmental Experts had yielded concrete results and that it was necessary to preserve the momentum that had been created. The meetings of the Group were currently organized in such a way as to allow for the negotiation and drafting of agreements during the first week,

followed by the consideration of information and consultations with capitals in order to be able to prepare, during the second week, the report to be submitted to the Meeting of the High Contracting Parties. She recalled that, in a spirit of compromise, Costa Rica had accepted the deletion of the reference to Protocol III in order to facilitate the adoption of paragraph 31, even in the absence of convincing arguments, because respecting the majority was a practice whose effectiveness had been demonstrated. Costa Rica supported the proposal by the United States to add a footnote indicating that the organization of meetings would be dependent on the availability of funds. A road map should be drawn up and a working methodology defined for the meetings that would be held in 2019.

63. **Mr. Takamizawa** (Japan), expressing support for Costa Rica in respect of the need for a two-phase approach, said that it was important that High Contracting Parties should pay their contributions on time.

64. **Mr. Ji Haojun** (China) said that it would be less important to invite experts than it had been in the past, which would allow for a saving in the number of meeting days. The working methodology ought to be reviewed, since too much time was devoted to general exchanges of views. While some delegations were calling for more days of meetings, attendance was low, indicating a lack of interest in the issues under discussion. It was necessary to take financial constraints into account when organizing meetings.

65. **The Chairperson** said that a clear preference was emerging for two separate sessions, preferably for a duration of five days each, in order to maintain the momentum of the negotiation process, and he called on the Russian delegation to show flexibility. Supported by **Mr. Broilo** (Poland), he proposed to reconcile the different points of view by setting the total duration at eight days – five days for the first session and three for the second.

66. **Mr. Yermakov** (Russian Federation) said that he continued to believe that only five days were needed for the consideration of issues related to lethal autonomous weapon systems. All work could be carried out in a single four-day session, and the Chairperson would prepare a draft final report that would be submitted to the Meeting of the High Contracting Parties at a one-day meeting on lethal autonomous weapon systems.

67. **Mr. Hwang** (France), supported by **Mr. Vogelaar** (Netherlands) said that the principle of having 10 meeting days in 2019 had been agreed by consensus in August 2018. He regretted that the Russian Federation had reneged on its commitment.

68. **Ms. Hammer** (Austria) said that her delegation supported the idea of strengthening the mandate of the Group of Governmental Experts but was prepared, in a spirit of compromise, to accept the status quo. However, that was incompatible with any shortening of the meeting time or the deletion of the reference to Decision 1 of the Review Conference. Budgetary difficulties should be addressed by improving efficiency.

69. **Mr. de Aguiar Patriota** (Brazil) proposed reducing, by half a day, the time allocated to the meetings of the Group of Experts of the High Contracting Parties to Amended Protocol II and the Experts of the High Contracting Parties to Protocol V, thus freeing up an additional day for the meeting of the Group of Governmental Experts on lethal autonomous weapons systems. Brazil considered that the mandate of that Group should evolve in a flexible manner, retaining the reference to Decision 1 of the Fifth Review Conference. It was also important to preserve the interval between the two sessions so as to facilitate the analysis of information and the preparation of negotiations.

70. **Mr. Yermakov** (Russian Federation) said that the proposal by Brazil to modify how meeting time was divided between groups of experts was worthy of consideration. The Russian Federation considered that Decision 1 of the Review Conference only concerned the organization of the work of the Group of Governmental Experts for 2017 and therefore did not need to be mentioned in the current final report. That decision established that the Group would meet for 10 days, but did not specify that the time would be divided into two separate sessions. Therefore, discussions about the number of meetings had no basis and the Russian delegation maintained that a duration of five days would be quite sufficient. However, by reallocating meeting time among the groups of experts, it might be possible to

devote an additional day to the consideration of issues relating to lethal autonomous weapons systems during the 2019 Meeting of the High Contracting Parties.

71. **Mr. Ji Haojun** (China) said that he welcomed the spirit of compromise shown by the Russian Federation in proposing to hold a one-day meeting during the Meeting of the High Contracting Parties. On that basis, he proposed holding an initial four-day meeting, with a further two-day meeting to be held immediately before or after the Meeting of the High Contracting Parties, which would save resources while preserving the two-phase approach. The time allocated to the meetings of the other groups of experts would not be reduced. He added that it was not appropriate to accuse States parties of not abiding by their commitments. To his recollection, in August, the delegation of the Russian Federation had not agreed to the principle of a 10-day meeting.

72. **The Chairperson** said that the meeting would be suspended for 15 minutes, in which time the incoming Chairperson of the Group of Governmental Experts on lethal autonomous weapons systems was invited to engage in informal discussions with the delegations, including that of the Russian Federation, in an effort to find a compromise.

The discussion covered in the summary record ended at 6.05 p.m.