



Statement by Karolina Zawieska

Research assistant at the Industrial Research Institute for Automation and Measurements PIAP
(e-mail: kzawieska@piap.pl)

Thank you Madame Chair. I would like to thank all of the panelists for making important contribution to this debate and providing us with many thought-provoking insights into LAWS. I would like to take this opportunity to share our view on the question of accountability and the use of the anthropomorphic terminology in relation to LAWS.

First of all, I would like to emphasise that we believe that while it is important to acknowledge the complexity of LAWS and address it from different perspectives, we shall not forget that the understanding of such concepts as robot autonomy will always vary between different disciplines. Therefore, we think it is necessary to clearly articulate and strengthen the approach developed in accordance with the principles we follow within the United Nations. This implies placing the value on the human being in the first place, and only after that focusing on technical features and functions of the robotic systems.

It seems that there is a broad agreement on that the development of fully autonomous weapon systems shall not be allowed. The question is how to allow the robotic systems to act autonomously to some extent, and at the same time never fully give up human control over such systems? Also, if robots are designed to act autonomously, who is to control them, and hence, to be held accountable for robot actions? To help answering this question, we would like to propose to look at the *possibility* of human control over the robotic systems rather than the *actual* execution of such control. Following this logic, a person accountable for robot actions is the user who has a possibility to take over control over a robotic system at every moment of the robot conduct, without necessarily executing such control. This refers not only to taking over manual control over the system but also the decisions we make that influence robots' goals.

Also, it is worth noting that when addressing the autonomous weapon systems, we often use anthropomorphic analogies to describe such systems, that is we attribute human-like characteristics to robots. We think that the anthropomorphic terminology has an important explanatory role however, it also leads to confusion about the actual capabilities of the system and the nature of its performance. This is why we shall consider developing entirely new terms for describing autonomy and other features of the robotic systems, just as the term 'robot' was coined to describe a new type of technological creations.

Madame Chair, we hope that the third informal meeting of experts will bring us a step closer to defining conceptual frameworks for LAWS in a way that leaves no doubt about the ethical principles we follow in this forum.

Thank you, Madame Chair.