

Brazil intervention

- As we have commented on previous occasions, the human element, particularly the aspect of human control, seems to be at the center of our considerations when dealing with the challenges posed by LAWS, account taken of the CCW's humanitarian nature.
- We note with satisfaction that discussions on the previous agenda items have pointed in this direction. In a sense, the debate on characterization has evolved into a debate on human control.
- Therefore, and picking up on elements of your general remarks and questions at the end of yesterday's session, we'd like to concur with your assessment that there is an opportunity to narrow down the object of our discussion, with a focus on the policy options available to the CCW.
- While we understand the value of a comprehensive approach to human control, in view of our mandate and for the purposes and objectives of the CCW, it is the view of my delegation that we should focus our work for the future on the different phases in the deployment and use of weapons systems with autonomous functions.
- Based on the "sunrise" table you have proposed during the first session of the GGE, we are of the view that future work should concentrate on the last quarter of that graph.
- Pursuing and ensuring human control over critical functions of AWS, with accountability, seem to provide the most promising avenue for establishing relevant international regulations and/or prohibitions under the CCW framework.
- Ensuring meaningful human control of critical functions of weapons systems which rely on AI would be a key contribution of the CCW to the wider humanitarian and human rights normative framework as well as to the emerging international regime governing the challenges of new weapon technologies.
- In this context, we see a common thread linking discussions on characterization, human element and possible options, pointing towards a legally binding instrument in the shape of a protocol to the CCW.