

Statement by India on Chair's Text delivered during the 2nd Session of the GGE on Lethal Autonomous Weapon Systems, Geneva, 2 September 2025

Chair,

I want to begin by appreciating you Mr. Chair and your team's efforts in guiding the work of the Group.

We are going to be rather brief. Our comments are going to be specific to Box-II.

In general, my delegation believes that we would benefit from more discussion, on where this box and its paragraphs should be placed, and what purpose do they serve in respect of the elements of the instrument.

More specifically, we note that the para 5 introduces a concept or a term of a fundamental nature: "*Context Appropriate Human Control & Judgement*"

Our Group has agreed to the term "human judgement" being essential in 2019 report.

Our Group also agreed to the term "*control*" in 2023 report.

These terms, I would like to highlight, were agreed separately, without linking one with the other.

Regarding the term "context appropriate", we would like to point out that GGE has agreed in its guiding principle (c), that in determining the quality and extent of human-machine interaction, a range of factors should be considered including the operational context, and the characteristics and capabilities of the weapons system as a whole.

We note that you have clubbed "context-appropriate" with "human judgment and control"

Such a clubbing of terms, while helpful given the nature of divergences, might superficially make them susceptible to some sort of misrepresentation.

The uncertainties that surround this term, might lead to varied interpretations around what it means, the operational obligations that it might create - whether that is in terms of weapon design or deployment or use.

We believe that, if we have to seriously consider this term for inclusion, the Group must evolve a common interpretation of this term.

As far as my delegation is concerned, at this stage, we view it strictly in line from the understandings agreed in the past and the manner in which they were agreed.

This term, in our view, does not imply continuous human involvement during system operation, but it should be satisfiable through prior decisions at design, programming, and mission-planning stages. We are willing to discuss this further.

We also have conceptual questions, including as to which factors in specific - *whether that is in terms of environment complexity, mission type, target characteristics, weapon capabilities* - should be considered in laying out the “context” and in assessing the context appropriateness of LAWS, that shape or will shape the required level of human judgement and control.

Our delegation is not entirely opposed to the term. However, we view that the Group needs to do more work to come on the same page.

We will, therefore, continue to examine and assess this term, whether its inclusion has merits or not. We have heard views of some delegations in this session and look forward to listening from others.

It is also our view that the term, even if it is considered, it should be laid out in Box-III that covers obligations, instead over here.

Thank you.
