



Permanent Mission of Italy to
the Conference on Disarmament
Geneva

**Group of Governmental Experts (GGE) on
Lethal Autonomous Weapons Systems (LAWS)**

2-6 March 2026

Section IV

Thank you, Chair, for giving me the floor and allowing me to comment on this section.

Regarding paragraph 2, we support the current formulation, which emphasizes the need to ensure compliance with IHL through review tools applied during the development or modification of weapons that have a significant impact on the essential functions of LAWS. The removal of the previous reference to *“human judgment and control appropriate to the context”*, well described in section III, is acceptable to us, considering the application of Article 36 of Additional Protocol I to the Geneva Conventions when assessing new weapons or significant modifications.

On paragraph 4, in the *chapeau*, we would prefer the addition of the word “adequately”, as suggested by others, or similar qualifier so as not to unduly constrain command actions. In sub-paragraph A, to clarify the meaning of the adjective “realistic,” we suggest replacing it with the phrase “reflecting actual battlefield conditions to evaluate their performance.” This wording is more technical and better reflects operational reality.

About sub-paragraph C, we agree with the comments provided by the Russian Federation and the Republic of Korea and would suggest to change the reference to “human operator” that could create misinterpretations. We would therefore propose “Ensuring appropriate guidance, training and instructions for personnel involved in the responsible chain of command and control of LAWS”.

Also, we propose the inclusion of a new sub-paragraph, reflecting point F of the Guiding Principles, which we consider a “security clause” for the development and use of LAWS. It would read: “When developing or acquiring new weapon systems based on emerging technologies in the area of lethal autonomous weapons systems, physical security, appropriate non-physical safeguards (including cyber-security against malicious cyber activities), the risk of acquisition by terrorist groups, and the risk of proliferation should all be considered.” We presented this proposal already in the previous session and we did not hear any specific objections. We deem its content to be of utmost importance.

Finally, for paragraph 5, we note that the text from the previous version has been unpacked to enhance clarity. It now lists a range of actions aimed at preventing harmful or unintended effects, including the need to account for “unintended bias” even in data sets.

Thank you, Mr. Chair.