

## **Inputs from the Republic of Armenia for UNSG Report**

### **Pursuant to UNGA resolution 79/239**

#### **“Artificial intelligence in the military domain and its implications for international peace and security”**

International security environment is profoundly influenced by the applications of rapidly evolving technologies in military domain. The ability to find common understanding on how to mitigate the related risks is of paramount importance for international peace and security. The Republic of Armenia attaches great importance to the UN led processes and frameworks that facilitate global dialogue in this area.

The incorporation and use of emerging technologies such as artificial intelligence into military domain pose serious political, legal, moral and ethical concerns. Their development and proliferation have the potential to increase global instability, fuel arms race and escalate tensions by lowering the threshold for conflict. Nevertheless, transformative potential of artificial intelligence may also positively shape peace and security domain, particularly its conflict management and risk reduction areas presenting unprecedented opportunities with better decision-making and improved early-warning systems.

#### **Responsible use**

The military use of artificial intelligence must fully comply with applicable international law, in particular with international humanitarian law and its core principles and requirements, such as the principles of distinction, proportionality and precautions, as well as with international human rights law.

In fostering responsible use of military AI, we emphasize the importance of ensuring the ethical and accountable transfer of such technologies. States that are at the forefront of developing advanced military AI capabilities, should exercise due diligence and refrain from authorizing transfers, if credible concerns exist regarding the recipient state's record viz-à-vis international law and international human rights law.

#### **Human Control and Judgement**

In the absence of effective human control and judgment, there remains a significant concern that AI-enabled weapons systems may face considerable challenges in consistently upholding the fundamental principles of International Humanitarian Law—namely, distinction, proportionality, humanity, and precaution—during the processes of target identification, selection, and engagement.

There remains a lack of international consensus on how human control and human judgment are to be understood in relation to one another, particularly regarding the specific stages at which they are essential to ensure compliance with International Humanitarian Law in the deployment of AI-enabled weapons systems.

The use of terms such as “effective” or “context-appropriate” human control and judgment may imply that, in certain systems or operational environments, such control and judgment could be exercised prior to the system’s autonomous identification, selection, and engagement of a target. If this interpretation is accepted, it raises critical questions regarding which contextual factors—such as operational environment, nature of the target, system capabilities, and time sensitivity—must be taken into consideration to determine the necessary level of human oversight.

In this context, external factors—such as the pace and complexity of operations, the reliability and transparency of the AI system, and the quality and provenance of data—play a central role in shaping the feasibility and adequacy of human intervention. A more detailed understanding of these factors is essential to inform the development of legal, ethical, and operational frameworks that ensure human control remains meaningful, effective, and consistent with IHL obligations.

### **State Responsibility and individual accountability**

Without a traceable and responsible chain of human command and control, the risk increases that unlawful uses of force will go unaddressed, undermining the enforcement of International Humanitarian Law (IHL) and international human rights law. The inability to assign responsibility for violations—due to the delegation of critical decisions to autonomous systems—can result in accountability gaps that erode legal norms governing armed conflict. Furthermore, if individual accountability or state responsibility is not upheld throughout the life cycle of these systems, from development to deployment, it can complicate conflict resolution efforts and hinder mechanisms for justice or reparations.

### **The use of artificial components in “smart” bombs, mines, and other types of munitions**

The use of artificial components in “smart” bombs, mines, and other types of munitions presents several challenges. The unpredictability of AI behavior in complex, dynamic environments can lead to unintended outcomes. The opaque nature of many AI systems—often referred to as the “black box” problem—can hinder traceability and accountability, making it difficult to assess how decisions were made. Additionally, the increasing autonomy of these weapons can blur the line of human control, raising concerns about compliance with legal and ethical standards. Lastly, variability in system performance, especially in unforeseen scenarios, poses operational risks that are difficult to anticipate or mitigate.