

**Conference on Disarmament  
2002-2006**

France, Germany, Hungary, India, Indonesia, the Islamic Republic of Iran, Iraq, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Japan, Kazakhstan, Kenya, Malaysia, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Myanmar, the Netherlands, New Zealand, Nigeria, Norway, Pakistan, Peru, Poland, the Republic of Korea, Romania, the Russian Federation, Senegal, Slovakia, South Africa, Spain, Sri Lanka, Sweden, Switzerland, the Syrian Arab Republic, Tunisia, Turkey, Ukraine, the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, the United States of America, Venezuela, Viet Nam and Zimbabwe participated as Member States in the work of the Conference.

C. Attendance and Participation of States not Members of the Conference

7. In conformity with Rule 32 of the Rules of Procedure, the States not members of the Conference listed in the following paragraph attended its plenary meetings.

8. The Conference received and considered requests for participation in its work from 37 States not members of the Conference. In accordance with the Rules of Procedure and its decision taken at its 1990 session on its improved and effective functioning (CD/1036), the Conference invited the following non-Member States to participate in its work: Albania, Armenia, Azerbaijan, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Costa Rica, Croatia, Cyprus, the Czech Republic, Denmark, Estonia, Gabon, Georgia, Ghana, Greece, Guinea, the Holy See, Jordan, Kuwait, Latvia, Lebanon, the Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Madagascar, Malta, Monaco, Oman, the Philippines, Portugal, Qatar, San Marino, Saudi Arabia, Singapore, Slovenia, Sudan, Thailand and Yemen.

D. Agenda and Programme of Work for the 2002 Session

9. At its 889th plenary meeting on 22 January 2002, the Conference adopted its agenda for the 2002 session in conformity with the Rules of Procedure. The agenda (CD/1662) reads as follows:

“Taking into account, inter alia, the relevant provisions of the Final Document of the First Special Session of the General Assembly Devoted to Disarmament, and deciding to resume its consultations on the review of its agenda, and without prejudice to their outcome, the Conference adopts the following agenda for its 2002 session:

1. Cessation of the nuclear arms race and nuclear disarmament.
2. Prevention of nuclear war, including all related matters.
3. Prevention of an arms race in outer space.
4. Effective international arrangements to assure non-nuclear-weapon States against the use or threat of use of nuclear weapons.

5. New types of weapons of mass destruction and new systems of such weapons; radiological weapons.
6. Comprehensive programme of disarmament.
7. Transparency in armaments.
8. Consideration and adoption of the annual report and any other report, as appropriate, to the General Assembly of the United Nations."

10. In connection with the adoption of the agenda, the President made the following statement: "It is my understanding that if there is a consensus in the Conference to deal with any issues, they could be dealt with within this agenda."

11. During the annual session, successive Presidents of the Conference conducted intensive consultations with a view to reaching consensus on the programme of work. In the course of these consultations, the Presidents put forward some informal proposals related to the programme of work. The Conference did not, however, agree on the programme of work and did not re-establish or establish any mechanism on any of its specific agenda items during the 2002 session.

12. At its 893rd plenary meeting on 14 February 2002, the Conference adopted decision CD/1667, which reads as follows:

"The Conference on Disarmament, reaffirming its commitment to work intensively towards the approval of a programme of work, using the Amorim Proposal, as contained in document CD/1624, as a basis for further intensified consultations and taking into consideration all relevant proposals:

In accordance with CD/1653 (paragraph 41), decides to appoint Special Coordinators on the Review of its Agenda, the Expansion of its Membership and its Improved and Effective Functioning. These Special Coordinators, in discharging their duties and functions, will take into account all proposals and views, as well as future initiatives. The Conference requests these Special Coordinators to report to it before the conclusion of the 2002 session."

13. At its 896th plenary meeting on 7 March 2002, the Conference appointed Ambassador Eui-Yong Chung of the Republic of Korea as Special Coordinator on Review of the Agenda of the Conference, Ambassador Dimiter Tzantchev of Bulgaria as Special Coordinator on Expansion of the Membership of the Conference, and Ambassador Prasad Kariyawasam of Sri Lanka as Special Coordinator on Improved and Effective Functioning of the Conference.

14. With regard to the programme of work, the Conference had before it the following official document submitted by the then President of the Conference, Ambassador Markku Reimaa of Finland: CD/1670, dated 23 May 2002, entitled "Proposal by the President: Draft Decision".

# CONFERENCE ON DISARMAMENT

CD/1667

14 February 2002

Original: ENGLISH

---

## Decision

(adopted by the Conference on Disarmament at its 893rd plenary meeting on 14 February 2002)

The Conference on Disarmament, reaffirming its commitment to work intensively towards the approval of a programme of work, using the Amorim Proposal, as contained in document CD/1624, as a basis for further intensified consultations and taking into consideration all relevant proposals:

In accordance with CD/1653 (paragraph 41), decides to appoint Special Coordinators on the Review of its Agenda, the Expansion of its Membership and its Improved and Effective Functioning. These Special Coordinators, in discharging their duties and functions, will take into account all proposals and views, as well as future initiatives. The Conference requests these Special Coordinators to report to it before the conclusion of the 2002 session.

GE.02-60433

# CONFERENCE ON DISARMAMENT

CD/1670

23 May 2002

Original: ENGLISH

---

## Proposal by the President

### Draft Decision

Recalling the United Nations General Assembly resolution 56/24 T on Multilateral cooperation in the area of disarmament and non-proliferation and global efforts against terrorism

and

with reference to the agreed mandate (CD/1299), common experience and existing proposals when initiating the work of the Conference on Disarmament in 2002,

the Conference on Disarmament decides to establish the following bodies:

- Working Group on Nuclear Disarmament
- Ad Hoc Committee on Treaty Banning the Production of Fissile Material (CD/1547)
- Working Group on Prevention of Arms Race in Outer Space
- Working Group on Negative Security Assurances (CD/1501/ para 2)

When initiating the work, the Conference will apply the schedule of activities as indicated in annex I.

The nomination of the Chair persons to the above-mentioned working bodies will follow the understanding reflected in annex II.

The Conference may reassess this arrangement on the basis of progress made.

GE.02-61597

Annex I

CONFERENCE ON DISARMAMENT

SCHEDULE OF ACTIVITIES

	Monday	Tuesday	Wednesday	Thursday	Friday
Morning	-	AHC/TBPOFM		Plenary	WG/NSA
Afternoon	WG/ND	-	WG/PAROS	(reserved for open-ended informal meetings)	-

Annex II

CONFERENCE ON DISARMAMENT

The subsidiary bodies will be chaired as follows:

Working Group on Nuclear Disarmament:

the representative of the G-21

Ad Hoc Committee on Treaty Banning  
the Production of Fissile Material:

the representative of the Western Group

Working Group on Prevention of an  
Arms Race in Outer Space:

the representative of the Eastern Group

Working Group on Negative Security  
Assurances:

the representative of the G-21

15. At the 908<sup>th</sup> plenary meeting on 31 July 2002, Ambassador Mohamed Salah Dembri of Algeria, on behalf of Ambassador Jean Lint of Belgium, Ambassador Camilo Reyes Rodríguez of Colombia, Ambassador Henrik Salander of Sweden, Ambassador Juan Enrique Vega of Chile and on his behalf, outlined a cross-group initiative on a programme of work of the Conference (CD/PV.908). At the 912<sup>th</sup> plenary meeting, on 29 August 2002, Ambassador Dembri formally presented the proposal to the Conference (CD/PV.912). A wide range of delegations expressed their appreciation for this initiative.

16. During plenary meetings of the Conference, delegations and groups of delegations expressed their views on the issue of a programme of work. These are duly reflected in the plenary records.

#### E. Expansion of the Membership of the Conference

17. The importance of the expansion of the membership of the Conference was addressed by delegations in plenary meetings.

18. Requests for membership had been received, since 1982, from the following 22 non-members, in chronological order: Greece, Croatia, Kuwait, Portugal, Slovenia, the Czech Republic, Costa Rica, Denmark, The Former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Cyprus, Lithuania, Ghana, Luxembourg, Uruguay, the Philippines, Azerbaijan, the Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Armenia, Thailand, Georgia, Jordan and Estonia.

19. In discharging his mandate, the Special Coordinator on Expansion of the Membership of the Conference, Ambassador Dimiter Tzantchev of Bulgaria, held bilateral consultations with a number of members and participating non-members of the Conference, as well as an informal open-ended meeting on 16 May 2002, and presented his report in a statement at the 911<sup>th</sup> plenary meeting on 22 August 2002 (CD/PV.911).

#### F. Review of the Agenda of the Conference

20. The importance of the review of the agenda of the Conference was addressed by delegations in plenary meetings.

21. In discharging his mandate, the Special Coordinator on Review of the Agenda of the Conference, Ambassador Eui-Yong Chung of the Republic of Korea, held bilateral consultations with a number of members and participating non-members of the Conference, as well as an informal open-ended meeting on 6 June 2002, and presented his report in a statement at the 911<sup>th</sup> plenary meeting on 22 August 2002 (CD/PV.911).



# CONFERENCE ON DISARMAMENT

CD/PV.908  
31 July 2002

ENGLISH

---

## FINAL RECORD OF THE NINE HUNDRED AND EIGHTH PLENARY MEETING

Held at the Palais des Nations, Geneva,  
on Wednesday, 31 July 2002, at 10.15 a.m.

President: Mr. Volker Heinsberg (Germany)

The PRESIDENT: I declare open the 908th plenary meeting of the Conference on Disarmament and welcome you all back from your summer break. I have six speakers on my list so far: the first is Ambassador Hans-Joachim Daerr of Germany, from the Federal Government Commission for Disarmament and Arms Control.

Mr. DAERR (Germany): Mr. President, Mr. Secretary-General, distinguished delegates, ladies and gentlemen, it is a pleasure and a privilege for me to be here and to share with you some views of the German Government on the question, where do arms control, disarmament and non-proliferation stand today? Allow me, in dealing with this subject, to take a look slightly wider than the mandate of this Conference.

Over more than a decade now the centre of gravity of arms control, due to changing framework conditions, has steadily shifted. From improving security through a balance of power, arms race prevention and crisis stability between military blocks confronting each other, emphasis has now moved to preventing the proliferation of weapons of mass destruction and to arms control relevant to local conflict management.

In addition to this steady shift, as a sudden and sharp shock, the horrific events of 11 September 2001 have made us aware of the new global dimension of terrorist threat and its obvious links with the proliferation of weapons of mass destruction and festering local conflicts.

As a consequence, arms control and disarmament are in a permanent process of reassessment and adaptation to new challenges and changing framework conditions. Arms limitations, force ratios between alliances or single countries, mutually-assured deterrence and crisis stability have not yet become irrelevant, but preventing the spread of nuclear, chemical or biological weapons, including respective carrier systems, and, in particular, preventing them from getting into the hands of non-State-actors seems now to have become the more acute challenge.

As far as the handling of arms control is concerned, there are mainly two stumbling blocks in the way of progress at present.

One is the debate about how much can be reached by multilateral negotiation and agreement, against what should rather be tackled, possibly in a synchronized manner, by steps taken at the national level. The process of negotiating and reaching even a multilateral - let alone universal - convention, and then ensuring its reliable implementation, is certainly long and cumbersome and the result will always be less than perfect. The point, however, is whether on balance we are better off with or without this imperfect result. Even the process itself, that is, dialogue and negotiation alone, could already diminish the risk of otherwise allowing terrorists freedom of manoeuvre in what would be arms-control-free terrain. This has to be weighed, of course, against the risk of creating a false sense of security, but I certainly see a lot of room between a less than perfect result and a flawed or counterproductive one. Why should a coalition against terror, ideally as global as possible, be better off by not handling the most dangerous tools of terrorism in the same multilateral way? The obvious solution seems to me the combination of multilateral and national action.

(Mr. Daerr, Germany)

The other obstacle in the way of progress is the traditional technique of establishing linkages between matters of different maturity or of different priority to the respective negotiating parties. With all respect for the give-and-take principle, this linkage game is a recipe for slow-down and standstill even where positive results are likely. Here again one should take the on-balance approach and decide whether partial progress is not better than no progress at all.

Germany remains committed to our common goal of strengthening the existing non-proliferation regime. To this effect, we have to do everything in our power to strengthen existing multilateral instruments. One significant aspect in this context is the attempt to enhance the global standards of the mechanisms for the implementation of these instruments and to improve their verification tools. Where necessary and appropriate, the creation of new multilateral instruments to this effect should not be excluded.

Nuclear non-proliferation and nuclear disarmament go hand-in-hand. The Non-Proliferation Treaty (NPT) remains the cornerstone of nuclear non-proliferation. It is also the foundation of global nuclear disarmament, as it constitutes the formal legal commitment by the nuclear-weapon States to that end. Furthermore, the NPT has established a firm relation between non-proliferation and nuclear disarmament. Both treaty objectives are not separate goals, but can only be pursued jointly and not at each other's expense. Furthermore, negotiations in the Conference on Disarmament on a non-discriminatory multilateral and internationally and effectively verifiable treaty banning the production of fissile material for nuclear weapons or other nuclear devices remain a matter of high priority.

We are cautiously optimistic that, in the course of the ongoing NPT review process, significant progress in the implementation of the NPT can be registered by the Review Conference to be held in 2005. The practical steps contained in the Final Document issued by the 2000 NPT Review Conference, which was adopted by consensus, continue to be relevant benchmarks for the systematic and progressive efforts to implement article VI of the Treaty.

Germany continues to advocate universal adherence to the NPT. All countries which have not yet done so remain called upon to sign and ratify the Treaty.

The focus on non-proliferation and the risk of nuclear terrorism does not mean that the stability and the strategic relationship between the nuclear-weapon States are no longer important. In this context, we welcome the treaty between the United States of America and Russia, signed by President Bush and President Putin in Moscow on 24 May this year, which reduces the number of operationally deployed strategic warheads to no more than 2,200 by the year 2012, as a substantial step towards the ultimate goal of completely eliminating these nuclear arsenals.

The inclusion of substrategic arsenals in nuclear arms control agreements is still outstanding. Substrategic arsenals so far have only been covered by the presidential nuclear initiative of 1991-1992. Not only would a significant reduction of substrategic nuclear weapons

(Mr. Daerr, Germany)

in a transparent and verifiable manner be of prime importance to European security, but it would also reduce risks from storage and transportation, as well as from possible terrorist attempts to gain control over these substrategic devices.

Recent reports on terrorist efforts to strive for means of explosive dissemination of radiological material, to build a so-called "dirty bomb", are alarming. This Conference should not ignore this new aspect of an old problem. Therefore, under its presidency of the Conference, Germany has suggested that the issue of radiological weapons should be revisited. Former endeavours to adopt a convention have not been successful, and with this in mind, it is not our intention to restart deliberations on the basis of a draft that is more than 10 years old. We feel it is appropriate, however, that the Conference should thoroughly discuss and examine whether further action is required.

The Chemical Weapons Convention has moved closer to universal adherence; Germany is confident that the fresh start which OPCW has made will ensure its full and balanced implementation. As a corollary, common standards of national implementation would significantly reduce the risk of the proliferation of chemical weapons material to non-State actors. Continued and timely destruction of existing chemical weapons stocks will further enhance international security. Germany, within the framework of disarmament cooperation with Russia, is making substantial and exemplary contributions to support the relevant projects.

In November this year, the resumption of the fifth Review Conference of the Biological and Toxin Weapons Convention will be another crucial item on the agenda of multilateral disarmament. Germany has spared no effort in working towards a substantial final document for the purpose of preserving the multilateral process for the strengthening of the BWC. Everybody should join such efforts in order to achieve a positive outcome of the Conference, to adopt a text that will be supported by all major actors and groups of BWC States parties. Failure this time might mean a serious setback for the Convention itself.

There is an urgent need for a multilateral instrument for curbing missile proliferation. In the recent past, various approaches to this important question have been developed. Germany, together with its partners in the European Union, has strongly supported the idea of an international code of conduct against the proliferation of ballistic missiles. We regard the international code of conduct as the most substantive and advanced initiative in this field, without precluding more ambitious ones like the Russian proposal for a global control system. After the broad participation of interested countries in the two conferences in Paris last February and in Madrid last June, we hope for universal participation in this politically-binding instrument. Germany also participated actively in the work of the United Nations Panel of Governmental Experts on Missiles.

In our view, the question of arms control in outer space is an important issue which should be addressed by the Conference in a substantive discussion. So far only weapons of mass destruction in space have been subject to an agreement. Since it is a complex matter, instead of

(Mr. Daerr, Germany)

taking an overall approach, it might be helpful to tackle it sector by sector. It remains to be seen what the outcome of such a discussion will be, especially with a view to the future treatment of this issue.

Small arms and light weapons, explosive remnants of war and landmines continue to pose a grave humanitarian problem, especially during and after regional conflicts. Despite all the welcome successes of demining, the indiscriminate killing of human beings through landmines continues. The Ottawa Convention is an important step towards the total elimination of anti-personnel mines. The fact that it has been ratified by 125 States and signed by another 17 is an encouraging success which has set standards for humanitarian international law. The Federal Government has devoted itself to the fight against all landmines that pose a threat to the civilian population and will not lessen its efforts in this field. We therefore stand ready to host the 2004 Ottawa Convention Review Conference in Germany.

The Treaty on Conventional Forces in Europe (CFE), despite originating from a past area of block-to-block confrontation, is still meaningful and has preserved its model character for conflict prevention and stability. In a historical perspective, conventional arms control has decisively contributed - in particular through the instruments of the CFE - to creating stability in Europe and consequently, to overcoming the cold war. We therefore welcome the recent Russian notification of compliance with the flank limitations of the adapted CFE Treaty.

To conclude after this "tour d'horizon", let me come back to the agenda of this Conference.

The present stalemate regarding nuclear disarmament, prevention of an arms race in outer space, fissile material cut-off, and negative security assurances is deplorable. All four areas are of acute relevance, and progress, even if it has to be step-by-step, seems as feasible as it is desirable. We should not forget that the limited membership in this sole international negotiating forum for disarmament brings with it a particular responsibility to the United Nations family for progress in the course of disarmament, arms control and non-proliferation. The Conference has a contribution to make for the solution of the problems we are facing today. Let me reiterate: Germany will spare no effort in that regard and in the same vein welcomes every initiative which would overcome the present stalemate in the conference.

The PRESIDENT: I thank the Ambassador for his statement and now give the floor to the next speaker on my list, Ambassador Dembri of Algeria.

Mr. DEMBRI (Algeria) (translated from French): Mr. President, a few weeks ago - more specifically, during the intersessional period - a group of five ambassadors, whose delegations in the Conference on Disarmament come from different geographical regions, met to give some thought together on ways and means that would enable our forum to emerge from the stalemate in which it has languished for many months now. Prompted by pure goodwill and by their friendship, they put together an entirely informal paper, setting forth some ideas relating to essential matters on the agenda, as a rough sketch for a programme of work. Since then this paper has been in circulation; it has received comments and a range of different assessments.

(Mr. Dembri, Algeria)

This, without doubt, is the best fate that could befall a collective and entirely disinterested initiative whose sole purpose is to restart dialogue at this crucial point in the life of the Conference on Disarmament.

Today this group of ambassadors has entrusted me with the honour of speaking on their behalf - which I do merely as first among equals - to shed light on a quest that could promote the resumption of our work, a quest which, regrettably, seems as arduous as that for the Holy Grail undertaken by the hero Parzifal of your national poet, Wolfram von Eschenbach.

We should bear in mind first of all that this initiative is set within the continuum of our efforts, over recent years, that have brought various proposals before us. This draft is in no sense a radical departure: it is a draft that has clear links with all previous proposals, as it arises from a positive process of their synthesis, the only sort of process which can help lead us to a better understanding, which can help shed light on our situation, which can help translate our expectations and our concerns - in a word - which can help focus both the letter and the spirit that should inform the future framework for our work.

Second, we should also bear in mind that this initiative cannot claim to offer either a definite text or one - and I stress this - subject to any specific conditions. By its very nature, the text that is being circulated seeks to be corrected, amended and supplemented by all delegations, so that ultimately it can evolve and be subject to substantive and formal amendments that will turn it into a text chosen by all and for all.

In this process of pursuing contacts and seeking explanations, we followed the logical approach and started work on the draft, at the outset, with you, Mr. President, who have the onerous task of guiding our Conference at this precise time, of steering this boat in its encouraging progress toward the clear blue horizons of collective creativity. You shared your feelings with us, you gave us some advice, you commented on the ideas that had been developed and it is in this direction that we must now press forward.

The group of five ambassadors has since received very useful written proposals for amendments. The group hopes that this process of correction and amendment will gather as much momentum as possible over the 10 days to come, so that an amended and revised version of the initial preliminary draft can be decided upon and circulated to all members before the end of this month, that is, before the end of August. In this connection, we would like to receive contributions in writing, so that these may be incorporated in the revised version.

Ms. INOBUCHI (Japan): At the outset, Mr. President, let me express my pleasure in seeing you back in full strength after a refreshing one-month break. I would like to reaffirm the intention of my delegation to extend to you our full support and cooperation during your term of office. I would also like to reiterate my appreciation to Mr. Sergei Ordzhonikidze, Secretary-General of the Conference, and to the secretariat of the Conference for their support and assistance at this critical juncture.

(Ms. Inoguchi, Japan)

The Conference on Disarmament continues to face a stalemate. Our common efforts to bring it out of this impasse must continue. In his statement during the last plenary meeting, Ambassador Javits of the United States of America encouraged all members to keep a clear focus on this challenge over the break. As he pointed out, an untiring commitment is needed in this regard.

The Conference has just heard, from Ambassador Dembri of Algeria, of the initiative taken by the five distinguished ambassadors.

The initiative provides us with a historic opportunity to begin substantive work on the four key issues of greatest importance to many member States, namely, negative security assurances, nuclear disarmament, a fissile material cut-off treaty, and the prevention of an arms race in outer space. While the Japanese delegation is willing to participate actively in deliberations on the other three issues, it considers that negotiations on an FMCT are of paramount importance. Japan believes that an FMCT would contribute significantly to nuclear non-proliferation and constitute an essential building block for nuclear disarmament. Japan is eager to see the beginning of negotiations on such a treaty - it is something which we have long awaited.

A significant feature of this initiative is that it has emerged from a cross-regional group of middle Powers strongly interested in disarmament. Such a group is in a better position to identify the collective will of the international community on disarmament, overarching a difference of interests. Of no less importance, however, is the momentum created by the major Powers. The May 2002 agreement between the Russian Federation and the United States of America on strategic offensive warhead reductions has led to a favourable atmosphere in the Conference as well. In fact, during the second part of the Conference's current session, the different positions regarding the programme of work of all major countries - including China, thanks to the efforts of its distinguished ambassador - became significantly closer. Disarmament requires a harmonious combination of initiatives from various countries, which can result in significant progress. Thus, this initiative offers a real opportunity for the Conference on Disarmament further to narrow the remaining gaps and finally to achieve a much needed breakthrough.

Another advantage is that this initiative will enable the Conference on Disarmament to pursue its endeavours in a continuous manner. I highly appreciate the aim, under this initiative, that the work of the Conference should be sustained at least for the duration of the 2002 and 2003 sessions.

In addition to this basic appraisal, I would like to offer three modest suggestions as contributions to the initiative for the consideration of all delegations here.

First, my delegation understands the general idea and the philosophy on the method of work of the Conference, expressed in the initiative. This idea would seem to be self-evident, when viewed in terms of the history of the Conference on Disarmament, which has successfully negotiated disarmament instruments by adopting a method of work based on converging points

(Ms. Inoguchi, Japan)

agreed by all. In this manner, the Conference on Disarmament has the full potential to promote international peace and security, respecting the principle of undiminished security for all. Yet to articulate this idea in a text requires careful consideration if unnecessary confusion is to be avoided. And I will be willing to help the five ambassadors with the wording, if necessary.

Second, with regard to the mandate on an FMCT, my delegation believes that the report of the special coordinator, contained in document CD/1299, and the mandate contained therein present the only realistic approach to the launching of negotiations on a treaty of such significance, with unresolved issues remaining as stated in the aforementioned report. The formulation agreed twice, both in 1995 and in 1998, should be viewed in that light.

Third, while appreciating the sustainability of the work contained in the initiative, I am also aware that article 28 of the rules of procedure needs to be amended in order to settle this question permanently. My delegation essentially supports the idea of amending this article, thereby facilitating the Conference's continuation of its substantial work. In view of the differences among all delegations concerning this matter, however, overloading the decision by seeking an amendment of the rules of procedure should probably be avoided. In my view, given the special circumstances which have placed the Conference on Disarmament in a stalemate for nearly six years, it would be better for the five ambassadors simply to state that the decision on the programme of work on this occasion is taken notwithstanding article 28 of the rules of procedure.

My delegation understands that this initiative is still evolving. With this understanding, I would like to give assurances of my full support and express my utmost appreciation to the five ambassadors for their sincere and diligent efforts to bring the current stalemate to an end. Let me remind all present in this room that citizens all over the world are watching us, ardently wishing to live in a safer international environment. In this light, it is imperative that the Conference seizes this present opportunity to respond to their collective wishes by resuming its meaningful work, by promoting international peace and security. Finally, Mr. President, let me reiterate my complete faith in the direction you have chosen in guiding us toward fulfilling our responsibilities.

The PRESIDENT: I thank the ambassador for her statement and for the kind words addressed to the Chair. The next speaker on my list is the distinguished representative of the Republic of Korea, Ambassador Chung.

Mr. CHUNG (Republic of Korea): Mr. President, let me take the opportunity of my first statement under your presidency to congratulate you on your assumption of the office at this important juncture. I am confident that your leadership and rich experience in disarmament forums will guide us to a productive outcome in the Conference. I assure you of my delegation's full cooperation.



(Mr. Chung, Republic of Korea)

I also wish to extend my appreciation to Mr. Sergei Ordzhonikidze, Secretary-General of the Conference on Disarmament, Mr. Enrique Román-Morey, Deputy Secretary-General, and to the other able members of the secretariat for their contribution to our work. We hope that such efficient management of the Conference by the secretariat will continue to help this body revitalize its work.

Since the Conference on Disarmament opened its first session of this year last January, I have listened with great seriousness and appreciation to all the statements made by distinguished colleagues and by other high-level speakers. Different speakers have provided us with various perspectives on a broad range of issues of our common concern. Whatever the differences between them, I could detect certain commonalities cutting across these statements. Among other things, there is a widely shared belief that the global security environment is undergoing major changes as a result of recent events, most notably the 11 September terrorist attacks on the United States and the significant United States-Russian agreements to reduce offensive nuclear weapons and to work out a new strategic framework for the twenty-first century.

Another point is that, under these circumstances, multilateralism, rather than falling into disrepute, has been reaffirmed as a core principle of disarmament and non-proliferation. It appears that the right way to address the challenges that we have faced since last September is through political solidarity and international coalition. This belief is confirmed by the determination manifested in United Nations resolution 56/24T, on multilateral cooperation in the area of disarmament and non-proliferation and global efforts against terrorism.

Multilateral efforts should go hand-in-hand with bilateral, regional and plurilateral efforts. In April this year, we witnessed progress in the modest outcome of the first meeting of the Preparatory Committee for the 2005 NPT Review Conference and, on 27 June, in the agreement by leaders of the G8 launching the G8 Global Partnership Against the Spread of Weapons and Materials of Mass Destruction, to prevent the proliferation of weapons of mass destruction to terrorists. We welcome the development in nuclear disarmament with the signing of the Treaty of Moscow by Russia and the United States in May this year, and are also encouraged by high-level talks between China and the United States to strengthen the constructive and cooperative relations between the two countries. My delegation hopes that all these developments will provide renewed momentum for multilateral disarmament negotiations, particularly in this Conference.

Notwithstanding these positive signs, our mindset still needs to adapt further to the evolving global security environment. The Conference on Disarmament, as the single multilateral negotiating forum for disarmament, is being urged to break free from its prolonged impasse and to start its substantive work with a renewed sense of urgency. In this regard, I would like to extend my appreciation to you and your predecessors, as well as other representatives, for the strenuous efforts that you have all made over the past years to break the deadlock in the Conference's work programme.

(Mr. Chung, Republic of Korea)

Today, we stand at a critical moment when similar leadership and collective will are desperately needed to make the world safer from the real threat of weapons of mass destruction, including anthrax and dirty bombs, and to reduce the danger of proliferation not only to States of concern but also to non-State actors. Here in the Conference on Disarmament, we have a full agenda to enable us to address our concerns, including nuclear disarmament, FMCT, PAROS, and negative security assurances. Furthermore, we have the best available option in the Amorim proposal, as contained in CD/1624, which is the culmination of painstaking work to prepare agreements with flexibility and strategic ambiguity. We thus support the Amorim proposal as the basis upon which we can reach consensus on a work programme. The task remaining before us is to get out of this zero-sum mentality and instead to exercise political will and a spirit of compromise so that we may move the process forward.

Such efforts have been reflected well in many realistic proposals brought forward on the programme of work and the views expressed in most of the previous statements made by fellow representatives. We also share the views expressed by several ambassadors who stressed that every issue should be dealt with independently, without linkages to other issues.

FMCT negotiations are undoubtedly the next logical step we have to pursue as a matter of top priority. This is particularly so in view of the mandate we have already agreed upon and the commitment we made during the 2000 NPT Review Conference and in the relevant resolutions of the United Nations General Assembly. My delegation fully supports and encourages constructive efforts to facilitate the early start of negotiations on FMCT. In this context, we appreciate South Africa's substantive working paper on the fissile material treaty, circulated on 28 May in document CD/1671 and we extend our thanks to the Netherlands for having hosted an open-ended informal meeting on 7 June.

Despite the different views that persist on the mandate of PAROS, the differences seem to have become narrower and more countries have begun to demonstrate their political will to resolve the issue. We will therefore welcome any proposals or initiatives which could contribute to consensus on the programme of work. In this regard, my delegation also appreciates the most recent proposal put forward by the group of five distinguished ambassadors. To reach a final agreement on the work programme, however, it will require all member States to show further flexibility and wisdom for the common objective of international peace.

The Republic of Korea, given its unique geopolitical security environment and the long-standing threat of weapons of mass destruction that has hung over it, has been, and will continue to be, unreservedly committed to the cause of multilateral disarmament and non-proliferation. This unflinching commitment is demonstrated by the fact that it has ratified all treaties on weapons of mass destruction, such as the NPT, the BWC, the CWC, and the CTBT. My country is now expediting the domestic procedure required for ratifying the IAEA Additional Protocol and, as a member of several important export-control arrangements, including the Missile Technology Control Regime (MTCR), the Australia Group, and the Nuclear Suppliers Group, we are doing our part to reinforce global non-proliferation efforts.

(Mr. Chung, Republic of Korea)

In this regard, we support the continuing efforts of countries within and outside the MTCR to adopt the international code of conduct against ballistic missile proliferation in a transparent and constructive manner, and we will host the plenary meeting of the Nuclear Suppliers Group in Korea in May 2003. In addition, since the tragic incident of 11 September, we have continuously worked to strengthen various anti-terrorist measures by joining in the global efforts against terrorism.

Mr. President, I should like to take this opportunity to express my appreciation to delegations for entrusting me with the important task of serving as the special coordinator on the review of the agenda. Even though coordination on procedural issues can be no substitute for substantive work, I have concluded useful bilateral and small group consultations with the full support of delegations. I hope to submit a report on the outcome of my consultations concerning the review of the agenda during the last few months before the end of August.

The PRESIDENT: I thank the representative of the Republic of Korea for his statement and the kind words addressed to the Chair. The next speaker on my list is the distinguished representative of South Africa, Mr. Tom Markram.

Mr. MARKRAM (South Africa): Mr. President, I would like first to congratulate you on your assumption of the presidency. My delegation will of course continue to lend you its full support and continued cooperation.

I have asked for the floor today to voice South Africa's support for the Chinese and Russian Federation initiative on the prevention of an arms race in outer space, in the form of a working paper introduced on 27 June. South Africa regards the prevention of an arms race as one of the priority issues in the field of international peace and security. We therefore welcome this timely initiative and support the general thrust and content of the working paper. It was pointed out in the introductory remarks on the paper that it had been decided to refrain from making amendments based on comments and observations that had been made during the earlier briefing at the Chinese mission. We had specific comments on that occasion, particularly concerning the conditionality in the entry into force clause, and we hope that we will be able to elaborate further upon them in an ad hoc committee setting.

South Africa introduced a working paper on the possible scope and requirements of a fissile materials treaty on 23 May and this was circulated as document CD/1671. I have requested in a letter to our Secretary-General that an addendum to that document be circulated, outlining our proposal in a diagram format. It is trusted that it may assist delegations in visualizing how that process should work.

The PRESIDENT: I thank the representative of South Africa for his statement and the kind words addressed to the Chair. The next speaker on my list is the distinguished representative of Malaysia, Mr. Raja Reza.

Mr. RAJA REZA (Malaysia): Mr. President, on behalf of the Malaysian delegation, allow me to congratulate you on your assumption of the presidency of the Conference on Disarmament. We assure you of our full cooperation during the German presidency. It is our hope that, under your able leadership and guidance, the Conference will be able to commence its substantive work as soon as possible.

Malaysia welcomes the working paper jointly submitted by the delegations of China and the Russian Federation on 27 June 2002, entitled "Possible elements for a future international legal agreement on the prevention of the deployment of weapons in outer space, the threat or use of force against outer space objects", and circulated in document CD/1679. Malaysia supports this proposal, which aims to prevent the deployment of weapons in outer space and the threat or use of force against outer space objects. Malaysia believes that an arms race in outer space should be prevented through a legally-binding instrument and that the peaceful use of outer space should be guaranteed.

Outer space is the common heritage of mankind. It should be explored and utilized for peaceful purposes. The exploitation of outer space should be to the benefit of humankind.

The development and testing of weapon systems in outer space and the use of space systems for military purposes are matters of deep concern to Malaysia. We feel that, if left unchecked, this intensification of military activities could trigger an arms race in outer space. Outer space should not be allowed to become an arena for military confrontation.

Although there are several legal agreements related to outer space, including the 1967 Treaty on Principles Governing the Activities of States in the Exploration and Use of Outer Space, Including the Moon and Other Celestial Bodies, these are insufficient, especially under presentday conditions. In this context, Malaysia believes that only a legal instrument prohibiting the deployment of weapons in outer space and the prevention of the threat or use of force against outer space objects can eliminate the emerging threat of the weaponization of outer space.

As the sole multilateral negotiating forum for disarmament issues, the Conference on Disarmament is the most appropriate forum to negotiate such a treaty. General Assembly resolution 56/23 reiterates that the Conference on Disarmament, as the single multilateral disarmament negotiating forum, has the primary role in the negotiation of a multilateral agreement or agreements, as appropriate, on the prevention of an arms race in outer space in all its aspects.

In this regard, Malaysia supports the early establishment of an ad hoc committee on PAROS. The Conference on Disarmament has examined a number of important issues pertaining to the prevention of an arms race in outer space through the Ad Hoc Committee on PAROS, established by the Conference from 1985-1994. Since 1995, however, the Conference has not been able to re-establish this Ad Hoc Committee, owing to a lack of agreement on its mandate.

(Mr. Raja Reza, Malaysia)

Malaysia wishes to call upon all States, particularly those with advanced space capabilities, to contribute actively to the objective of the peaceful use of outer space and of the prevention of an arms race in outer space and to refrain from actions contrary to that objective and to the relevant existing treaties, for the sake of maintaining international peace and security.

Concerning the proposed treaty, Malaysia is of the view that the elements of cooperation and assistance for peaceful uses should be among its salient features. It is suggested that, as a further confidence-building measure, there should be a moratorium on the testing of all kinds of weapons and on the deployment of weapons in outer space.

The joint working paper submitted by the delegations of China and the Russian Federation provides a very useful outline of some possible elements of an international legal agreement on PAROS. We wish to thank both delegations for their initiative, which would contribute to our efforts to develop a treaty preventing the deployment of weapons and an arms race in outer space. The concept of maintaining outer space as a weapon-free environment, which is supported by the majority of States, should be recognized as an area of prime multilateral importance.

The PRESIDENT: I thank the representative of Malaysia for his statement and for the kind words addressed to the Chair. Although that concludes my list of speakers for today, I see that the distinguished representative of Iran has asked for the floor.

Mr. SOLTANIEH (Islamic Republic of Iran): Mr. President, may I express the appreciation of my delegation for your competent chairmanship and the hope that, under your presidency, we will be able to start substantive discussions and relaunch the work of the Conference on Disarmament soon.

With regard to the initiative put forward by five distinguished ambassadors, introduced by our distinguished friend, Ambassador Dembri, I would like at this stage to make a very preliminary comment while we wait for instructions from our capital. We have noticed some positive points in the proposal and believe that it merits very careful consideration. We also consider the attempt very positive, an attempt at breaking the present stalemate in the Conference on Disarmament and, we hope, reactivating this body once again. We consider the attempt positive in that it moves in the direction of giving due consideration to the concerns expressed by some delegates regarding previous proposals. We hope that we will proceed in the right direction. At a later stage, my delegation will of course be in a position to give its detailed comments either directly to the distinguished proponents of the proposal or here in the Conference itself.

The PRESIDENT: I thank the representative of the Islamic Republic of Iran for his statement and the kind words to the Chair. The distinguished representative of Belarus has asked for the floor.

Mr. MALEVICH (Belarus) (translated from Russian): Mr. President, first of all I would like once again to assure you of the support of the Belarusian delegation for your efforts in this very difficult time for the Conference on Disarmament and to wish you every success in your presidency of this distinguished forum.

Unfortunately, since our delegation has not received the text of the initiative put forward by the five ambassadors, I cannot at this point make any comments, except perhaps for the following. Any initiative which aims to lead us out of this impasse deserves the highest praise and the closest attention from all participants in the Conference on Disarmament.

I would like also to take this opportunity to inform participants in the Conference that, in order to ensure compliance by Belarus with the OSCE document on small arms and light weapons, adopted on 24 November 2000 at the 308th plenary meeting of the OSCE forum for Security and Cooperation, on 15 July 2002 the President of the Republic of Belarus signed a decree on compliance by the Republic of Belarus with the international obligations deriving from the OSCE document on small arms and light weapons. That decree stipulates the bodies responsible for implementation of this document and establishes the procedure for the preparation and presentation of information on light firearms to other OSCE States parties. Adoption of that decree fully will make possible full compliance by Belarus with its obligations under the OSCE document on light firearms and affords one more example of the consistent policy of our country aimed at strengthening international and European security through compliance with measures in the area of arms control.

The PRESIDENT: I thank the representative of Belarus for his statement and for the kind words to the Chair. Are there any other delegations wishing to take the floor? That would seem not the case and our list of speakers for today is therefore concluded.

As I have no more speakers, I would like to make some remarks on behalf of the presidency. Since our last plenary on 27 June, the German presidency has held various consultations, both here in Geneva and at the level of Governments, with the aim of bringing us nearer to common ground on the so-called "four issues".

I would like to reiterate on this occasion what I said in my opening remarks on 27 June. We need more movement in positions, if there really is a wish to reach common ground. I would also like to reiterate that the German presidency, both here in Geneva and at the government level, will continue to make every effort to bring the Conference on Disarmament back to substantive work.

In that regard, in my opening remarks on 27 June, I also appealed to delegations to come up with ideas and proposals. Against that background and in this spirit - and also, as President of the Conference, without taking a position on the substance - I welcome the information given us by Ambassador Dembri today of an initiative by five of our distinguished colleagues.

(The President)

As just underlined by Ambassador Daerr in his statement, the German presidency of the Conference on Disarmament has suggested that the issue of radiological weapons should be revisited. I would like to add that, bearing in mind that former endeavours to adopt a convention have not been successful, it is not the intention of the German presidency to restart deliberations on the basis of a more than 10-year-old draft. We do feel, however, that it is appropriate for the Conference to deal with this important issue.

To this end, we propose that the Conference examine whether additional endeavours are required to detect and, where necessary and appropriate, to fill possible gaps in the international legal framework. Germany believes that the prospects of such weapons falling into the hands of non-State actors justify the resubmission of this issue to this forum. In my statement on 27 June, I announced that it was my intention to hold open-ended informal consultations on that issue. I invite interested delegations to open-ended informal consultations to discuss the way forward on the issue of radiological weapons after our next plenary next week on Thursday, 8 August. I will circulate a discussion paper in advance, through the secretariat.

Does any delegation now wish to take the floor? That seems not to be the case. This therefore concludes our business for today.

The next plenary meeting of the Conference will be held on Thursday, 8 August 2002, at 10 a.m.

The meeting rose at 11.15 a.m.

# CONFERENCE ON DISARMAMENT

CD/PV.912  
29 August 2002

ENGLISH

---

## FINAL RECORD OF THE NINE HUNDRED AND TWELFTH PLENARY MEETING

Held at the Palais des Nations, Geneva,  
on Thursday, 29 August 2002, at 10.15 a.m.

President:

Mr. András Szabó

(Hungary)



The PRESIDENT: I declare open the 912th plenary meeting of the Conference on Disarmament.

At the outset, I would like to extend on behalf of the Conference a warm welcome to the new Permanent Representative of Venezuela, Ambassador Blancanieve Portocarrero, and to assure her of our cooperation and support in her new assignment.

Today I have on my list of speakers the representatives of Egypt, Algeria, Italy, Venezuela, Japan, China and Indonesia - seven speakers in all.

Before giving them the floor, however, I would like to remind you that, immediately following this plenary meeting, we shall hold an informal plenary devoted to the first reading of the annual draft report to the United Nations General Assembly, which was distributed yesterday as document CD/WP.527.

I now give the floor to the representative of Egypt, Ambassador Naéla Gabr.

Ms. GABR (Egypt) (translated from Arabic): Mr. President, allow me at the outset to congratulate you sincerely on your assumption of the presidency of the Conference on Disarmament and to assure you of my delegation's full support for your endeavours to revitalize the work of the Conference. I would also like to convey my appreciation to your predecessors, the ambassadors of Ethiopia, Finland, France and Germany. I also wish to pay tribute to Mr. Sergei Ordzhonikidze, Secretary-General of the Conference, Mr. Enrique Román-Morey, Deputy-Secretary-General, and the members of the secretariat for their dedication to the work of the Conference. Our gratitude also goes to the three special coordinators who were appointed to this session, for their efforts and for the comprehensive reports that they presented to us at our plenary meeting last week.

As our annual session draws to a close, it is clear from our deliberations that the prevention of an arms race in outer space is one of the crucial issues raised by delegations in their statements at our plenary meetings. We welcome this renewed interest in PAROS by the Conference on Disarmament, particularly as Egypt will be introducing the draft resolution on PAROS to the First Committee in a few weeks' time. We hope that this resolution, which we present in rotation with Sri Lanka, will receive unanimous support, as in previous years. Egypt's longstanding commitment to PAROS stems from its unshakeable belief that outer space is the common heritage of humanity and that it should therefore be used solely for peaceful purposes in order to benefit humankind.

Egypt, together with the majority of countries, is firmly convinced that a comprehensive and binding legal instrument is the only means for remedying the glaring deficiencies in the system of law concerned with outer space, and particularly the absence of rules prohibiting the proliferation of weapons other than weapons of mass destruction. The Final Document of the first special session of the General Assembly devoted to disarmament affirms, in this regard, that in order to prevent an arms race in outer space, further measures should be taken and appropriate

(Ms. Gabr, Egypt)

negotiations held. In this connection, in its resolution 56/23, the General Assembly: "reiterates that the Conference on Disarmament, as the single multilateral disarmament negotiating forum, has the primary role in the negotiation of a multilateral agreement or agreements, as appropriate, on the prevention of an arms race in outer space in all its aspects".

The Conference on Disarmament extensively addressed the issues pertaining to PAROS through the work carried out by the ad hoc committee on PAROS, under the auspices of the Conference, between 1985 and 1994. The conclusions of the first ad hoc committee on PAROS, which was chaired by Egypt in 1985, remain as relevant today as when they first underlined the importance and urgency of preventing an arms race in outer space. We hope that the ad hoc committee on PAROS will be re-established as soon as possible.

In this context, Egypt welcomes the joint working paper submitted by the delegations of China and the Russian Federation and co-sponsored by Viet Nam, Indonesia, Belarus, Zimbabwe and Syria on 27 June 2002 and entitled "Possible elements for a future international legal agreement on the prevention of the deployment of weapons in outer space; the threat or use of force against outer-space objects". This document is a first step towards addressing the issue of the demilitarization of outer space and will make a valuable contribution to the future work of the ad hoc committee on PAROS once it has been established. While we support the main thrust of the working paper, we take the view that any future legal instrument concerned with the prevention of an arms race in outer space should ban the military use of outer space. It should also include meaningful provisions on cooperation and assistance in order to ensure that, in accordance with the terms of the preamble to the 1967 Outer Space Treaty, "the exploration and use of outer space shall be carried out for the benefit and in the interests of all countries, irrespective of their degree of economic or scientific development".

This has gained further importance as the gap is widening between countries which have space capabilities and those that do not. In addition, we have a number of substantive comments which we would like to make once the ad hoc committee on PAROS has been established.

We are witnessing continuous technological and scientific developments in the commercial and scientific uses of outer space. As a result, humanity is increasingly dependent on outer space in a growing number of spheres, ranging from communications to agriculture. These global developments underscore the responsibility which the international community bears towards present and future generations for preserving outer space as an area for cooperation rather than military conflict. The consequences of an arms race in outer space could be devastating.

We should like to express our concern about the adverse effects of such a race on efforts to achieve nuclear disarmament, which is the Conference's top priority. Egypt believes that neither global nor regional peace and security can be achieved by a doctrine of military hegemony and sophisticated weapons systems, but rather that security relies on cooperation between all States. In this connection, the issue of PAROS demonstrates the crucial importance of multilateralism in the field of disarmament. Indeed, all countries, and in particular countries

(Ms. Gabr, Egypt)

with significant space capabilities, would benefit from the conclusion of a legally binding instrument that would protect outer space against a costly and dangerous arms race. In this regard, we reaffirm our support for the commencement of negotiations by the Conference on Disarmament on a comprehensive regime for the prevention of the use of outer space for all military purposes.

The PRESIDENT: I thank the representative of Egypt for her statement and for the kind words addressed to the Chair. I now give the floor to the representative of Algeria, Ambassador Dembri.

Mr. DEMBRI (Algeria) (translated from French): Mr. President, I too first of all would like to congratulate you on your assumption of the presidency of the Conference on Disarmament and to assure you of the cooperation and full support of the Algerian delegation in the performance of your functions. Hungary is not an unknown country to Algerians and, to those of my generation who were involved in the fight for liberation, your country has stood as a great national model. One of Hungary's great national heroes has always been a source of admiration to us: this is the charismatic figure of Lajos Kossuth, who remains a clear symbol to us to this day. We were also hugely impressed by the remarkable political breakthrough achieved by your country in the nineteenth century in that it was able to establish a kingdom without a king.

I would also like to take this opportunity to express our sincere thanks to your predecessor, Ambassador Volker Heinsberg of Germany for his unceasing efforts during his presidency to overcome the present stalemate and to extend our best wishes of welcome to our new colleague from Venezuela.

You will recall that, on 31 July, on behalf of a group of five ambassadors to the Conference on Disarmament, namely, Ambassador Lint of Belgium, Ambassador Reyes of Colombia, Ambassador Salander of Sweden, Ambassador Vega of Chile and myself, I introduced an initiative on a draft programme of work for the Conference incorporating all - or virtually all - the points set forth in the Decalogue.

At the time we said that this draft would evolve as it was further enriched and amended, and that it could give rise to a revised version. It is this revised version which has been circulated to you and which is being introduced today, 29 August 2002, by the group of five ambassadors. This revised version is the outcome of a series of consultations with members of the Conference on Disarmament, since the initiative was welcomed with interest and proved conducive to discussion, which helped it evolve into something in which people on all sides were able to vest their hopes.

We have received written proposals for amendments; several delegations have shared with us their views and suggestions during the discussions which we held with them. We would like here to thank them all, since they have provided me with this opportunity today, on behalf of my colleagues, to introduce the revised version.

(Mr. Dembri, Algeria)

It is to be hoped that this revised version - once, of course it has been duly appraised by the Conference on Disarmament in plenary session - will open the path to consensus on a work programme for next year, 2003.

The new text retains the idea of setting up four ad hoc committees to deal with negative security assurances, nuclear disarmament, fissile materials and outer space, and it also retains the appointment of three special coordinators entrusted with leading consultations on new types of weapons of mass destruction and the new systems of such weapons, on a comprehensive programme of disarmament and, finally, on transparency in armaments.

If we look now at the main changes to the text, since 31 July, we will see, first of all, that we have finally opted for a decision text, together with a statement by the President, rather than a preamble, which is why the preamble has been dropped. Second, the aspects related to the more extensive time-frame resulting from the revision of articles 27 and 28 of the rules of procedure have also been dropped and the current procedures based on strict adherence to the annual session programme remain in place.

As for those issues which would now seem to be ripe for immediate agreement, first of all, the idea of an ad hoc committee on negative security assurances today enjoys general support. Second, the ad hoc committee on FMCT is also fairly widely supported. You may note that stockpiles are no longer included in the text among the elements already agreed on in the Shannon mandate, the Amorim proposal and the excellent document produced by our colleague from South Africa, which has now been officially submitted. Third, the idea of creating an ad hoc committee on nuclear disarmament is also making favourable progress and should enjoy universal support very soon. Fourth, the appointment of three special coordinators also enjoys general support.

The one issue which remains under discussion is clearly that of the establishment of an ad hoc committee on outer space, the PAROS committee. There are of course a number of documents on this issue and I note in particular the Russian-Chinese document, which is of prime importance. The group of five ambassadors has observed, however, that the Conference on Disarmament is currently being pulled in two directions, one calling for negotiation on a treaty to prohibit the militarization of outer space, which we call the maximalist approach, and another recommending that this issue be tackled through discussions and the exploration of different scenarios, an approach that we have dubbed minimalist.

We have tried to resolve this problem by defining an immediate approach, which proposes a plan that evolves over time and that could, in the long run, enable us together to find the most appropriate formulations acceptable by and for everybody. Debate on the issue of PAROS will still be required, however, and we hope that the Conference on Disarmament will find the ways and means of reaching a negotiating mandate at the earliest possible stage.

(Mr. Dembri, Algeria)

As you know, our group's initiative builds on earlier proposals designed to arrive at a programme of work acceptable by and for everybody, as I have just stated. It is by no means our intention, therefore, for our initiative to replace earlier proposals or to cast aspersions on them. Instead, it forms part of a sort of continuum of the initiatives submitted to date and of course it endeavours to establish connections between these initiatives. For that reason you will be bound to find kinships and similarities with other texts in the various draft decisions contained in our initiatives, but you will also find in them a determination to go beyond the difficulties, and to arrive at consensus, to overcome the difficulties with which we are all so familiar and which we hardly need mention here.

Finally, this initiative is designed to stimulate positive debate, even if the weight of the international situation and the new strategic positions being struck continue to press down on our work. Within our group, we are all imbued with the sole desire to establish a climate of work which is open to debate and to dialogue, in order to reach the necessary flexibility and compromises which would allow the Conference to carry out its mandate. We hope that this approach will satisfy all delegations and, where appropriate, that we will be able to opt for a pragmatic approach whereby we deal with those items which might be considered as taken for granted. This is to say, if we cannot agree on all the mandates, we should at least be able to draw up a partial work programme covering those mandates which enjoy general support.

In that way, if we do not reach rapid agreement on PAROS, further consultations could be launched on the issue, so as to resolve it as best possible. That is why the presidential declaration contained in our initiative notes the positive nature of collective efforts to attain a programme of work and recommends that the members of the Conference on Disarmament work together in a spirit of dialogue to reach the necessary compromises.

It is for this reason too that all the provisions contained in this non-paper, including the draft presidential statement, are still subject to amendment and revision.

Mr. President, for the purpose of officially tabling this non-paper, or this informal paper, in the record of our meeting, I would like to hand over to my distinguished colleague, the chargé d'affaires of Chile, Mr. Alfredo Labbé for him to read it out.

The PRESIDENT: I thank the representative of Algeria for his statement and Chile now has the floor.

Mr. LABBÉ (Chile): Mr. President, I intend only to read in English the text of the non-paper, entitled: "Initiative of the Ambassadors Dembri, Lint, Reyes, Salander and Vega: proposal of a programme of work".

(Mr. Labbé, Chile)

The text reads as follows:

“Taking into account several proposals tabled since 1999, the Conference on Disarmament decides to establish, for the duration of the current session, the following programme of work, in respect of the elements of the agenda of the Conference.

“First, the Conference establishes for the duration of the current session an ad hoc committee under agenda item 4, entitled ‘Effective international arrangements to assure non-nuclear-weapon States against the use or threat of use of nuclear weapons’, to negotiate with a view to reaching agreement on effective international arrangements to assure non-nuclear-weapon States against the use or threat of use of nuclear weapons. These arrangements could take the form of an internationally binding instrument.

“The ad hoc committee shall present a report to the Conference on Disarmament on the progress of its work before the conclusion of the current session.

“The mandate of the ad hoc committee shall be reviewed as appropriate, taking into consideration all relevant views and proposals and the prospects for future work.

“Second, the Conference establishes, for the duration of the current session, an ad hoc committee, under agenda item 1, entitled ‘Cessation of the nuclear arms race and nuclear disarmament’, to deal with nuclear disarmament. The ad hoc committee shall exchange information and views on practical steps for progressive and systematic efforts to attain this objective and, in doing so, shall examine approaches towards potential future work of a multilateral character.

“In discharging its functions, the ad hoc committee will take into account current efforts and existing proposals and views, as well as proposals that may emerge from the study and discussion.

“The ad hoc committee shall present a report to the Conference on Disarmament on the progress of its work before the conclusion of the current session.

“The mandate of the ad hoc committee shall be reviewed as appropriate, taking into consideration all relevant views and proposals and the prospects for future work.

“Third, the Conference establishes, for the duration of the current session, an ad hoc committee under agenda item 1, entitled ‘Cessation of the nuclear arms race and nuclear disarmament’, which shall negotiate, on the basis of the report of the special coordinator, contained in document CD/1299, and the mandate contained therein, a non-discriminatory, multilateral and internationally and effectively verifiable treaty banning the production of fissile material for nuclear weapons or other nuclear explosive devices.

(Mr. Labbé, Chile)

“The ad hoc committee shall present a report to the Conference on Disarmament on the progress of its work before the conclusion of the current session.

“Fourth, the Conference establishes, for the duration of the current session, an ad hoc committee under agenda item 3, entitled ‘Prevention of an arms race in outer space’, to deal with the prevention of an arms race in outer space. The ad hoc committee shall identify and examine, without limitation and without prejudice, any specific topics or proposals, which could include confidence-building or transparency measures, general principles, treaty commitments and the elaboration of a regime capable of preventing an arms race in outer space. In doing so, the ad hoc committee shall take appropriate account of the needs to contribute actively to the objective of the peaceful use of outer space and the prevention of an arms race there, while also promoting international stability and respecting the principle of undiminished security for all.

“The ad hoc committee shall present a report to the Conference on Disarmament on the progress of its work before the conclusion of the current session.

“The mandate of the ad hoc committee shall be reviewed as appropriate, taking into consideration all relevant views and proposals and the prospects for future work.

“Fifth, the Conference appoints a special coordinator, under agenda item 5, entitled ‘New types of weapons of mass destruction and new systems of such weapons; radiological weapons’, to seek the views of its members on the most appropriate way to deal with this issue.

“In implementing this decision, the special coordinator shall take into consideration all relevant views and proposals, present and future.

“The Conference requests the special coordinator to present a report before the end of the current session.

“Sixth, the Conference appoints a special coordinator under agenda item 6, entitled ‘Comprehensive programme of disarmament’, to seek the view of its members on the most appropriate way to deal with this issue.

“In implementing this decision, the special coordinator shall take into consideration all relevant views and proposals, present and future.

“The Conference requests the special coordinator to present a report before the end of the current session.

“Seventh, the Conference appoints a special coordinator under agenda item 7, entitled ‘Transparency in armaments’, to seek the views of its members on the most appropriate way to deal with the questions related to this item.

(Mr. Labbé, Chile)

"In implementing this decision, the special coordinator shall take into consideration all relevant views and proposals, present and future.

"The Conference requests the special coordinator to present a report before the end of the current session.

"Presidential declaration: The Conference on Disarmament, the sole multilateral forum of negotiations as stated in rule 1 of the rules of procedure, considered many proposals aimed at achieving a consensus on a programme of work.

"These proposals reflect the importance that all delegations attach to the Conference in fulfilling its mandate and in addressing the aspirations of the international community.

"Taking into account these several proposals, the Conference on Disarmament decides to establish, for the duration of the current session, a programme of work, in respect of the elements of the agenda of the Conference.

"This will require that all member States work together to build on converging points which could lead, in time, to international instruments acceptable for all."

The PRESIDENT: I thank the representatives of Algeria and Chile for their joint statement providing us with additional information on the initiative of the five former presidents of the Conference on Disarmament. I also express my thanks to Ambassador Dembri for his kind words addressed to the Chair, particularly his comments on some historic links between our two countries. I now give the floor to the representative of Italy, Ambassador Maiolini.

Mr. MAIOLINI (Italy): Mr. President, it is a pleasure to take the floor under your presidency and I avail myself of this opportunity to congratulate you and your country on the assumption of this important responsibility.

Italy assures you the full cooperation of its delegation in support of your endeavours within the Conference on Disarmament, as you outlined them in your introductory statement.

I take the floor following the statements of Ambassador Dembri and Minister Labbé who - on behalf of Ambassador Lint, Ambassador Reyes, Ambassador Salander and Ambassador Vega - have just illustrated the proposal for a programme of work that Italy had already welcomed in the form presented to this body by the same Ambassador Dembri.

The new version, which Ambassador Dembri expanded upon in his statement a few moments ago, meets with the approval of the Italian delegation. The proposal is evolutionary in nature. It looks shorter and more concise than the previous draft and reflects major improvements on issues of substantial importance. As far as the presidential declaration is concerned, the new wording seems to us to be moving in the right direction.



(Mr. Maiolini, Italy)

Taking into consideration the activities of the last few years, this proposal of the five ambassadors gives us reason for encouragement and well represents the strong interest of the Conference's member States in injecting energy into our work and our activities and opening up new perspectives for this institution.

The PRESIDENT: I thank the representative of Italy for his statement and for the kind words addressed to the Chair. I now give the floor to the representative of Venezuela, Ambassador Blancanieve Portocarrero.

Ms. PORTOCARRERO (Venezuela) (translated from Spanish): Mr. President, first of all I wish to express my pleasure at participating in this distinguished forum, the sole such body in the United Nations system for multilateral negotiations, as these negotiations centre on what is one of the most important challenges of our times, namely, disarmament - the cornerstone of international peace and security.

I would also like to express thanks to the Secretary-General of the Conference, Mr. Sergei Ordzhonikidze, and the Deputy Secretary-General, Mr. Enrique Román Morey, as well as to the secretariat team, and to convey my appreciation to the distinguished ambassadors and other delegates in this hall.

I believe that the concept of disarmament is of particular importance to the culture of peace. Peace, international security and the well-being of humankind constitute the great paradigm of our time and challenge the international community to take timely and concerted action to ensure the strengthening of disarmament as an indispensable mechanism for bringing about the culture of peace.

My country and Government, that I have the honour of representing, share these principles in the certainty that there can be no peace or progress as long as the threats of war and destruction persist. The enormous efforts that we are all making in order to grapple with the evermore serious problems facing today's globalized society, a society based on relations that are increasingly interdependent, seem as nothing when confronted by the constant threat posed by the build-up of evermore sophisticated arms.

Disarmament and development, disarmament and peace, disarmament and human rights are important conceptual pairings that merit our careful consideration. The impact of the use of weapons in all their forms remains extremely serious in today's world, as witnessed by the disastrous consequences that we see around us daily; the wholesale destruction of populations, terrorism, the displacement of people, the maiming of innocent victims, a politics of instability and the rise of poverty, among other symptoms, all of which urge the international community to embark on a civilizing crusade and to show real political commitment to the abolition, reduction or limitation of the different types of weapons that exist at present, including the demilitarization of outer space, which is now an urgent imperative.

(Ms. Portocarrero, Venezuela)

The safeguarding of peace and respect for human rights that are constantly violated, necessitate national, regional and global efforts and this is the essential role of our Conference.

The Bolivarian Republic of Venezuela assigns paramount importance to all those measures which will contribute, in a balanced and progressive manner, to general and complete nuclear disarmament, as called for on several occasions by the international community through resolutions in the United Nations General Assembly. We have at our disposal legal instruments that oblige States to adopt important measures in this regard, such as the Non-Proliferation Treaty, the Comprehensive Nuclear-Test-Ban Treaty - which, I am pleased to inform you, was ratified by my country on 3 May 2002 in New York, the strengthening of the IAEA inspections system and the agreements recently signed by the United States of America and the Russian Federation on weapons reductions.

Yet, we are still far from the goal towards which we aspire: general and complete nuclear disarmament under an effectively verifiable legal regime. Nuclear proliferation, both vertical and horizontal, must be a central feature of the negotiations which we hope will take place in this forum.

We also consider that issues such as the cessation of the production of fissile material should be taken up in tandem with other related subjects, such as the negative security assurances offered by nuclear-weapon States, which should be provided in a legally binding document assuring non-nuclear States that they will never be subjected to the use or the threat of the use of these weapons. In addition, we strongly urge those States that have not yet done so, to join the existing arrangements for the limitation of nuclear arms and to do so without further delay.

The Bolivarian Republic of Venezuela considers, furthermore, that the existing legal regime for outer space is still not entirely adequate. This common heritage of humankind should be the subject of additional measures to prevent the deployment of offensive military devices or other installations that might endanger the security of States. This position of our country on this subject was manifested in its support for resolution 55/122 of 1996, by means of which the General Assembly reaffirmed that the exploration and use of outer space should serve peaceful purposes and stressed the importance of cooperation in attaining this goal.

At the regional level, at the Fourth Space Conference of the Americas, our position was that we should move forward on a united front in the development of space activities for peaceful purposes through better scientific and technological cooperation in the aerospace arena, by supporting international bodies such as the Commission for the Peaceful Use of Outer Space and the Office for Outer Space Affairs in their commitment to implement programmes and projects designed to promote a better use of space science and technology. One of the major conclusions of that meeting was recognition of the need that all countries in the region should make headway in ratifying treaties and other international legal instruments related to legal protection of outer space.

(Ms. Portocarrero, Venezuela)

Accordingly, on 26 June 2002, we supported the document submitted by China and the Russian Federation entitled "Possible elements for a future legal convention on preventing deployment of weapons in outer space and the use of or threat of use of force against objects in outer space". In this connection, we would like to call to mind the relevance of General Assembly resolution 56/23, which emphasizes the urgent need to initiate substantive work in this Conference to deal with the prevention of an arms race in outer space. In the light of all these considerations we continue to regard the aforementioned proposal as a text that contains the essential elements to meet the legitimate security and defence concerns of the international community, concerns which are therefore of immediate relevance to the work of the Conference on Disarmament.

We remain particularly concerned by the lack of progress in respect of the Biological Weapons Convention. The failure to achieve consensus during the Convention's fifth Review Conference, which was held in November 2001 and, in particular, the lack of progress in the ad hoc group dealing with the protocol which will lead to the achievement of an inspection mechanism should be the focus of greater attention.

We also attach great importance to the Organization for the Prohibition of Chemical Weapons and believe that has an important role to play in the realm of chemical disarmament and the effective and strict control, on an international scale, of all types of weapons of mass destruction.

We hope that the Executive Council will continue its excellent performance of the work that we entrusted to it in implementing the Convention and we would like to reassure the technical secretariat of our support in achieving the goals set for the Organization.

We would like to recall that Latin America was one of the first areas in the world to renounce the military use of nuclear energy, through the Treaty of Tlatelolco, by which it created the control body known as the Agency for the Prohibition of Nuclear Weapons in Latin America and the Caribbean (OPANAL). The commitment of the region has been strengthened since the signing of the Treaty, not only through the extensive accession by the countries of the region, but also through the initiatives launched by subregional groups, which both complement and strengthen this unique feature of Latin America and helps transform it into a significant contribution to international and regional peace and security.

We should also note the Lima Commitment, entered into by the Andean countries. On 17 June 2002, the ministers of defence and the foreign ministers signed the Andean Charter for Peace and Security and for the Limitation and Control of Foreign Defence Spending which has been circulated as an official document of this Conference.

Besides the importance evident from its title and the measures to which its signatories commit themselves, this instrument is of fundamental importance for the development of our countries, by rechanneling their resources into social investments capable of enhancing the quality of life enjoyed by our peoples.

(Ms. Portocarrero, Venezuela)

Mr. President, to conclude I would like to reiterate my country's commitment to the mission of this Conference, to live up to the expectations of future generations and, to this end, it is my earnest hope that together we can bridge the narrow gaps that divide us and start and launch the peace negotiations which the entire international community is awaiting from our Conference.

Let us uncover the creative capacities that lie deep within us. Let us engage in dialogue and deep reflection and although many hearts remain hardened, let us say it again: seek and you will find, we shall seek peace and we shall find it. We clearly have before us a long road beset with obstacles, but it will be illuminated by the light of transparent and reconstructive dialogue. Let us sow roses and remove the thorns; let us, quite simply, place ourselves at the service of love, of our love for humankind and humankind will be eternally grateful.

The PRESIDENT: I thank the representative of Venezuela for her first statement in the Conference and for the kind words addressed to the Chair. I now give the floor to the representative of Japan, Ambassador Inoguchi.

Ms. INOBUCHI (Japan): At the outset, I would like to reaffirm, Mr. President, the intention of my delegation to extend its full support and cooperation to you in your performance of the important task of guiding the Conference as it nears the end of its annual session.

The Conference has just learnt, from the distinguished representative of Algeria, Ambassador Mohamed Salah Dembri, and Minister Labbé, Deputy Permanent Representative of the Mission of Chile, the state of play of the five ambassadors' initiative on the programme of work. I am pleased to hear that, as a result of their efforts, significant progress has been made in identifying converging points as well as remaining differences. I would like to express, once again, my sincere appreciation for the invaluable commitment of these ambassadors to resolving the current stalemate in the Conference.

I would also like to reiterate the full support of my delegation for their efforts, while acknowledging that the proposal just presented will remain flexible to accommodate any outstanding concerns. The circulated non-paper contains some significant merits, including the potential scope that it offers for the implementation of the programme of work, while avoiding any prejudgement on the points where member States still disagree. I believe that this text provides one of the most realistic approaches to the programme of work and sincerely hope that it will continue to be the focus of serious attention by all delegations during the intersessional break.

Notwithstanding, the important efforts made by the five ambassadors, it is nevertheless true that the Conference is drawing to the end of this year's annual session, again without agreeing on a programme of work. This will be the fourth consecutive year in which the Conference on Disarmament, the sole multilateral disarmament negotiating body, has been unable to engage in any substantive work based on an agreed programme of work. This is a truly disturbing fact, which convincingly demonstrates that the Conference cannot solve its problem in

(Ms. Inoguchi, Japan)

isolation from the international environment. The Conference is caught in a dilemma between the role it has been given to play and the international environment which inhibits it from effectively performing this role. All member States must make a greater effort not only in Geneva, but also in their respective capitals.

For all of us here in Geneva it is important, as we find ourselves at the conclusion of this year's session, to reflect on the past year. The Conference must, above all, be fully accountable to the world for its current status, following all its deliberations of this year. It cannot simply say that it has failed. Instead, it must explain what has been done to solve the problem and how it has failed. Collective reflections by the Conference as a body, not individual reflections, will also enable the Conference to contemplate what must be done to resolve this problem in the future. In addition, these collective accounts will provide a basis on which capitals can work in order to create a more favourable environment for the Conference.

Let me share my thoughts on such reflections and, in the process, to make five distinct points.

First, there continues to exist a strong common interest in commencing substantive work under an agreed programme of work as early as possible. Such an interest has been shown by certain countries in particular through their submission of working papers on specific issues to be addressed under the future agreed programme of work.

Second, serious efforts have been made by the successive presidents to accelerate agreement on a programme of work. The Amorim formulation, as contained in document CD/1624, has formed the basis for consultations throughout this year's annual session. A number of delegations, including my own, have explicitly mentioned in plenary statements their readiness to accept this formulation as it stands. Some delegations are, however, not yet in a position to do so, and one such delegation presented a specific wording proposal based on the Amorim formulation. More clarifications are required on the nature of the substantive work that is envisaged under this formulation on nuclear disarmament and outer space.

Third, the five ambassadors took a serious initiative to reach a consensus programme of work, building on all past efforts, including the Amorim proposal. Apart from the content of their proposal, which is still evolving, the approach being taken by those ambassadors is of historical significance as the first attempt to represent a cross-group interest in the urgent need to start substantive work under a programme of work. In other words, it has launched a process for the collaborative creation of an acceptable programme of work by making available a draft on which all delegations can present their views and comments.

Fourth, and probably most important, despite the common interest and the serious efforts being made, the Conference has been unable to reach consensus. In this regard, it should be noted that a majority of member States give more priority to the urgent need to agree on a programme of work, and accept that their individual concerns and interests will not be addressed now but will be addressed, instead, through the substantive work to be started. On the other

(Ms. Inoguchi, Japan)

hand, some States are more interested in addressing their interests now, in the deliberations on the programme of work, rather than later. Clearly, those States which have strong positions that result in disagreement on certain issues must make more effort to eliminate their differences.

Finally, the signing of the Treaty on Strategic Offensive Reductions between the Russian Federation and the United States of America may, while at this point it is difficult to estimate to what degree, have had some impact on the Conference on Disarmament. Nonetheless, all States, including major military Powers, should be encouraged to enhance their mutual relationships, so as to create a more favourable environment for the Conference.

Mr. President, you have the important task of guiding the Conference towards adopting this year's annual report of the Conference to the General Assembly of the United Nations. This drafting exercise that we are about to commence is not just a procedural matter, but, more importantly, it is the only way, at this difficult juncture, for the Conference to remain responsible in relation to its function and relevant to future international peace and security. I am confident, Mr. President, that the Conference will be guided under your skilful chairmanship to a reasonable outcome in this regard.

The PRESIDENT: I thank the representative of Japan very much for her statement and for the kind words addressed to the Chair. The next speaker on my list is the representative of China, Ambassador Hu.

Mr. HU (China) (translated from Chinese): Mr. President, at the outset please allow me to congratulate you on your assumption of the presidency of the Conference on Disarmament and to assure you of the full cooperation of the Chinese delegation in your work.

Today I would like to introduce a paper submitted by the Chinese delegation, entitled "Draft decision on the establishment of an ad hoc committee on the prevention of an arms race in outer space and its mandate". I have asked the Secretary-General of the Conference on Disarmament to issue this paper as an official document of the Conference on Disarmament and to circulate it to all delegations.

The Mandate of the ad hoc committee on PAROS proposed in this document is exactly the same as that which I proposed informally on 12 June 2002, in other words, it is based on the mandate of PAROS contained in CD/1624, with the addition of the phrase "with a view to negotiating a relevant international legal instrument". If consensus can be reached on this, China will go along with the other parts of CD/1624.

We consider that this wording on the mandate of PAROS reflects the spirit of a series of United Nations resolutions on preventing an arms race in outer space, and is in line with the positions of the Group of 21 and China contained, respectively, in documents CD/1570 and CD/1576. At the same time, it also takes into account other delegations' opinions and the shared hope of all members of the Conference for the immediate resumption of substantive work in this body. This is an enormous concession by China and evidence of its utmost flexibility.

(Mr. Hu, China)

We hope that all sides will be able to show a cooperative and constructive spirit, and to reconsider and accept the Chinese suggestion, so as to enable the Conference on Disarmament to overcome its stalemate and begin its substantive work.

The PRESIDENT: I thank the representative of China for his statement and for the kind words addressed to the Chair. I now give the floor to the representative of Indonesia, Ambassador Wisnumurti.

Mr. WISNUMURTI (Indonesia): Mr. President, first of all I should like to express my delegation's pleasure at seeing you assume the presidency of the Conference on Disarmament. My delegation is confident that, building on the efforts of your predecessors, Ambassador Heinsberg of Germany, Ambassador de La Fortelle of France, Ambassador Reimaa of Finland, Ambassador Yimer of Ethiopia, and Mr. Tawfik of Egypt, who deserve our praise for their tireless dedication and effort, you will successfully lead this Conference in seeking to maintain its forward momentum. I wish to assure you of my delegation's fullest cooperation in assisting you in your task so that together we may achieve success.

Allow me also to extend our greetings to Mr. Sergei Ordzhonikidze, the Secretary-General of the Conference on Disarmament, and to Mr. Enrique Román-Morey, his deputy. I would also like to take this opportunity to welcome Ambassador Portocarrero, the new Permanent Representative of Venezuela.

As we are all aware, the strategic environment has undergone fundamental changes following the end of the cold war. It is unfortunate, however, that the post-cold-war era has not, so far, brought the safer and more secure world of our expectations. Instead, international treaty obligations in the disarmament field are not being observed, while international commitments to disarmament objectives have been undermined. At the same time, there is a growing resort to the unilateralism and a corresponding gradual undermining of multilateralism. As a result, for the last few years the Conference on Disarmament has been in a deadlock. The latest victim of these developments are the negotiations on the strengthening of the Biological Weapons Convention, which have failed either to reach a conclusion in the allocated period of time in 2001, or to produce a final declaration. As for the prospects for a successful resumption of the session of the Review Conference to be convened in November this year, they appear equally uncertain.

As regards nuclear disarmament issues, we are deeply concerned over the adoption of strategic defence doctrines which entail the use of nuclear weapons for the sake of security, such as the Strategic Concept adopted by NATO and the Nuclear Posture Review. Likewise, we are concerned at the unsatisfactory results of both the universalization of the CTBT and the strengthening of the NPT. In the latter case, Indonesia remains more than ever convinced that it is a key instrument in the effort to halt the vertical and horizontal proliferation of nuclear weapons.

(Mr. Wisnumurti, Indonesia)

For Indonesia - as we have stated unequivocally on more than one occasion in this forum - it is the very existence of nuclear weapons which poses the most serious threat to humankind. Yet, far from realizing the promise of nuclear disarmament, the efforts of the international community to curb and eliminate these weapons have been completely deadlocked. The "systematic and progressive efforts" of the nuclear-weapon States have fallen far short of the commitments undertaken at the 1995 Review and Extension Conference of the Parties to the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons. More than two years after the "unequivocal undertaking" at the 2000 NPT Review Conference, where as many as 187 Governments met and agreed on the so-called 13 practical steps for "systematic and progressive" disarmament and the total elimination of the world's nuclear weapons, measures have still not been identified, much less acted upon.

In face of some of the difficulties which certain NPT States parties appear to have in this regard, the question that comes to mind is the following: has any effort at all been made to date even to try to accomplish the first of these 13 steps? The decision taken at the Review Conference was negotiated multilaterally, and there is no doubt that it is legally binding. If that is the way in which a so-called consensus-based international instrument is applied, then there is every reason to believe that it will be very difficult to make any tangible progress in the years ahead, making nuclear disarmament an ever more distant utopia.

Against this backdrop, and although it lacks most of the standard provisions of other bilateral nuclear arms control treaties or any reference to an exchange of data or a verification mechanism, we welcome the signing of the Treaty on Strategic Offensive Reductions by the Russian Federation and the United States of America on 24 May 2002 as a contribution to international peace and security. By the same token, we call on the nuclear-weapon States to continue to take further steps to promote nuclear disarmament.

As we approach the end of the 2002 session of the Conference on Disarmament, my delegation shares the sense of frustration which lingers in this chamber following the failure of the Conference to achieve any substantive work on the basis of an agreed work programme ever since 1999, in spite of both its sincere efforts to show flexibility and the number of proposals put forward by its members.

In the past, the Conference on Disarmament scored several milestone achievements, notably the conclusion of the Chemical Weapons Convention in 1993, followed by the Comprehensive Test-Ban Treaty in 1996, thereby proving that it could work and provide results. It has since failed to repeat these successes, however, or indeed to make any significant headway on issues of the highest priority, including that of nuclear disarmament. On both substantive and procedural issues, its members have not succeeded in making any breakthrough. My delegation finds it distressing that, as the sole multilateral negotiating body on disarmament, the Conference on Disarmament has chronically failed to agree on and formulate a programme of work and thus deprived itself of the means to carry out its mandate. In this regard, we share the perception of other delegations that the problem is not with the agenda of the Conference, its rules of procedure or its decision-making process, although there is always room for improvement in all these areas.



(Mr. Wisnumurti, Indonesia)

A number of solutions have been proposed in the attempt to overcome the impasse on the programme of work of the Conference on Disarmament. Several specific proposals have been put forward, such as the Amorim proposal and the initiative taken by the five ambassadors - three of them from the Group of 21 - on the programme of work. In order to resolve one of the issues of the programme of work, the delegations of China and of the Russian Federation have also introduced their joint paper on possible elements for a future international legal agreement on the prevention of the deployment of weapons in outer space and the threat or use of force against outer space objects.

The Indonesian delegation regard the Amorim proposal, which has not yet gained consensus, as a comprehensive working tool, which has the great merit of reflecting the priorities of member States. The aim of the proposal is to offer the best compromise by accommodating various concerns of member States without prejudicing any individual position or interests. To my regret, however, the proposal has not so far been given the benefit of proper discussion or negotiation.

We have just heard Ambassador Dembri introduce a revised non-paper on the programme of work of the Conference on Disarmament, which reflects further efforts by the five ambassadors, former presidents of the Conference, to improve the previous versions of the non-paper. My delegation welcomes and appreciates this effort and are of the view that the proposal offers sensible and positive suggestions in a genuine endeavour to make a breakthrough in the stalemate facing the Conference on its programme of work. Furthermore, the proposal indeed merits our consideration since it has been developed on the basis of the Amorim proposal. We believe that further consultations, elaboration and deliberation are required, in order that common ground may be reached. My delegation therefore calls upon all members of the Conference to show flexibility and to make all possible efforts with a view to achieving the necessary compromises.

As you are aware, Indonesia is one of the sponsors of the joint working paper entitled "Possible elements for a future international legal agreement on the prevention of the development of weapons in outer space, the threat or use of force against outer space objects", submitted by China and the Russian Federation. Indonesia considers that, even though no weaponization has actually take place in outer space, urgent measures should nevertheless be envisaged to prevent the deployment of weapons in outer space as well as the threat or use of force against outer space objects. With the astounding pace of development in military and space technology, the weaponization of outer space is no longer a figment of the imagination and could become a reality. Seen in this light, the existing arms control and disarmament treaties or agreements related to outer space are inadequate and cannot guarantee the prevention of such a weaponization or arms race.

Outer space is the common heritage of humankind and should be used, explored and used for the benefit and interest of all humankind in a spirit of cooperation. The international community therefore needs, as a matter of urgency, to initiate further measures and negotiations designed to produce a legally binding instrument prohibiting the deployment of weapons in outer space and preventing the threat or use of force against outer space objects.

(Mr. Wisnumurti, Indonesia)

In this regard, the joint paper contains some promising elements that can be used for further elaboration and negotiation. Indonesia would therefore like to urge all members of the Conference to contribute actively to the discussion on the joint proposal, which is open to further considerations, suggestions and amendments to improve the contents of the draft.

As the sole negotiating forum on disarmament matters, this Conference is the appropriate forum to negotiate such a treaty. By moving to re-establish without delay an ad hoc committee on PAROS, it seems to us that a decisive step could be taken towards breaking the stalemate in the Conference of Disarmament on the issue of the programme of work.

Before I conclude, I should like to commend the work carried out by the three special coordinators, namely Ambassador Dimiter Tzantchev of Bulgaria, Ambassador Chung Eui-yong of the Republic of Korea, and Ambassador Prasad Kariyawasam of Sri Lanka. My delegation would like to express its appreciation to the special coordinators for their reports. We are greatly indebted to them for their dedication and for the tireless efforts which they have deployed in organizing open-ended informal consultations in the face of considerable time constraints.

My country is duty bound, as mandated by its Constitution, to participate actively in maintaining and promoting international peace and security. In this spirit, we shall always make the utmost effort to contribute to the common endeavours of the international community to achieve this goal. What we should like to see now is an unequivocal resolve on the part of all the members of this Conference to justify its existence and restore our confidence in its ability to discharge its mandate by setting out a programme of work. For its part, the Indonesian delegation is preparing to contribute actively towards the resumption of negotiations and, to this end, is ready to study all proposals from other delegations to the Conference in a spirit of good will. We therefore call on every delegation to make the same effort, so that the Conference can relaunch its substantive work at the earliest possible juncture.

The PRESIDENT: I thank the representative of Indonesia for his statement and the kind words addressed to the Chair and to the previous presidents.

In the meantime, there are two more speakers on my list, the Ambassador of India and the Ambassador of Tunisia. Before giving them the floor, let me remind you that we still have a considerable amount of work ahead of us. We shall start the first reading of the draft annual report, which is scheduled to take place in the informal part of the plenary.

With this in mind, I give the floor to the Ambassador of India.

Mr. SOOD (India): Mr. President, at the outset, let me express my congratulations to you on your assumption of the presidency of the Conference on Disarmament and also to take this opportunity to convey to you assurances of the full cooperation of my delegation in your work during this critical period.

(Mr. Sood, India)

I am taking the floor after the statement made by our distinguished colleague, Ambassador Dembri, followed by the draft programme of work read out by our colleague, Minister Labbé of Chile, which is the new initiative that has been presented to us this morning. This is one in a long series of formal and informal proposals that we have had presented to us over perhaps the last six years during which the Conference on Disarmament has been unable to undertake any negotiations.

We have in the past, in our capacity as the delegation of India, put forward our preferred position for negotiations in the Conference on Disarmament, which are contained in documents CD/1570 and CD/1571. We came to the conclusion some time ago, however, that, since these proposals were not capable of attracting consensus in this Conference, we would therefore, in the interests of pragmatism, indicate our willingness to accept the proposal that was put forward two years ago by Ambassador Amorim, as contained in CD/1624. India said that CD/1624 might perhaps attract compromise as a consensus document and, accordingly, that it would be prepared to accept CD/1624 as a programme of work. On 31 July we heard Ambassador Dembri brief us on the proposal that he and other colleagues were elaborating. On that occasion our delegation sought certain clarifications from Ambassador Dembri, and we now find that the new proposal takes care of some of the concerns and clarifications that we had sought.

We keep hearing about new threats that have emerged in the post-cold-war and post-11 September period. We also keep hearing about an evolution in military affairs that is around the corner or is already upon us. Perhaps what is needed now is a revolution in diplomatic affairs.

The proposal that we have heard today reflects a new coalition that cuts across traditional political groupings. This obviously is a coalition for change and perhaps it can help bring about the necessary revolution in diplomatic affairs that is needed in this Conference. In this spirit, India welcomes the proposal and will be prepared to support it if it can help the Conference on Disarmament adopt a programme of work.

The PRESIDENT: I thank Ambassador Sood for his statement. The next speaker on my list is the representative of Tunisia, followed by Ambassador Javits of the United States.

Mr. BEN SALEM (Tunisia) (translated from French): Mr. President, might I first wish you every success in your new position and assure you, both on my own behalf and on that of my delegation, of our full support and cooperation. I would also like to take this opportunity to thank your predecessor, the Ambassador of Germany, for his wise guidance of the affairs of this Conference.

I venture to say that it is no secret that today a significant number of delegates participating in this Conference, among whom I count myself, are growing increasingly exasperated. For that reason, I would like to commend the group of five ambassadors for their timely and serious work and to tell them that they have my support in their anxiety to get this Conference moving again after several months of consultation, if we may put it so

(Mr. Ben Salem, Tunisia)

diplomatically. It is in this spirit and while reserving the right to study in more detail the various aspects of the initiative that my delegation encourages this Conference to take due consideration of the serious study of the work programme informally brought to our attention today by the five distinguished ambassadors. By so doing, they have given us a shot in the arm - a homeopathic dose perhaps, but one which will inject dynamism into our consultations.

To close, I would to take up what was said in her conclusion by our distinguished new colleague from Venezuela with reference to peace: she said that if you wanted to seek peace, you could easily find it. All that is needed is good will. I very much hope that this good will from now on will inspire the work of the Conference and I know that this will not be difficult for us to achieve.

The PRESIDENT: I thank the representative of Tunisia for his statement and for the kind words addressed to the Chair. I now give the floor to the next - and, for the time being, last - speaker on my list, Ambassador Javits.

Mr. JAVITS (United States of America): At the outset I would like to offer my congratulations to Hungary and to its distinguished representative, Ambassador Szabó, on his ascendancy to the presidency of the Conference and to pledge the support of my delegation for his efforts in leading us during the final stages and through the intersessional period. I also welcome very warmly my immediate neighbour, Ambassador Blacanieve Portocarrero of Venezuela, and wish her well in all her endeavours in this Conference.

As we approach the end of the session, it is important to note that this has been an active year for the Conference on Disarmament. We applaud the effort and energy shown by all delegations and their willingness to engage constructively and to collaborate collegially in seeking to move this body forward to a programme of work, particularly through the cross-group initiatives which have emerged and which mark a new and dynamic form of cooperation.

The United States has tried to offer constructive suggestions, encouragement and support for the evolutionary process that has emerged. We believe that fuller communication, tolerance of others' views and genuine collaboration are the best way to find consensus. It is in this spirit that we welcome the proposal of the five ambassadors. While we cannot commit ourselves to any proposal at this time, we will continue to work with the other members of the Conference to find a work programme acceptable to all.

We certainly commend China for its willingness to yield its long held insistence on commencing immediate negotiations on PAROS in that ad hoc group. Yet China knew in advance that its offer to accept the Amorim wording while demanding that the mandate include "with a view to negotiating a relevant international legal instrument" would be unacceptable to the United States. We have consistently reiterated our commitment to full, in-depth discussion on outer space. That, by itself, was a major concession to compromise on our part, and should be recognized as such. We have demonstrated our desire to have the Conference on Disarmament return to work. We will not, however, accept a PAROS mandate that prejudices where PAROS discussions will lead.

(Mr. Javits, United States)

We wonder, therefore, what comfort is provided by the additional phrase "with a view to negotiating a relevant international legal instrument"? Does it guarantee that negotiations will take place? No. It guarantees only that a work programme will not even be adopted and that no discussions will take place.

The United States has not and will not put forward proposals on these issues which we know to be unacceptable to other countries, because we do not want to put any colleague or country in the Conference on the defensive, just as we do not want that done to us.

With that in mind, we believe that a full review of every proposal is warranted. We hope that the decision of China to table its proposal today does not inhibit the further development of cross-group efforts still in evolution, or of other initiatives. We hope that China and all other members of the Conference on Disarmament will be able to support what might emerge from the intersessional consultations as the work programme enjoying the broadest support from all colleagues and members of the Conference.

The PRESIDENT: I thank the distinguished Ambassador of the United States for his statement. I have one additional speaker on my list, the Ambassador of the Russian Federation.

Mr. SKOTNIKOV (Russian Federation) (translated from Russian): Mr. President, first of all I would like to congratulate you on your assumption of the presidency of the Conference on Disarmament at this crucial juncture in its work. We assure you of our full support and our willingness to cooperate in every way with the Chair.

We are grateful to Ambassador Dembri for introducing the initiative of the five former presidents of the Conference on Disarmament. We believe that this proposal represents a significant contribution to the task of getting the Conference back to work and we are grateful to the five ambassadors for their efforts. We would like in particular to note that, in developing their proposal, they not merely took due account of the comments made by delegations, but also tried to reflect the prevailing mood in the Conference. As a result, the document has evolved in what we believe is the right direction. In its present wording, it can be seen as a sound development of the Amorim proposal. In fact, the co-authors of the new initiative were very careful in their handling of the Amorim initiative and maintained the essence of all its substantive elements. We also see the proposal which has just been tabled by Ambassador Hu as an important contribution to overcoming the deadlock. This proposal is also based on the Amorim package. We note the flexibility manifested by China on the issue of the Conference's programme of work. We believe that the proposals put forward today will form an excellent basis for renewing the search for consensus on the programme of work. For our part, we are ready to give constructive consideration to the proposals that have just been tabled.

The PRESIDENT: I thank Ambassador Skotnikov for his statement and for his kind words addressed to the Chair. The Ambassador of Iran wishes to take the floor.

Mr. ALBORZI (Islamic Republic of Iran): Mr. President, allow me to congratulate you on your assumption of the presidency of the Conference on Disarmament. It is a pleasure for me to take the floor under your presidency and I would like to reassure you of the fullest cooperation of my delegation.

Let me also express my delegation's appreciation to the distinguished ambassadors of Algeria, Chile, Sweden, Belgium and Colombia for their excellent effort, which aims at providing us an opportunity to break the deadlock on the programme of work of the Conference. I welcome this initiative as an important venture which deserves the full attention and consideration of us all.

My delegation does of course wish to see the original version of this proposal as a point of departure, owing to the importance which we attach to the issue of stockpiles of fissile material. I am certain, however, that aspects of this initiative will be taken into consideration by my capital, which has received the text and which will study it very carefully.

The PRESIDENT: I thank the Ambassador of Iran for his statement and for his kind words. This concludes my list of speakers for today. Does any delegation wish to take the floor? If that is not the case, then I should like to inform you of the following procedures.

With regard to the organization of our work for next week, I would like to remind you that next Thursday and Friday, 5 and 6 September, are official United Nations holidays and the Palais des Nations will be closed. Therefore, in accordance with previous practice, the Conference will hold its next plenary meeting on Tuesday, 3 September.

This concludes our business for today.

As I mentioned to you earlier, we will convene in an informal plenary meeting in 10 minutes or so to start the consideration of the draft annual report. I would like to remind you that the informal plenary meetings are open only to the member States of the Conference as well as the observer States.

May I emphasize once again that we have a large volume of work ahead of us today, and I intend, therefore, to keep strictly to these 10 minutes.

The meeting rose at 11.55 a.m.

10. The Conference received and considered requests for participation in its work from 37 States not Members of the Conference. In accordance with the Rules of Procedure and its decision taken at its 1990 session on its improved and effective functioning (CD/1036), the Conference invited the following non-Member States to participate in its work: Azerbaijan, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Costa Rica, Croatia, Cyprus, the Czech Republic, Denmark, Estonia, Georgia, Ghana, Greece, the Holy See, Jordan, Kuwait, Latvia, Lebanon, the Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Madagascar, Malta, Monaco, Nepal, Oman, the Philippines, Portugal, Qatar, Republic of Moldova, San Marino, Saudi Arabia, Serbia and Montenegro, Singapore, Slovenia, Sudan, Thailand, Uruguay and Yemen.

D. Agenda and Programme of Work for the 2003 Session

11. At its 915<sup>th</sup> plenary meeting on 21 January 2003, the Conference adopted its agenda for the 2003 session in conformity with the Rules of Procedure. The agenda (CD/1694) reads as follows:

“Taking into account, inter alia, the relevant provisions of the Final Document of the First Special Session of the General Assembly devoted to disarmament, and deciding to resume its consultations on the review of its agenda, and without prejudice to their outcome, the Conference adopts the following agenda for its 2003 session:

1. Cessation of the nuclear arms race and nuclear disarmament.
2. Prevention of nuclear war, including all related matters.
3. Prevention of an arms race in outer space.
4. Effective international arrangements to assure non-nuclear-weapon States against the use or threat of use of nuclear weapons.
5. New types of weapons of mass destruction and new systems of such weapons; radiological weapons.
6. Comprehensive programme of disarmament.
7. Transparency in armaments.
8. Consideration and adoption of the annual report and any other report, as appropriate, to the General Assembly of the United Nations.”

12. In connection with the adoption of the agenda, the President made the following statement: “It is my understanding that if there is a consensus in the Conference to deal with any issues, they could be dealt with within this agenda.”

13. During the annual session, successive Presidents of the Conference conducted intensive consultations with a view to reaching consensus on the programme of work. In the course of these consultations, a number of informal proposals related to the programme of work were put forward. The Conference did not, however, agree on the programme of work and did not re-establish or establish any mechanism on any of its specific agenda items during the 2003 session.

14. During plenary meetings of the Conference, delegations and groups of delegations expressed their views on the issue of a programme of work, taking into account all relevant proposals, including CD/1624 and CD/1693, as well as an amendment to the latter subsequently put forward. The Conference witnessed active debates and, especially towards the end of the session, constructive efforts to seek common ground. These are duly reflected in the plenary records.

15. At the 916<sup>th</sup> plenary meeting on 23 January 2003, Ambassador Jean Lint of Belgium, on behalf of Ambassador Mohamed Salah Dembri of Algeria, Ambassador Camilo Reyes Rodriguez of Colombia, Ambassador Henrik Salander of Sweden, Ambassador Juan Enrique Vega of Chile and on his behalf, introduced a cross-group proposal on a programme of work of the Conference (CD/1693). At the 932<sup>nd</sup> plenary meeting, on 26 June 2003, Ambassador Lint presented, on behalf of the five Ambassadors, an amendment to the proposal (later reflected in CD/1693/Rev.1). Appreciation was expressed for this initiative. A wide range of delegations expressed their support for the proposal. Some delegations indicated that, though they had some concerns about certain elements in the proposal, they would not oppose a consensus on it or on its amended version. Some did not express their views.

16. Statements were made by some delegations emphasizing that linkages should not be established between elements of the programme of work and/or of the agenda while others stressed the need for a comprehensive approach.

#### E. Expansion of the Membership of the Conference

17. The important question of the expansion of the membership of the Conference was addressed by delegations in plenary meetings. Their views on the issue are duly reflected in the plenary records.

18. Requests for membership had been received, since 1982, from the following 22 non-members, in chronological order: Greece, Croatia, Kuwait, Portugal, Slovenia, the Czech Republic, Costa Rica, Denmark, The Former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Cyprus, Lithuania, Ghana, Luxembourg, Uruguay, the Philippines, Azerbaijan, the Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Armenia, Thailand, Georgia, Jordan and Estonia.

#### F. Review of the Agenda of the Conference

19. The importance of the review of the agenda of the Conference was addressed by delegations in plenary meetings. Their views on the issue are duly reflected in the plenary records.

#### G. Improved and Effective Functioning of the Conference

20. The importance of the improved and effective functioning of the Conference was addressed by delegations in plenary meetings. Their views on the issue are duly reflected in the plenary records.

21. During the annual session, some Presidents of the Conference conducted a series of consultations on possible ways to enhance the contribution of civil society to the work of the Conference on Disarmament. In the course of these consultations a number of proposals were put forward. The modalities of civil society participation in other disarmament fora were considered and legal advice from the United Nations Legal Counsel was obtained. No objections were raised to a proposal to facilitate civil society in making available documents outside the meeting room of the Conference.

#### H. Communications from Non-Governmental Organizations

22. In accordance with Rule 42 of the Rules of Procedure, a list of all communications from non-governmental organizations and persons was circulated to the Conference (document CD/NGC/37).

### III. SUBSTANTIVE WORK OF THE CONFERENCE DURING ITS 2003 SESSION

23. Significant contributions were made to promote substantive discussions on issues on the agenda in the plenary meetings. Furthermore, the Conference discussed other issues that could also be relevant to the current international security environment.



---

## Initiative of the Ambassadors Dembri, Lint, Reyes, Salander and Vega

### Proposal of a Programme of Work

Taking into account the several proposals tabled since 1999, the Conference on Disarmament decides to establish, for the duration of the current session, the following programme of work, in respect of the elements of the agenda of the Conference:

1. The Conference establishes for the duration of the current session, an Ad Hoc Committee under agenda item 4 entitled "Effective international arrangements to assure non-nuclear-weapon States against the use or threat of use of nuclear weapons", to negotiate with a view to reaching agreement on effective international arrangements to assure non-nuclear weapon States against the use or threat of use of nuclear weapons. These arrangements could take the form of an internationally binding instrument.

The Ad Hoc Committee shall present a report to the Conference on Disarmament on the progress of its work before the conclusion of the current session.

The mandate of the Ad Hoc Committee shall be reviewed as appropriate, taking into consideration all relevant views and proposals and the prospects for future work.

2. The Conference establishes, for the duration of the current session, an Ad Hoc Committee, under agenda item 1 entitled "Cessation of the nuclear arms race and nuclear disarmament" to deal with nuclear disarmament. The Ad Hoc Committee shall exchange information and views on practical steps for progressive and systematic efforts to attain this objective, and in doing so shall examine approaches towards potential future work of a multilateral character.

In discharging its functions, the Ad Hoc Committee will take into account current efforts and existing proposals and views, as well as proposals that may emerge from the study and discussion.

The Ad Hoc Committee shall present a report to the Conference on Disarmament on the progress of its work before the conclusion of the current session.

The mandate of the Ad Hoc Committee shall be reviewed as appropriate, taking into consideration all relevant views and proposals and the prospects for future work.

3. The Conference establishes, for the duration of the current session, an Ad Hoc Committee, under agenda item 1 entitled "Cessation of the nuclear arms race and nuclear disarmament" which shall negotiate, on the basis of the report of the Special Coordinator (CD/1299) and the mandate contained therein, a non-discriminatory, multilateral and internationally and effectively verifiable treaty banning the production of fissile material for nuclear weapons or other nuclear explosive devices.

---

\*/ Re-issued for technical reasons

*Presidential Declaration*

*The Conference on Disarmament, the sole multilateral forum of negotiations as stated in article 1 of the Rules of procedures, considered many proposals aimed at achieving a consensus on a programme of work.*

*These proposals reflect the importance all delegations attach to the Conference in fulfilling its mandate and in addressing the aspirations of the international community.*

*Taking into account these several proposals, the Conference on Disarmament decides to establish, for the duration of the current session, a programme of work, in respect of the elements of the agenda of the Conference.*

*This will require that all member States work together, according to the rules of procedure, to build on converging points which could lead, in time, to international instruments acceptable for all.*

---

## Initiative of the Ambassadors Dembri, Lint, Reyes, Salander and Vega

Proposal of a Programme of Work  
revised at the 932<sup>nd</sup> plenary meeting on Thursday, 26 June 2003

Taking into account the several proposals tabled since 1999, the Conference on Disarmament decides to establish, for the duration of the current session, the following programme of work, in respect of the elements of the agenda of the Conference:

1. The Conference establishes for the duration of the current session, an Ad Hoc Committee under agenda item 4 entitled "Effective international arrangements to assure non-nuclear-weapon States against the use or threat of use of nuclear weapons", to negotiate with a view to reaching agreement on effective international arrangements to assure non-nuclear-weapon States against the use or threat of use of nuclear weapons. These arrangements could take the form of an internationally binding instrument.

The Ad Hoc Committee shall present a report to the Conference on Disarmament on the progress of its work before the conclusion of the current session.

The mandate of the Ad Hoc Committee shall be reviewed as appropriate, taking into consideration all relevant views and proposals and the prospects for future work.

2. The Conference establishes, for the duration of the current session, an Ad Hoc Committee, under agenda item 1 entitled "Cessation of the nuclear arms race and nuclear disarmament" to deal with nuclear disarmament. The Ad Hoc Committee shall exchange information and views on practical steps for progressive and systematic efforts to attain this objective, and in doing so shall examine approaches towards potential future work of a multilateral character.

In discharging its functions, the Ad Hoc Committee will take into account current efforts and existing proposals and views, as well as proposals that may emerge from the study and discussion.

The Ad Hoc Committee shall present a report to the Conference on Disarmament on the progress of its work before the conclusion of the current session.

The mandate of the Ad Hoc Committee shall be reviewed as appropriate, taking into consideration all relevant views and proposals and the prospects for future work.

3. The Conference establishes, for the duration of the current session, an Ad Hoc Committee, under agenda item 1 entitled "Cessation of the nuclear arms race and nuclear disarmament" which shall negotiate, on the basis of the report of the Special Coordinator (CD/1299) and the mandate contained therein, a non-discriminatory, multilateral and internationally and effectively verifiable treaty banning the production of fissile material for nuclear weapons or other nuclear explosive devices.

The Ad Hoc Committee shall present a report to the Conference on Disarmament on the progress of its work before the conclusion of the current session.

4. The Conference establishes, for the duration of the current session, an Ad Hoc Committee under agenda item 3 entitled "Prevention of an arms race in outer space" to deal with the prevention of an arms race in outer space. The Ad Hoc Committee shall identify and examine, without limitation, any specific topics or proposals, which could include confidence-building or transparency measures, general principles, treaty commitments and the elaboration of a regime capable of preventing an arms race in outer space, including the possibility of negotiating relevant international legal instrument. In doing so, the Ad Hoc Committee shall take appropriate account of the need to contribute actively to the objective of the peaceful use of outer space and the prevention of an arms race there, while also promoting international stability and respecting the principle of undiminished security for all.

The Ad Hoc Committee shall present a report to the Conference on Disarmament on the progress of its work before the conclusion of the current session.

The mandate of the Ad Hoc Committee shall be reviewed as appropriate, taking into consideration all relevant views and proposals and the prospects for future work.

5. The Conference appoints a Special Coordinator under agenda item 5 entitled "New types of weapons of mass destruction and new systems of such weapons; radiological weapons" to seek the views of its Members on the most appropriate way to deal with this issue.

In implementing this decision, the Special Coordinator shall take into consideration all relevant views and proposals, present and future.

The Conference requests the Special Coordinator to present a report before the end of the current session.

6. The Conference appoints a Special Coordinator under agenda item 6 entitled "Comprehensive programme of Disarmament" to seek the views of its Members on the most appropriate way to deal with this issue.

In implementing this decision, the Special Coordinator shall take into consideration all relevant views and proposals, present and future.

The Conference requests the Special Coordinator to present a report before the end of the current session.

7. The Conference appoints a Special Coordinator under agenda item 7 entitled "Transparency in armaments" to seek the views of its members on the most appropriate way to deal with the questions related to this item.

In implementing this decision, the Special Coordinator shall take into consideration all relevant views and proposals, present and future.

The Conference requests the Special Coordinator to present a report before the end of the current session.

*Presidential Declaration*

*The Conference on Disarmament, the sole multilateral forum of negotiations as stated in article 1 of the Rules of procedures, considered many proposals aimed at achieving a consensus on a programme of work.*

*These proposals reflect the importance all delegations attach to the Conference in fulfilling its mandate and in addressing the aspirations of the international community.*

*Taking into account these several proposals, the Conference on Disarmament decides to establish, for the duration of the current session, a programme of work, in respect of the elements of the agenda of the Conference.*

*This will require that all member States work together, according to the rules of procedure, to build on converging points which could lead, in time, to international instruments acceptable for all.*

---

## B. Participants in the Work of the Conference

7. The representatives of the following 65 Member States participated in the work of the Conference: Algeria, Argentina, Australia, Austria, Bangladesh, Belarus, Belgium, Brazil, Bulgaria, Cameroon, Canada, Chile, China, Colombia, Cuba, the Democratic People's Republic of Korea, the Democratic Republic of the Congo, Ecuador, Egypt, Ethiopia, Finland, France, Germany, Hungary, India, Indonesia, the Islamic Republic of Iran, Iraq, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Japan, Kazakhstan, Kenya, Malaysia, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Myanmar, the Netherlands, New Zealand, Nigeria, Norway, Pakistan, Peru, Poland, the Republic of Korea, Romania, the Russian Federation, Senegal, Slovakia, South Africa, Spain, Sri Lanka, Sweden, Switzerland, the Syrian Arab Republic, Tunisia, Turkey, Ukraine, the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, the United States of America, Venezuela, Viet Nam and Zimbabwe.

## C. Attendance and Participation of States not Members of the Conference

8. In conformity with Rule 32 of the Rules of Procedure, the States not Members of the Conference listed in the following paragraph attended its plenary meetings.

9. The Conference received and considered requests for participation in its work from 38 States not Members of the Conference. In accordance with the Rules of Procedure and its decision taken at its 1990 session on its improved and effective functioning (CD/1036), the Conference invited the following non-Member States to participate in its work: Albania, Azerbaijan, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Costa Rica, Croatia, Cyprus, the Czech Republic, Denmark, Estonia, Georgia, Ghana, Greece, Guatemala, the Holy See, Iceland, Jordan, Kuwait, Latvia, Lebanon, the Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Madagascar, Malta, Oman, the Philippines, Portugal, Qatar, San Marino, Saudi Arabia, Serbia and Montenegro, Singapore, Slovenia, Sudan, Thailand, The Former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Uruguay and Yemen.

## D. Agenda and Programme of Work for the 2004 Session

10. Following discussions at the informal plenary meeting on 22 January 2004, the Conference adopted, at its 943<sup>rd</sup> plenary meeting on 27 January 2004, its agenda for the 2004 session in conformity with the Rules of Procedure. The agenda (CD/1725) reads as follows:

“Taking into account, *inter alia*, the relevant provisions of the Final Document of the First Special Session of the General Assembly devoted to disarmament, and deciding to resume its consultations on the review of its agenda, and without prejudice to their outcome, the Conference adopts the following agenda for its 2004 session:

1. Cessation of the nuclear arms race and nuclear disarmament.
2. Prevention of nuclear war, including all related matters.
3. Prevention of an arms race in outer space.

4. Effective international arrangements to assure non-nuclear-weapon States against the use or threat of use of nuclear weapons.
5. New types of weapons of mass destruction and new systems of such weapons; radiological weapons.
6. Comprehensive programme of disarmament.
7. Transparency in armaments.
8. Consideration and adoption of the annual report and any other report, as appropriate, to the General Assembly of the United Nations.”

11. Subsequently, the President made the following statement: “In connection with the adoption of the agenda, I, as the President of the Conference, should like to state that it is my understanding that if there is a consensus in the Conference to deal with any issues, they could be dealt with within this agenda. The Conference will also take into consideration rules 27 and 30 of the rules of procedure of the Conference, as well as paragraph 23 of the report of the Conference on Disarmament to the General Assembly, contained in document CD/1718 of 10 September 2003.”

12. During the annual session, successive Presidents of the Conference conducted intensive consultations with a view to reaching consensus on a programme of work. In the course of these consultations, a number of informal proposals related to a programme of work were put forward. The Conference did not, however, agree on a programme of work and did not re-establish or establish any mechanism on any of its specific agenda items during the 2004 session.

13. During plenary meetings of the Conference, delegations and groups of delegations expressed their views on the issue of a programme of work, taking into account all relevant proposals, including those submitted as the documents of the Conference on Disarmament since 2000. Statements were made by some delegations emphasizing that linkage should not be established between elements of a programme of work while other delegations stressed the need for a comprehensive approach. Support for proposals and ideas on a programme of work is duly reflected in the plenary records.

14. The following document dealing with this item was submitted to the Conference:

CD/1733, entitled “Letter dated 23 March 2004 from the Permanent Representative of Japan to the Conference on Disarmament addressed to the Secretary-General of the Conference transmitting the text of the statement given as President of the Conference on the programme of work on 19 December 2003 in Geneva.”

# CONFERENCE ON DISARMAMENT

CD/1733  
29 March 2004

Original: ENGLISH

---

**LETTER DATED 23 MARCH 2004 FROM THE PERMANENT REPRESENTATIVE OF  
JAPAN TO THE CONFERENCE ON DISARMAMENT ADDRESSED TO THE  
SECRETARY-GENERAL OF THE CONFERENCE TRANSMITTING THE TEXT OF  
THE STATEMENT GIVEN AS PRESIDENT OF THE CONFERENCE ON THE  
PROGRAMME OF WORK ON 19 DECEMBER 2003 IN GENEVA**

I have the honour to transmit the text of my statement as President of the Conference on Disarmament at the Open-Ended Consultations on the Programme of Work of the Conference on Disarmament on 19<sup>th</sup> December 2003.

I should be grateful if the statement could be issued and circulated as an official document of the Conference on Disarmament.

*(Signed):*

Kuniko INOBUCHI, Ph.D.  
Ambassador  
Permanent Representative of Japan  
to the Conference on Disarmament



**Statement by Ambassador Kuniko Inoguchi of Japan,  
President of the Conference on Disarmament  
at the Open-Ended Consultations on the Programme of Work  
of the Conference on Disarmament  
19 December 2003**

At the outset, allow me to express my sincere appreciation to all delegations for the support and cooperation that has been extended to me. I have decided to hold this meeting, although the timing may not necessarily be the most desirable, because it is my duty as president, to fulfill my task in accordance with the enhanced mandate provided in the Report of the Conference. I believe that the most effective way to do this is to share my analysis on the current status of the Conference with all member States, as well as to submit a few suggestions which I hope will be useful to my successor, Ambassador Amina Mohamed of Kenya, and to all other delegations, as they consider the most efficient manner to initiate next year's session so that the Conference is able to commence its substantive work at an early stage.

(Current Status)

Firstly, let me explain the current status of my consultations. Since the end of the annual session, my first important task has been to present the Report of the Conference to the First Committee of the General Assembly, and to submit a resolution on the CD Report for consensus adoption. During my consultations on the resolution, while I detected strong interest among countries in seeking agreement on a programme of work on the basis of the five-ambassador proposal, some delegations continued to reserve their positions. Therefore the situation was not ready for the resolution of the General Assembly to indicate a clear message on the programme of work. The resolution, however, stressed the urgent need for the Conference to commence substantive work during its 2004 annual session. I believe that this resolution manifests the willingness of all States to enhance the collective interest by bringing the Conference back to work.

I have continued to consult with delegations since the First Committee. The consultations have yet to materialize into any clear picture on the issue of the program of work. Basically, the current situation is, as described in the Report in a rather detailed manner, that most of the member States support, or accept, the five-ambassador proposal, while some delegations continue to reserve their positions. At this juncture, therefore, there has not been any visible progress made. However, it is inevitable that the Conference will face a critical moment to determine where it will head for. Such current situation has focused member States to review their respective positions seriously and energetically on the key issues in the current proposal. I would like to take this opportunity, as president, to offer some suggestions to pave the way toward the beginning of next year's annual session.

(Presidential Suggestions)

Firstly, the five-ambassador proposal enjoys wide, cross-group support or acceptance because it is a more or less acceptable reflection of the interests and priorities of those countries supporting or accepting this proposal. In order to allow the Conference to collectively engage in substantive

work, this situation should be acknowledged by all delegations, especially by those countries which continue to reserve their positions.

Secondly, as the Report mentions, there have been discussions on the linkage approach or the comprehensive approach, with respect to the issue of the program of work. The former implies undue restrictions on the work of the CD, and therefore should be denied, whereas the latter is a legitimate idea to accommodate various security and arms control interests in the international community. It is important to ensure institutionally that the CD will work as a comprehensive response to the current international security situation while preventing linkage tactics from further complicating the work of the CD, including its substantive work in the individual ad hoc committees. In this regard I strongly believe that the decisions on the mandates should be made separately, not in a package form. It is worthwhile to repeat that the normal practice until 1998 when we had the last programme of work in the recent years was separate decisions.

Thirdly, allow me to elaborate my comments on each of the four core issues.

- (1) As evidently shown by the consensus General Assembly resolution on the Fissile Material Cut-Off Treaty, there is a full recognition on the need to commence negotiations on a non-discriminatory, multilateral and internationally and effectively verifiable treaty banning the production of fissile material for nuclear weapons or other nuclear explosive devices.
- (2) With respect to the issue of the prevention of an arms race in outer space, because of the constructive effort witnessed toward the end of this year's annual session, an appropriate option to allow the Conference to commence meaningful discussions on this issue is emerging.
- (3) The establishment of an ad hoc committee on nuclear disarmament has consistently been the priority of one group in the CD. After years of consultations, despite the differences among groups and countries, the discussion on nuclear disarmament has now become a realistic option for the Conference.
- (4) Negative security assurance is a complex issue in terms of its substance. Negotiations in 1998 failed to lead the Conference to any meaningful solution. In other words, the mandate on this issue was not capable of engaging the Conference in a successful exercise at that time. Whether the same situation is still persisting remains to be answered. It is, however, also appropriate for us to be open to the possibility of reviewing this mandate in order to engage in a promising exercise, not one doomed to failure.

Finally, there is growing concern over new threats, particularly those related to the risk that terrorists may obtain weapons of mass destruction. At the First Committee, many delegations referred to these problems. It is not the traditional task of the Conference to focus on terrorism. However, in the context of an evolving security environment, it is appropriate for the Conference to address new problems that are of widespread concern. Also, consideration should be given to new concerns in the context of substantive exercises on the traditional issues.

In conclusion, the remaining gaps are significantly narrower than a year ago thanks to all past efforts to seek a convergence of positions. However, we probably need more clarity on the nature, substance, etc. of the work in which we are going to engage, in order to initiate a

promising process for the next years. I am confident that the reviews and reflections currently underway in the respective capitals of member States on their positions will be extremely useful to our efforts to be made early next year to bridge the remaining gaps.

Now I would like to open the floor to hear the views of delegations on the current status of the CD, as well as on my suggestions, or to hear any comment you may wish to make at this stage.

(Closing)

I thank you very much for all your contributions made today. I do not intend to sum up the discussion but I hope that the overall picture of the Conference which we all have obtained from today's debate will bring us into the new year well prepared to confront the critical juncture that awaits us. I would also like to stress, as president passing the torch from the successive Western presidents to the G21 presidents, that such cross-group effort by the successive presidents must prove the effective functioning of multilateral diplomacy which is after all the fundamental guarantee for the international peace and security.

Before concluding, once again I thank all delegations present today for their active participation. I would also like to express my sincere appreciation to Mr. Roman-Morey, Mr. Jerzy Zaleski and other members of the Secretariat as well as the interpreters, not only for enabling us to conduct our business today but also for supporting the presidency and the entire Conference throughout the year.

I wish you all pleasant holidays, a merry Christmas and a happy new year.

The meeting is closed.

---

Morey, Deputy Secretary-General of the Conference on Disarmament; and Mr. Jerzy Zaleski, Political Affairs Officer, Secretary of the Conference on Disarmament.

B. Participants in the Work of the Conference

7. The representatives of the following 65 Member States participated in the work of the Conference: Algeria, Argentina, Australia, Austria, Bangladesh, Belarus, Belgium, Brazil, Bulgaria, Cameroon, Canada, Chile, China, Colombia, Cuba, the Democratic People's Republic of Korea, the Democratic Republic of the Congo, Ecuador, Egypt, Ethiopia, Finland, France, Germany, Hungary, India, Indonesia, the Islamic Republic of Iran, Iraq, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Japan, Kazakhstan, Kenya, Malaysia, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Myanmar, the Netherlands, New Zealand, Nigeria, Norway, Pakistan, Peru, Poland, the Republic of Korea, Romania, the Russian Federation, Senegal, Slovakia, South Africa, Spain, Sri Lanka, Sweden, Switzerland, the Syrian Arab Republic, Tunisia, Turkey, Ukraine, the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, the United States of America, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of), Viet Nam and Zimbabwe.

C. Attendance and Participation of States not Members of the Conference

8. In conformity with Rule 32 of the Rules of Procedure, the States not Members of the Conference listed in the following paragraph attended its plenary meetings.

9. The Conference received and considered requests for participation in its work from the 34 States not Members of the Conference. In accordance with the Rules of Procedure and decision taken at its 1990 session on its improved and effective functioning (CD/1036), the Conference invited the following non-Member States to participate in its work: Azerbaijan, Costa Rica, Croatia, Cyprus, the Czech Republic, Denmark, Estonia, Ghana, Greece, Guatemala, the Holy See, Iceland, Jordan, Kuwait, Latvia, Lebanon, the Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Madagascar, Malta, Oman, Panama, the Philippines, Portugal, Qatar, San Marino, Saudi Arabia, Serbia and Montenegro, Singapore, Slovenia, Thailand, The Former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia and Uruguay.

D. Agenda and Programme of Work for the 2005 Session

10. Following a debate at which the content of the annual agenda was reviewed, the Conference adopted, at its 972<sup>nd</sup> plenary meeting on 8 February 2005, its agenda for the 2005 session in conformity with the Rules of Procedure. The agenda (CD/1747) reads as follows:

“Taking into account, inter alia, the relevant provisions of the Final Document of the First Special Session of the General Assembly devoted to disarmament, and deciding to resume

its consultations on the review of its agenda, and without prejudice to their outcome, the Conference adopts the following agenda for its 2005 session:

1. Cessation of the nuclear arms race and nuclear disarmament.
2. Prevention of nuclear war, including all related matters.
3. Prevention of an arms race in outer space.
4. Effective international arrangements to assure non-nuclear-weapon States against the use or threat of use of nuclear weapons.
5. New types of weapons of mass destruction and new systems of such weapons; radiological weapons.
6. Comprehensive programme of disarmament.
7. Transparency in armaments.
8. Consideration and adoption of the annual report and any other report, as appropriate, to the General Assembly of the United Nations.”

11. Subsequently, the President made the following statement: “In connection with the adoption of the agenda, I, as the President of the Conference, should like to state that it is my understanding that if there is a consensus in the Conference to deal with any issues, they could be dealt with within this agenda. The Conference will also take into consideration rules 27 and 30 of the rules of procedure of the Conference, as well as paragraph 22 and other relevant paragraphs of the 2004 report of the Conference on Disarmament to the General Assembly, contained in document CD/1744.”

12. During the annual session, successive Presidents of the Conference conducted intensive consultations and made significant efforts with a view to reaching consensus on a programme of work. In the course of these consultations, a number of informal proposals related to a programme of work were put forward. In spite of the efforts of the Presidents, the Conference was not able to agree on a programme of work and did not re-establish or establish any mechanism on any of its specific agenda items during the 2005 session.

13. During plenary meetings of the Conference, successive presidents, delegations and groups of delegations expressed their views (duly reflected in relevant PV's) on the issue of a programme of work, taking into account all relevant proposals, including those submitted as the documents of the Conference on Disarmament since 2000. Statements were made by some delegations emphasizing that linkage should not be established between elements of a programme of work, while other delegations stressed the need for a comprehensive approach. Support for these proposals on a programme of work is duly reflected in the plenary records.

**Proposal by the President  
On the Programme of Work for the 2005 session of the  
Conference on Disarmament**

Draft decision

The Conference takes the following decision:

1. The Conference establishes for the duration of the current session, an Ad Hoc Committee on Nuclear Disarmament under agenda item 1 entitled "Cessation of the nuclear arms race and nuclear disarmament". The Ad Hoc Committee shall exchange information and views on practical steps for progressive and systematic efforts to attain this objective, and in doing so shall examine approaches towards potential future work of a multilateral character.

In discharging its functions, the Ad Hoc Committee will take into account current efforts and existing proposals and views, as well as proposals that may emerge from the study and discussion.

The Ad Hoc Committee shall present a report to the Conference on Disarmament on the progress of its work before the conclusion of the current session.

The mandate of the Ad Hoc Committee shall be reviewed as appropriate taking into consideration all relevant views and proposals and the prospects for future work.

2. The Conference establishes, for the duration of the current session, an Ad Hoc Committee under agenda item 1 entitled "Cessation of the nuclear arms race and nuclear disarmament", which shall negotiate a non-discriminatory, multilateral treaty banning the production of fissile material for nuclear weapons or other nuclear explosive devices, taking into account all existing proposals and drafts as well as future initiatives with a view to giving the Conference a possibility to achieve its final drafting as soon as possible.

The Ad Hoc Committee shall present a report to the Conference on Disarmament on the progress of its work before the conclusion of the current session.

## B. Participants in the Work of the Conference

7. The representatives of the following 65 Member States participated in the work of the Conference: Algeria, Argentina, Australia, Austria, Bangladesh, Belarus, Belgium, Brazil, Bulgaria, Cameroon, Canada, Chile, China, Colombia, Cuba, the Democratic People's Republic of Korea, the Democratic Republic of the Congo, Ecuador, Egypt, Ethiopia, Finland, France, Germany, Hungary, India, Indonesia, the Islamic Republic of Iran, Iraq, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Japan, Kazakhstan, Kenya, Malaysia, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Myanmar, the Netherlands, New Zealand, Nigeria, Norway, Pakistan, Peru, Poland, the Republic of Korea, Romania, the Russian Federation, Senegal, Slovakia, South Africa, Spain, Sri Lanka, Sweden, Switzerland, the Syrian Arab Republic, Tunisia, Turkey, Ukraine, the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, the United States of America, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of), Viet Nam and Zimbabwe.

## C. Attendance and Participation of States not Members of the Conference

8. In conformity with Rule 32 of the Rules of Procedure, the States not Members of the Conference listed in the following paragraph attended its plenary meetings.

9. The Conference received and considered requests for participation in its work from the 35 States not Members of the Conference. In accordance with the Rules of Procedure and decision taken at its 1990 session on its improved and effective functioning (CD/1036), the Conference invited the following non-Member States to participate in its work: Azerbaijan, Bahrain, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Costa Rica, Croatia, Cyprus, the Czech Republic, Denmark, Estonia, Ghana, Greece, Guatemala, the Holy See, Jordan, Kuwait, Latvia, the Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Madagascar, Malta, Mauritius, Oman, the Philippines, Portugal, Republic of Moldova, Serbia and Montenegro<sup>1</sup>, Slovenia, Sudan, Thailand, Timor-Leste, The Former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, United Arab Emirates, Uruguay and Zambia.

## D. Agenda and Programme of Work for the 2006 Session

10. Following a debate at which the content of the annual agenda was reviewed, at its 998<sup>th</sup> plenary meeting on 24 January 2006, the Conference on Disarmament adopted its agenda for the 2006 session in conformity with the Rules of Procedure (CD/PV.998). The agenda reads as follows:

“Taking into account, inter alia, the relevant provisions of the Final Document of the First Special Session of the General Assembly devoted to disarmament, and deciding to resume its consultations on the review of its agenda, and without prejudice to their outcome, the Conference adopts the following agenda for its 2006 session:

---

<sup>1</sup> Since 3 June 2006 — Serbia.

1. Cessation of the nuclear arms race and nuclear disarmament.
2. Prevention of nuclear war, including all related matters.
3. Prevention of an arms race in outer space.
4. Effective international arrangements to assure non-nuclear-weapon States against the use or threat of use of nuclear weapons.
5. New types of weapons of mass destruction and new systems of such weapons; radiological weapons.
6. Comprehensive programme of disarmament.
7. Transparency in armaments.
8. Consideration and adoption of the annual report and any other report, as appropriate, to the General Assembly of the United Nations.”

11. Subsequently, the President made the following statement: “In connection with the adoption of the agenda, I, as the President of the Conference, should like to state that it is my understanding that if there is a consensus in the Conference to deal with any issues, they could be dealt with within this agenda. The Conference will also take into consideration rules 27 and 30 of the rules of procedure of the Conference, as well as paragraph 20 and other relevant paragraphs of the 2005 report of the Conference on Disarmament to the General Assembly, contained in document CD/1761.”

12. Pursuant to paragraph 38 of the 2005 report of the Conference (CD/1761), the last President of the 2005 session (Peru) and the first President of the 2006 session (Poland), in cooperation with the five incoming Presidents of the 2006 session (the Republic of Korea, Romania, the Russian Federation, Senegal and Slovakia), conducted informal consultations on the possibilities of reaching consensus on a programme of work with a view to commencing early substantive work during the 2006 session of the Conference.

13. During the annual session, successive Presidents of the Conference conducted intensive consultations and made significant efforts with a view to reaching consensus on a programme of work. In spite of the efforts of the Presidents, the Conference was not able to agree on a programme of work and did not re-establish or establish any mechanism on any of its specific agenda items during the 2006 session.

14. At the 1003<sup>rd</sup> plenary meeting on 9 February 2006, the President submitted to the Conference a joint proposal of the CD Presidents on the Conference’s activities for the 2006 session, which included general debates at the plenary meetings allowing for a rolling discussion on all agenda items, and focused structured debates, with the participation of experts, as follows:



- (a) during the Presidency of the Republic of Korea: from 27 February to 3 March – agenda items 1 (Cessation of the nuclear arms race and nuclear disarmament) and 2 (Prevention of nuclear war, including all related matters), with the general focus on nuclear disarmament;
- (b) during the Presidency of Romania: from 15 to 19 May – agenda items 1 (Cessation of the nuclear arms race and nuclear disarmament) and 2 (Prevention of nuclear war, including all related matters), with general focus on the prohibition of production of fissile material for nuclear weapons and other nuclear explosive devices;
- (c) during the Presidency of the Russian Federation: from 8 to 15 June – agenda item 3 (Prevention of an arms race in outer space), and from 19 to 23 June – agenda item 5 (New types of weapons of mass destruction and new systems of such weapons; radiological weapons);
- (d) during the Presidency of Senegal: from 31 July to 4 August – agenda item 4 (Effective international arrangements to assure non-nuclear-weapon States against the use or threat of use of nuclear weapons), and from 7 to 11 August – agenda item 6 (Comprehensive programme of disarmament);
- (e) during the Presidency of Slovakia: from 21 to 25 August – agenda item 7 (Transparency in armaments), and from 4 to 15 September – agenda item 8 (Consideration and adoption of the annual report and any other report, as appropriate, to the General Assembly of the United Nations).

The substance of the debates was to be based on proposals made by Member States, including those contained in official documents of the Conference, working papers and other recommendations and proposals by States. It was emphasized that Rule 30 of the Rules of Procedure would apply to these debates. The joint proposal was without prejudice to any future decisions of the Conference on its programme of work or on the establishment of any subsidiary body. The Conference on Disarmament took note of the proposal.

15. A representative of the International Atomic Energy Agency (IAEA) made a statement to the Conference at the 1037<sup>th</sup> plenary meeting on 24 August 2006 (CD/PV.1037).

16. During plenary meetings of the Conference, successive Presidents, delegations and groups of delegations expressed their views (duly reflected in relevant PVs) on the issue of a programme of work, taking into account all relevant proposals, including those submitted as the documents of the Conference on Disarmament since 2000. Statements were made by some delegations emphasising that linkages should not be established between elements of a programme of work, while other delegations stressed the need for a balanced and comprehensive approach. The level of support for proposals on a programme of work is duly reflected in the plenary records.