

CONFERENCE ON DISARMAMENT

CD/1843

14 April 2008

Original: ENGLISH

LETTER DATED 4 APRIL 2008 FROM THE PERMANENT REPRESENTATIVE OF PAKISTAN ADDRESSED TO THE PRESIDENT OF THE CONFERENCE ON DISARMAMENT TRANSMITTING THE STATEMENT DELIVERED AT AN INFORMAL MEETING HELD ON 13 MARCH 2008

I have the honour to draw your attention to the document CD/1841 entitled “Presidential Report to the Conference on Disarmament on Part I of the 2008 Session”, circulated in the CD’s plenary meeting on 27 March 2008.

The Presidential Report referred to the draft decision presented by the President of the Conference on Disarmament, contained in document CD/1840, at an *informal meeting* on 13 March 2008. Pakistan, in its statement in the informal plenary on 13 March, had explained its position and raised a number of questions. There was an understanding in the Conference that open and transparent consultations would be held on this informal proposal with a view to reaching consensus on it.

I shall be grateful if you would issue this letter and my statement delivered on 13 March 2008 as an official document of the Conference on Disarmament and distribute it to all member states and non-member participants of the Conference. Copy of the statement is enclosed.

I would like to assure you that Pakistan would engage constructively to a) reach a consensus on a balanced and comprehensive programme of work of the Conference; and b) ensure that security concerns of all CD members are taken on board.

(Signed):

Masood Khan
Ambassador
Permanent Representative

**Statement by Ambassador Masood Khan, Pakistan's Permanent Representative,
in the Conference on Disarmament
Geneva, 13 March 2008**

Mr. President,

We congratulate and compliment you on your Presidency. We thank you for your effective leadership of the Conference on Disarmament. During your Presidency, the Conference has received high level attention. In the coming months, we would continue to count on your wisdom and expertise. Turkey has been keen to start negotiations in the CD as early as possible. You have made consistent efforts to move the CD in that direction. We also commend your delegation for its professionalism and hard work.

Mr. President,

We have seen the paper entitled "*Draft Decision by the Presidents of the 2008 session of the Conference on Disarmament*". We shall transmit it to our capital for careful consideration. We appreciate your assurance that it is not a take-it-or-leave-it proposal. Our initial reaction is as follows:

Process

We would have appreciated more intensive consultations within the P-6 and with the regional groups, before circulation of this paper. Now we take this paper as the beginning of a process for consultations. As we go along, we shall submit our own proposals and amendments to make it more balanced and comprehensive.

Title

The paper is titled "Draft Decision by the Presidents". We understand that decisions, as per Rule 18 of the Rules of Procedure, are taken by the Conference, not by the Presidents. The P-6 is an informal mechanism trying to steer the work of the Conference. Decisions will be taken by the Conference membership. A CD President's functions are spelt out in Rules 9 to 12. The P-6 proposals, like any other proposal, are subject to open negotiations and concurrence of all members. The Presidents' initiatives are not *fait accompli*, but an input for further work.

Substance

The paper omits a commitment to negotiate a "non-discriminatory, multilateral and internationally and effectively verifiable" fissile material treaty. It also omits the possibility of taking up the questions of the scope of the treaty as well as the past and future production of fissile material, as envisaged in the Shannon Report of 1995. To foster consensus, these two elements must be inserted in the proposed negotiating mandate for a Fissile Material Treaty.

The paper should give equal and balanced treatment to the four core issues.

The practice of coordinators, which is an informal arrangement to project that the CD is active before negotiations, does not supplant or substitute the mechanisms recognized by the CD. The coordinators act informally under the authority of the Presidents. They are not Special Coordinators appointed by the Conference. According to Rule 23 of the Rules of Procedure, the recognized mechanisms are ad hoc sub committees, working groups, and technical groups or groups of governmental experts.

Format

The operative part of this paper seeks to indirectly legitimize the informal role of the coordinators and turn it into a formal mandate for their work. It mixes the *informal discussions held by the coordinators* with the *proposed formal programme of work*. This kind of forced amalgamation is unsustainable because the mandate of work for negotiations under various agenda items and the functions of coordinators, appointed under the authority of the Presidents, are separate and distinct. The formal work on the four core issues will be conducted by ad hoc committees, under the relevant Rules of Procedure, and not by coordinators in an informal setting. If a formal role is to be assigned to coordinators, we will have to amend the Rules of Procedure. I do not think we want to embark on that course.

The paper should refer to the CD's agreed agenda and agenda items. It should also be clearly stated that the proposal is for the current session.

Mr. President,

We underline the following elements to achieve success in the CD:

- One*, pursue dialogue and consensus building through wide consultations;
- Two*, pursue transparency and inclusiveness in decision making;
- Three*, take on board security concerns of all CD members;
- Four*, demonstrate faithful adherence to the Rules of Procedure;
- Five*, build upon the consensual agreements and understandings reached earlier.

We stand ready to present our amendments to the paper as per instructions of our capital.

I thank you, Mr. President.
