
Conference on Disarmament

1 September 2011

English

Final record of the one thousand two hundred and thirty-sixth plenary meeting

Held at the Palais des Nations, Geneva, on Thursday, 1 September 2011, at 3.15 p.m.

President: Mr. Rodolfo Reyes Rodríguez (Cuba)

The President (*spoke in Spanish*): I declare open the 1236th plenary meeting of the Conference on Disarmament.

As was mentioned this morning, we are going to begin considering and negotiating the text of the report. I will not repeat what I said, only apply it, and I ask delegations that take the floor to propose any specific amendments they deem necessary. I remind you that you should mention whether you are proposing an addition, a change or a deletion and that proposals should be submitted in writing. This is very important because it is really the only way to guarantee that the proposals are included as presented by each delegation. I also remind you that, in addition to being read out during the meeting, proposals must be submitted in writing to the secretariat.

The document that you have all received was officially distributed on 24 August. It contains the deliberations of the Conference up to 10 August 2011, at which time the document was finalized and submitted for processing.

The draft lists the documents submitted by the delegations up to that date. It goes without saying that the secretariat will make the necessary changes and introduce the formal elements that are not currently included in the document.

The secretariat would like to remind us of a few very important matters, namely, that we will consider the document paragraph by paragraph, that all suggested amendments should, as I mentioned, be submitted in writing and that any editorial changes will be made directly by the secretariat.

I draw your attention to part I of the document, which begins with the introduction, in this case paragraph 1. Are there any questions regarding this paragraph? I will not say *ad referendum* because it is obvious that, as in all multilateral negotiations, the paragraphs will be adopted provisionally, or *ad referendum*, as they always have, and that their adoption will not be final until agreement has been reached on the entire document. However, to save time, I will not say so for every paragraph. Let us simply move on to adopting each paragraph. Are there any comments regarding paragraph 1? Good, then I take it that paragraph 1 is adopted.

Let us consider part II regarding the organization of the work of the Conference. Paragraph 2 provides information about the dates of the 2011 meetings. As I already mentioned, the secretariat will add the final number of plenary meetings that have been held. Are there any comments on paragraph 2? It is adopted.

Let us move on to paragraph 3. The total number of plenary meetings will be recorded in due course. Are there any comments on paragraph 3? It is adopted.

Are there any comments on paragraph 4? It is adopted.

Let us move on to paragraph 5.

Mr. Laassel (Morocco) (*spoke in French*): Mr. President, as this is the first time that my delegation has taken the floor during your presidency, I would like to congratulate you on your assumption of the presidency and also commend the efforts of the other presidents.

The Kingdom of Morocco shares the view that the report of the Conference on Disarmament to the General Assembly of the United Nations should be factual and procedural and deal with the work of the Conference rather than the Conference itself. Therefore, we believe that the reference contained in paragraph 5 is selective, as it deals with only part of the Secretary-General's statement. We propose that the paragraph merely refer to the report of the relevant meeting.

The President (*spoke in Spanish*): There is a specific proposal by the delegation of Morocco. Would Pakistan object to revising this paragraph?

Let us be methodical. Please do not ask for the floor if you wish to support a proposal, but only if you have objections. If, as I imagine, Pakistan will support Morocco's proposal, then I do not think the delegation needs to take the floor. Do any delegations object to the proposal by Morocco to revise this paragraph in order to make it coherent with the Secretary-General's entire statement, by explicitly referring to the document in which the statement is recorded? Are there any objections? As there are none, the proposal by Morocco is approved and paragraph 5 will be revised.

Ms. Fogante (Argentina) (*spoke in Spanish*): I did not want to request the floor earlier because my intervention concerning paragraph 5 is not related to its content. My delegation has no objections to adopting it as it stands, but we would like to raise the question of how we could reflect the Secretary-General's statement in this report while taking into account our later references to the high-level meeting, which is an initiative of the Secretary-General.

For the moment, we would merely like to point out that, in his statement of 26 January, the Secretary-General referred to his own initiative, namely the high-level meeting of September 2006. Therefore, we could include a reference to it and develop the various elements relating to the high-level meeting in the remainder of the report. I say this taking into consideration the informal meeting we had with the Secretary-General on 26 August, the meeting of 30 June with the Advisory Board on Disarmament Matters and the elements in paragraphs 8 to 11. We could, for example, insert our entire reference to the Secretary-General's statement after paragraph 7. But for now, I leave it as something to think about later when we reach the paragraphs devoted to the high-level meeting. I hope that I have not complicated the consideration of this paragraph.

The President (*spoke in Spanish*): You have not complicated it, provided we proceed as I suggest, taking into account your viewpoint, which corresponds to what was said this morning by various Latin American delegations – that is, to include certain specific issues in the report's substantive references. In the case of paragraph 5, as we are referring to statements by various dignitaries, including ministers and such, I suggest leaving out the general reference to the statement and, as proposed by the delegation of Morocco, referring to the official Conference document that contains the Secretary-General's entire statement. This would not preclude us from making any amendments deemed necessary to take into account delegations' interests, once we start the substantive consideration of the remaining paragraphs.

Mr. Gill (India): Mr. President, my delegation is comfortable with the language of paragraph 5 as it is currently drafted, but our colleague from Morocco has raised the issue of selectivity, which is always a problem when we try to refer to statements by high-level dignitaries. Now I would have thought that we could fix that by a small insertion saying that the Secretary-General delivered a message in which he, *inter alia*, talked about the adoption of a programme of work. And let me emphasize here that we end with the reference to consensus, so what the Secretary-General suggested was in accordance with the Conference's rules of procedure.

So I am wondering, given the points that have been raised by the representatives of Morocco and Argentina, if we can fix this paragraph by just saying, "in which he, *inter alia*, said that..." and then continuing.

The President (*spoke in Spanish*): The delegation of India has made a proposal that is acceptable to Morocco and supported by other delegations.

Mr. Laassel (Morocco) (*spoke in French*): I thank our colleague from India for his proposal. However, my delegation thinks that it is not customary for reports to the General Assembly to include in full all statements made by dignitaries, but rather a selection of excerpts. I think that the Secretary-General's statement was a very important one which

conveyed several points. He described the situation of the Conference and put forward several suggestions. I do not have the text before me, but I do not see why we would choose only the passage referring to the adoption of the 2009 programme of work. That is why we propose to keep the wording up to “delivered an important message” and refer to the record of the meeting that includes the entire speech, which would enable us to present the matter in a very simple and objective manner.

The President (*spoke in Spanish*): We have another option, that is, to look at paragraph 5 of last year’s report, which was more general and had the advantage of not losing the substantive message. I do not know whether you have on hand document CD/1900, which states:

(*continued in English*)

At the inaugural meeting of the 2010 session on 19 January, the Secretary-General of the United Nations, Mr. Ban Ki-moon, delivered a video message in which he urged the Conference to recognize the importance of achieving progress in disarmament and non-proliferation in 2010 and expressed the hope that it would agree on a programme of work as soon as possible, hopefully during the first part of its session.

(*continued in Spanish*)

I ask the delegation of Morocco, and others who might be interested, whether we could work on the basis of a substantive message similar to that in paragraph 5 of last year’s report, and make a general reference to progress in disarmament and non-proliferation and to the desire to move forward on a programme of work. I think that we have all been trying throughout this year to make progress on that front, so it is not really a contentious issue.

Ms. Drexler (Germany): Mr. President, let me congratulate you on the assumption of the presidency.

I just wanted to reply briefly to the remarks of our Moroccan colleague regarding selectivity in mentioning certain parts of the speech of the Secretary-General. I think the reason why this is maybe more relevant here than other comments is that it has direct procedural relevance for the work that we are doing, and, as you have just shown, we have made reference to requests to the Conference to adopt a programme of work before, in previous reports. So, from my point of view, it would be a good compromise to go along with the proposal made by our Indian colleague to insert “inter alia” and otherwise retain the paragraph as it is.

Mr. Lusiński (Poland): Mr. President, since the Polish delegation is taking the floor for the first time during your presidency, let me congratulate you on assuming the presidency and wish you the best possible results. Your energetic way of conducting the debate is definitely suited to achieving success.

Let me make sure we are still proceeding in formal mode. Since we are adopting the report point by point, I don’t believe we can leave any square brackets because this would mean that this part is optional. So we would have to make a decision either way. We do not have any specific position regarding whether to leave the text in square brackets, but we will have to make up our minds.

Mr. Corr (Ireland): Mr. President, since this is my first time speaking, may I also congratulate you and Cuba on assuming the presidency.

Very briefly, our feeling is very much the same as that of the representatives of India, Germany and others. This section relates to the organization of the work of the Conference, and, while the issue will come up elsewhere, I think the “inter alia” idea

actually does straddle the facts very well. So we would favour, since it is a specific issue, leaving the paragraph as it is, simply because it is under the chapeau of “Organization of the work of the Conference”.

If later the wider issues need to be addressed, we could look at them here, but I do think “*inter alia*” really does solve this problem effectively.

The President (*spoke in Spanish*): Having listened to the Ambassador of Ireland, I suggest the following: let us leave paragraph 5 for later consideration and continue with the first reading. I never expected that the first reading would allow us to clear up all doubts. I would prefer to discuss these issues with the delegations later and try to find a formulation that suits everyone.

So let us leave paragraph 5 pending and move on to paragraph 6. Are there any comments?

I think the delegation of the United States of America mentioned this morning the statement by the Secretary of State, but I am not sure whether it dealt with paragraph 6 or paragraph 7.

Mr. Reid (United States of America): Mr. President, in fact, paragraph 6 as it appears — the spelling of her name and everything — is fine. It was how we deal with comments that are imputed to her in paragraph 7 that I wanted to address. I can wait until paragraph 7 comes up.

The President (*spoke in Spanish*): Do any delegations wish to say anything about paragraph 6?

Mr. Lusiński (Poland): Mr. President, I am not the Coordinator of the Group of Western European and Other States any longer — it is now the job of Ambassador Corr of Ireland — but I would like to refer to your possibly visionary notion about an organization for the prohibition of nuclear weapons. For the time being, Ambassador Ahmet Üzümcü is Director-General of the Organization for the Prohibition of Chemical Weapons.

The President (*spoke in Spanish*): Are there any objections to the proposal by Poland? I do not think so.

Paragraph 6 is adopted. Let us move on to paragraph 7.

Mr. Reid (United States of America): Mr. President, I imagine that what I’m about to say could be shared by colleagues whose countries’ ministers and other representatives were listed in paragraph 6. Our challenge is to summarize what in fact were quite heterogeneous remarks.

I would simply note at this point that in fact Secretary of State Clinton did not highlight the work of all the presidents. She specifically thanked Ambassador Jazaïry, who was at that time the acting President. She also did not subscribe to several of the other sentences here. I would imagine that what we are going to have to do is either devise a recasting of paragraph 7 that is more minimalistic or look at whether or not we really require a full summary paragraph such as we have in paragraph 7. I am open to working with colleagues on either approach, but as the text is now it does not in fact reflect what the Secretary of State said.

The President (*spoke in Spanish*): I am not aware of any instructions on recognizing the work of any specific president, and there have been other presidents. My delegation would have no difficulty with removing the reference to specific presidents and simply stating that they welcomed the concerted effort by the Conference on Disarmament as a body, without having to name any one president. Are there any objections to removing the reference to presidents in this paragraph and summarizing the statements by dignitaries

in the preceding paragraph? As there are none, the reference to presidents is removed. Can we then adopt paragraph 7?

Ms. Jáquez Huacuja (Mexico) (*spoke in Spanish*): I have no problem with the suggestion. However, I would like to comment on what we have heard. Perhaps we could also include the phrase “some of those dignitaries” in order not to give the impression that all the speakers said exactly the same thing, because that might be inaccurate.

The President (*spoke in Spanish*): I do not object to your proposal, but if we include the thoughts of only a few and give the impression that some of them did not support the joint efforts of the Conference to move forward by consensus and begin multilateral negotiations, then we could give the wrong signal. Therefore, in order to avoid specific references to any of the presidents, myself included, my suggestion would be to simply remove the reference to the presidents, although I believe that, as a rule, all those who made statements commended the concerted efforts of the Conference on Disarmament and expressed their support for its continued work towards consensus and launching multilateral negotiations. I think that if we rephrase the sentence that way, we will not be implying that certain people expressed doubt.

Ms. Jáquez Huacuja (Mexico) (*spoke in Spanish*): Mr. President, I agree with your approach and accept the proposal.

Mr. Wilson (Australia): Mr. President, taking up Mexico’s point, I was just going to suggest that the word “variously” be inserted before the word “addressed” in the first sentence. This is obviously in the English. I don’t have the other languages in front of me. “But these dignitaries, recognizing the forum, variously addressed a wide range of issues in the area of disarmament and international security.” That would convey the fact that there wasn’t uniformity but they addressed a wide range of issues. That is just a suggestion.

The President (*spoke in Spanish*): I have no quarrel with this specific proposal by Australia. Are there any objections to including it?

Mr. Suda (Japan): While we are talking about the suggestion made by the President, in the second sentence, as I understand it, your suggestion is: “... they also welcomed the concerted efforts by the Conference on Disarmament and expressed their support ...” Is that a correct understanding of what you’re suggesting?

I think they didn’t particularly welcome the concerted efforts of the Conference on Disarmament. If the Conference on Disarmament had been making concerted efforts, it should have made more progress. So my suggestion is to say just that “they also expressed their support for further efforts by the Conference”, deleting “the concerted efforts by the President of the Conference on Disarmament and”.

The President (*spoke in Spanish*): Japan has made what I think is an interesting proposal. If we want to be truthful about what is happening in the Conference, we should not praise something we have not accomplished, but rather express what we should be doing. I think that the proposal by Japan is a welcome one and could be submitted for your consideration.

Mr. Reid (United States of America): Mr. President, first off, an explicit expression of support for your fix in the first sentence, and thank you very much. Support as well for our Australian and Japanese colleagues for their suggestions.

In the second line of the current draft, where there is a reference to the Conference as the single multilateral disarmament negotiating forum, my Secretary of State did not say that either – I don’t think she would ever say that. I would suggest that a way around this would be just to recognize the importance of the Conference on Disarmament and then drop “the single multilateral disarmament forum”, resuming with “addressed a wide range” or

“variously addressed a wide range”. You see that that recurs in the penultimate sentence of the same paragraph, where it could also be dropped.

The President (*spoke in Spanish*): On this point I do have a substantive problem. I can understand the concern of the United States delegation about attributing to the Secretary of State positions to which the country does not subscribe, but I think that perhaps we can resolve the issue in the first sentence by including something such as:

(*continued in English*)

“Most of those dignitaries” — or “various dignitaries” — “recognized the importance of the Conference as the single multilateral disarmament negotiating forum, and all of them addressed a wide range ...” I think that it is very important to keep the concept of a wide range of members of the Conference. I think that we need to preserve that concept.

I would like to ask our colleague from the United States if he can accept the wording “in their addresses a wide range of dignitaries recognized the importance of the Conference as the single multilateral disarmament negotiating forum, and all of them addressed a wide range of issues in the area of disarmament and international security”. Would that be acceptable to the United States?

Mr. Reid (United States of America): That’s fine by me, Mr. President. I just wanted to make clear that it was not our Secretary of State who said that.

The President (*spoke in Spanish*): We have two specific revision proposals, one concerning the first sentence and the other, by Japan, concerning the third sentence of the paragraph. Can we adopt paragraph 7 with the changes to the first and third sentences?

Mr. Ahmad (Pakistan): Mr. President, we recognize the utter difficulty that we have in this paragraph, all the more so as we have already discussed paragraph 5, in which we are trying to summarize some of the elements from one speaker, and here we have the ordeal of summarizing or identifying highest common factors for a number of dignitaries. However, I think that a number of suggestions have been made. Probably we could discuss this paragraph later on with the amendments that are being proposed incorporated in the text.

The President (*spoke in Spanish*): Following the proposal by the delegation of Pakistan, I suggest that we leave paragraph 7 pending and move on to paragraph 8. Do any delegations wish to say anything about this paragraph?

Mr. Khelif (Algeria) (*spoke in French*): The delegation of Algeria would like to address paragraphs 8 and 9 together since they cover the same topic.

My delegation thinks that the Conference on Disarmament should reclaim the current discussions on the follow-up process of the high-level meeting on revitalizing the work of the Conference on Disarmament, but it should do so in accordance with its rules of procedure, which stipulate that reports of the Conference shall reflect the negotiations and work of the Conference and contain inter alia the agenda and a summary of specific requests addressed to the Conference by the United Nations General Assembly.

We can report on discussions held in the Conference regarding the high-level meeting, but we do not think that section A is the appropriate place to broach that topic. Perhaps we could shift paragraph 8 to part III, section H, which deals with other matters considered during the session.

We should also disassociate two elements in paragraphs 8 and 9: discussions about the high-level meeting, and internal discussions about the revitalization of the Conference. For this reason, we think that the document drafted by Colombia, in its national capacity,

regarding the revitalization of the Conference should be reflected in part II, section G on the improved and effective functioning of the Conference on Disarmament.

The President (*spoke in Spanish*): The specific proposal by Algeria involves moving paragraph 8 to part III, section H and paragraph 9 to part II, section G.

Mr. Khelif (Algeria) (*spoke in French*): In fact, my delegation suggests transferring paragraphs 8 and 9 (a), relative to the letter containing the text of the common statement of 29 delegations to the Conference of Disarmament (CD/1911), to part III, section H on other disarmament-related matters.

Concerning the document by Colombia, as you said, we suggest reflecting it in part II, section G on improving the functioning of the Conference on Disarmament.

The President (*spoke in Spanish*): Let me see if I have understood correctly. Paragraphs 8 and 9 (a) would be moved to part III, section H, while paragraph 9 (b) would be moved to part II, section G. Is that your suggestion?

I repeat the proposal: to move paragraphs 8 and 9 (a) to part III, section H, and paragraph 9 (b) to part II, section G. This is Algeria's proposal.

Mr. Valencia Muñoz (Colombia) (*spoke in Spanish*): Mr. President, in the same vein as the statement by Ambassador Arango Olmos this morning, and in line with your request for tangible paragraphs, my delegation proposes the following alternative for paragraph 8:

“Members of the Conference on Disarmament discussed the situation of the Conference on Disarmament and ways to strengthen it in informal plenary meetings held on 9 and 14 June 2011, taking into account, among others, the subsequent follow-up events to the high-level meeting on revitalizing the work of the Conference on Disarmament, held in New York on 24 September 2010.

Their views on this issue are duly reflected in the plenary records of the Conference. The Conference received document CD/1913, dated 30 June 2011, entitled ‘Letter dated 27 June 2011 from the Permanent Representative of Colombia addressed to the Secretary-General of the Conference on Disarmament transmitting a document entitled “Thoughts on the current state of the Conference on Disarmament and how to strengthen it”’.”

The idea is that, instead of referring only to the high-level meeting, we would focus in the report on what has been accomplished in the Conference on Disarmament, which would also address the doubts raised by the representative of Algeria. What we should be reporting on is our own discussion of this topic. That is our proposal. This way it would not be necessary to move the paragraph to the section on other matters, as Algeria suggested earlier.

Ms. Fröhler (Austria): Mr. President, since it's the first time that I have taken the floor, let me too congratulate you on your assumption of the presidency, and of course assure you of the full cooperation of my delegation.

When it comes to the changes suggested by my Algerian colleague, I have to admit that I fail to see the logic behind them, and I would actually ask him to kindly elaborate on why 9 (a) would go to part III, section H and 9 (b) would go to part II, section G. Actually we are very much in favour of retaining the language as it stands, but I stand to be corrected if my Algerian colleague makes a convincing argument.

The President (*spoke in Spanish*): We also have the proposal by Colombia, which, in my opinion, is a sensible text.

Mr. Khelif (Algeria) (*spoke in French*): First, I would like to respond to the proposal just made by our colleague from Colombia, which states that the views of the member States regarding the meetings held on 9 and 14 June 2011 are duly reflected in the plenary records of the Conference. Those meetings were informal, and, if I am not mistaken, no decision has been taken by the Conference about including the substance of those discussions in a record. I do not know how this can be reflected if the Colombian proposal is approved.

As to dividing paragraphs 8 and 9 between sections G and H, I said at the start of my earlier statement that the report must be drafted according to the principles set out in the rules of procedure, which stipulate that reports of the Conference shall be factual, reflect the negotiations and work of the Conference, and contain the agenda and a summary of specific requests addressed to the Conference.

My delegation thinks that discussions regarding the high-level meeting are not on the agenda of the Conference; rather, they occurred in conjunction with another discussion process under way in New York. Therefore, we do not think that the introductory part of section A, on the 2011 session of the Conference, is the appropriate place to reflect that discussion, which in our view is about issues other than the Conference agenda. That is why we suggested moving paragraphs 8 and 9 (a) to part III, section H, of the report.

Mr. El-Atawy (Egypt): Mr. President, let me repeat my congratulations to you for assuming the presidency and pledge our helpful cooperation with your presidency. Can I, through you, ask the delegate of Colombia to provide us with the precise language of his suggestion — if possible, in English — so we are able to consider his suggestion and decide where we stand regarding it?

The President (*spoke in Spanish*): I suggest the following: before making a decision, I will give the floor to Chile. The delegation of Colombia assures me that it has the text in English, and we will distribute it, as is customary. I already requested at the start that delegations submit their proposals to the secretariat.

To help the process along and dispatch the report, I ask the delegation of Colombia to give its proposal to the secretariat, which will then distribute it to all the delegations. In any case, before deciding what to do about paragraphs 8 and 9, I give the floor to Chile.

Mr. Guzmán (Chile) (*spoke in Spanish*): My delegation, given that we share a language with Colombia, perfectly understands the paragraph that delegation has proposed and supports it fully.

Mr. Daryaei (Islamic Republic of Iran): Mr. President, I fully understand the argument made by our colleague from Algeria. We support splitting paragraph 9 and moving paragraphs 8 and 9 (a) as he proposes.

With regard to the proposal made by our colleague from Colombia, I think we need to see the exact formulation. However — we raised this concern many times — the proposal presented to this chamber by Colombia was a national paper. It was not a summary of the discussion, and this delegation objects to any reflection to the contrary.

Ms. Jáquez Huacuja (Mexico) (*spoke in Spanish*): We support the delegation of Colombia. However, I would like to make a suggestion in the interest of expediency. The issue is that the heading of paragraph 9 — I am reading from the Spanish — suggests that the subsequently mentioned documents on the follow-up discussion to the high-level meeting were submitted to the Conference. Therefore, with all due respect to the delegations that have suggested that those paragraphs should be moved to other sections under different headings, we do not think this is appropriate, because the paragraph lists the documents that were presented in the context of follow-up to the high-level meeting.

That being said, to address some of the concerns raised, perhaps paragraphs 8 and 9, which refer to the high-level meeting and the meetings on revitalizing the work of the Conference on Disarmament, could be moved in their entirety to part II, section G, on the improved and effective functioning of the Conference. In the end the purpose of the high-level meeting convened by the Secretary-General and of our follow-up to it here is to seek ways of making the Conference's work more effective. Thus, a factual list of the working documents that were presented would remain in the first part, instead of their all being placed under the follow-up to the high-level meeting. This way we could start work on the text proposed by Colombia and other delegations regarding the high-level meeting.

The President (*spoke in Spanish*): Before saying that I like your proposal, let me hear what the delegation of Colombia has to say, not because it will say the opposite, but because I do not want any conflicts between two Latin American countries.

Mr. Valencia Muñoz (Colombia) (*spoke in Spanish*): I simply want to state that my delegation agrees that paragraphs 8, 9, 10 and 11 should be treated as a unit. We think that this would address the concerns raised about the report by the other delegations.

The President (*spoke in Spanish*): Does the delegation of Colombia have any objection to working on Mexico's proposal for a unit comprising paragraphs 8, 9 and 10 to go in part II, section G?

Mr. Valencia Muñoz (Colombia) (*spoke in Spanish*): We agree to it, Mr. President.

The President (*spoke in Spanish*): Does the delegation of Austria agree as well? Does the delegation of Algeria have any objections?

Mr. Khelif (Algeria) (*spoke in French*): We have already expressed our view on moving paragraphs 8 and 9.

Our colleague from Mexico has just made a proposal to move paragraphs 9 (a) and 9 (b) to part II, section G. We have already agreed to the proposal by Colombia regarding paragraph 9 (b). As to moving the letter containing the text of the common statement of 29 delegations to the Conference of Disarmament on the high-level-meeting follow-up debate in the General Assembly, I do not know. The opinion of the 29 delegations and the content of their statement are perfectly respectable, but some parts of the statement suggest the possibility of using other means to move multilateral negotiations forward. The delegations hint at the possibility of turning to forums other than the Conference on Disarmament.

I do not know whether mentioning such a solution is meant to strengthen the Conference or, on the contrary, to set it completely aside. Therefore, we do not think it appropriate to report on that statement in the section on strengthening the Conference.

The President (*spoke in Spanish*): There are several matters pending, and various proposals have been made. I suggest leaving paragraphs 8 and 9 pending for now. We have not examined paragraph 10, so let us do that.

Mr. Gill (India): Mr. President, we could work on the basis of the proposal from Mexico and Colombia to move these paragraphs into part II, section G on the improved and effective functioning of the Conference, but we would need to drastically summarize the paragraphs.

To my delegation it appears that we have, through detail, created problems for ourselves. There were some factual things that we need to reflect in this report – mainly the interactive session with the Advisory Board on Disarmament Matters. That can be captured through a simple sentence in section G.

Of course, we also need to capture the fact that several delegations addressed the matter of follow-up to the high-level meeting held late last year. That was done not just on

two days or three days but throughout the year. So I am sure we can come out with a formulation that captures that fact in that section.

Finally, with regard to the documents that have been submitted, I think the intention of Colombia certainly seemed to be to stimulate a debate in the Conference on improved and effective functioning, and we can certainly capture that by saying that specific documents related to that issue were submitted.

The President (*spoke in Spanish*): The statement by India has confirmed what I thought was necessary, namely, that we should take another look at those paragraphs later, taking into consideration the various proposals, particularly Algeria's and also Mexico's, which seems interesting. Let us not forget the paragraph proposed by Colombia, which the secretariat will distribute to all the delegations.

Paragraph 10 is, as was mentioned previously, connected to paragraphs 8 and 9. We have not considered it yet, so I open the floor for discussion.

Mr. Khelif (Algeria) (*spoke in French*): Paragraph 10 is made up of two sentences. The first gives an account of the conclusions drawn by the Secretary-General of the United Nations following the high-level meeting and of his decision to task the Advisory Board on Disarmament Matters with brainstorming about the Conference. It also presents the conclusions of the fifty-fifth session of the Advisory Board. My delegation thinks that this is not germane to the activities of the Conference, and therefore we do not see why it should be mentioned in the annual report.

Turning to the second sentence, which covers the fifty-sixth session of the Advisory Board and the latter's discussion with the Conference on Disarmament here in this room on 30 June, we think that this sentence could be included in part II, section G on the improved and effective functioning of the Conference.

The President (*spoke in Spanish*): I am not so sure that the Secretary-General's statement and the mandated tasks are not related to the Conference.

Ms. Fogante (Argentina) (*spoke in Spanish*): In the light of what we said this morning, we understand the logic of what the delegation of Algeria is proposing, and perhaps we should spend a little more time trying to see how we can reflect those comments.

We should indeed retain what the Secretary-General said to the Conference on Disarmament as well as the fact that we have had various opportunities, not only when he paid us a visit on 26 January, as already mentioned in paragraph 5, but also at the informal meeting we had with him to exchange views on the high-level meeting. We also had, as we mentioned this morning and as is reflected here, an informal meeting with the members of the Advisory Board. Lastly, we also held official meetings to follow up on the meeting of 27 July, which took place after the high-level meeting. Perhaps we should try again to recast the paragraph in a way that reflects all these elements from the perspective of the Conference's work. Naturally, we understand that they might be moved elsewhere, as we have already seen with part II, section G of the report.

The President (*spoke in Spanish*): Are any delegations inclined to work on recasting the paragraph on the basis of the criteria that have been mentioned? I do not know if that is what is being suggested. I will give the floor to Germany, followed by Colombia, and hope that one of these countries will volunteer to submit an alternative proposal.

Ms. Drexler (Germany): Colombia was first, actually.

Mr. Valencia Muñoz (Colombia) (*spoke in Spanish*): Mr. President, as you know, my ambassador is quite active. We already have two proposals which would replace the current text of paragraphs 10 and 11 and subsume paragraph 9 under them. We believe that

our proposals address the doubts expressed by the delegation of Algeria and are in line with what the representative of Argentina said. We also have them for distribution in English, if necessary.

The President (*spoke in Spanish*): I invite the delegation of Colombia to submit them to us, and we will take them into account during our second reading of the document. We appreciate this. I do not think your ambassador is the only dynamic one among you, as we ambassadors can always count on dynamic expert advisors, so I thank the delegation of Colombia as a whole.

Ms. Drexler (Germany): Mr. President, we are looking forward to seeing the Colombian proposal in writing, and I can imagine that it provides good language.

One possibility could be to drastically shorten paragraph 10, as suggested by our Algerian colleague, in order to concentrate on what actually happened in the Conference on Disarmament. Then one could even start with the current last sentence of that paragraph, which starts with “during its fifty-sixth session in Geneva, the Advisory Board on Disarmament Matters attended an informal plenary meeting of the Conference on Disarmament on 30 June 2011”.

But then I would suggest adding what has been said by many of the Conference delegations. For example, the formulation could be “in which member States expressed deep concern about the repeated failure of the Conference to adopt and implement a programme of work for its annual session, thus continuing its more-than-a-decade-long inability to fulfil its function as the single multilateral disarmament forum”. I am happy to share that with other members of the Conference.

The President (*spoke in Spanish*): Your proposals will also be welcome, and we would really appreciate it if you could incorporate the good ideas expressed by the representative of Argentina. We eagerly await your proposal.

Mr. Lusiński (Poland): Mr. President, in the joint effort to redraft paragraph 10, the Polish delegation would like to propose, after the words “the Secretary-General of the United Nations, Mr. Ban Ki-moon”, deleting “said that he would ask his” and putting simply “requested the Advisory Board on Disarmament Matters”.

The President (*spoke in Spanish*): I would like to remind you that the proposals are made in the specific context of the Conference. This will help us since it is that body’s report that we are drafting.

Mr. Ahmad (Pakistan): Mr. President, we think that, just as Algeria stated, the first part of paragraph 10 is not related to the work of the Conference. But regarding our effort to devise language regarding the second part, starting with the phrase “during its fifty-sixth session” and dealing with the Advisory Board on Disarmament Matters, I think the elements of a better formulation could involve starting a sentence with the phrase “During its fifty-sixth session”, and if we have to add substantive language, which, as some delegations have suggested, would describe what this meeting is about, that language could probably be added at the end of this paragraph. We are also of the view that, as Algeria stated, after we agree on language for this paragraph, maybe a better place for the paragraph can also be considered.

Mr. Daryaei (Islamic Republic of Iran): Mr. President, we also believe that the proposed paragraphs 10 and 11 do not have any relationship to the work of the Conference, so we would very much prefer the total deletion of the proposed paragraphs. But if other delegations would like to have something, we can go along with the proposal made by our colleague from Pakistan to keep only the sentence which shows that the Advisory Board had an informal meeting with the Conference in Geneva.

The President (*spoke in Spanish*): Thank you for your flexibility and for not being too drastic, because if we keep deleting text we will end up without a report and then I truly will not have anything to say to the General Assembly.

As to those paragraphs, I suggest, as mentioned, that we leave their consideration for later. We will wait for the proposals of the various delegations that have expressed their interest in recasting the paragraphs, particularly Germany and Colombia. I would also appreciate their taking into account the proposals and concerns of the delegations of Argentina and Pakistan and others that have voiced their opinion. I think that the discussion has shed light on the various views regarding these themes.

I open the floor for discussion of paragraph 11, which I hope we will not delete.

Mr. Valencia Muñoz (Colombia) (*spoke in Spanish*): When I said that our proposals were ready for distribution, I forgot to read the proposal for paragraph 11, which specifically addresses the concern that the report of the Conference on Disarmament should deal with the activities undertaken in the Conference.

The alternative paragraph 11 we propose reads as follows:

“The Conference on Disarmament held a plenary meeting on 4 August 2011 regarding the plenary debate of the General Assembly held from 27 to 29 July 2011 in follow-up to the high-level meeting of 24 September 2010, as requested by 49 States Members of the United Nations in a letter dated 18 April 2011. Related documents were submitted to the Conference in document CD/1911 dated 21 June 2011.”

This way, we would focus paragraph 11 on an activity of the Conference on Disarmament and subsume paragraph 9 (b), to which I alluded earlier.

The President (*spoke in Spanish*): It somehow seemed to me that paragraph 9 (b) was itself an earlier reformulation of paragraph 8 as put forward by the delegation of Colombia. In any case, this is an interesting proposal by Colombia; however, the delegation of Algeria wishes to say something regarding paragraph 11.

Mr. Khelif (Algeria) (*spoke in French*): The delegation of Algeria believes that, as it stands, paragraph 11 deals with a matter unrelated to the direct activities of the Conference on Disarmament. We therefore suggest deleting it.

Perhaps we could think about how to report on the discussions in the Conference regarding the July 2011 meeting held in follow-up to the high-level meeting. In that connection, the proposal by Colombia could serve as a basis for an agreed text.

The President (*spoke in Spanish*): In that case, I suggest that the delegation of Colombia also submit for distribution the text of this paragraph – if possible, in English.

Mr. Ahmad (Pakistan): Mr. President, we completely agree with the Algerian delegation that this paragraph in its current formulation is not part of the Conference’s work, but we look forward to the Colombian proposal, and we will be able to give our comments on that.

Mr. Laassel (Morocco) (*spoke in French*): Like the delegations of Algeria and Pakistan, we believe that this paragraph refers to a letter sent to the Secretary-General by 49 countries. Applying the same logic, namely, that the report should reflect what happened within the Conference, we think that the paragraph does not belong in the report.

The President (*spoke in Spanish*): I think your concerns are valid, although the proposal by Colombia could specify that we are referring to the Conference’s consideration of the outcome of that meeting. Let us wait for the text by Colombia to be distributed to all the delegations, and then we can return to this paragraph.

Accordingly, I suggest that we leave paragraph 11 pending and move on to paragraph 12.

Ms. Fröhler (Austria): Mr. President, we would just like to lend our support, obviously, to the Colombian suggestion, because we believe that it is a fair reflection of what has actually taken place in the Conference.

Also — a point of information — we have requested that the secretariat issue the letter dated 18 April 2011 on behalf of 49 States Members of the United Nations which was submitted to the Secretary-General of the United Nations and the General Assembly as an official conference document of the Conference on Disarmament. We hope that the submission of that will definitely be reflected in the Conference report.

The President (*spoke in Spanish*): There is clearly no reason not to mention an official document in the report, but we will return to the topic when we have a clear idea of how to accommodate the proposals. We will wait for the complete text by Colombia. We are moving on to paragraph 12.

Do any delegations wish to propose anything regarding paragraph 12 of the document?

I am about to ask the ambassadors to please carry off their expert advisors, who are working so hard and have so many ideas and suggestions.

Since there are no comments on paragraph 12, it is adopted.

We are moving on to section B of the document, concerning participation in the work of the Conference.

Do any delegations wish to take the floor regarding paragraph 13?

Mr. Khelif (Algeria) (*spoke in French*): May I return to paragraph 10, Mr. President?

The President (*spoke in Spanish*): I cannot refuse, although we did decide to leave it pending. But let us hear your thoughts, so that they are fresh in mind when we return to the matters on hold. In your case, I cannot call for the ambassador, since Mr. Jazāiry is as dynamic as you.

Mr. Khelif (Algeria) (*spoke in French*): I would like to say that my delegation supports, in principle, the idea shared by Colombia, but we think that to start by saying that the Conference on Disarmament held an official plenary meeting on 4 August 2011 would mean that there had been a formal decision regarding the object of the meeting. We suggest starting the paragraph as follows:

(*continued in English*)

“During the plenary meeting of 4 August 2011, the Conference on Disarmament discussed ...”, and then continuing with the rest of the sentence.

The President (*spoke in French*): Could you please put your suggestion in writing and, if possible, consult with the delegation of Colombia? That would be better.

(*continued in Spanish*)

Let us resume where we left off – in other words, with paragraph 13. Are there any worries, proposals, concerns or additions? Since that is not the case, then paragraph 13 is adopted.

We are moving on to section C and the consideration of paragraph 14. Do any delegations wish to comment on this paragraph? Since that is not the case, then paragraph 14 is adopted.

Paragraph 15 lists the official documents submitted to the Conference. Do any delegations wish to say anything about this paragraph? Paragraph 15 is adopted.

We are moving on to section D regarding the agenda and the programme of work for the 2011 session, a topic on which we have made much progress this year, especially on the programme of work.

I open the floor for comments on paragraph 16. Do any delegations wish to take the floor? Since that is not the case, then paragraph 16 is adopted.

Are there any comments on paragraph 17? Paragraph 17 is adopted.

Are there any comments on paragraph 18? Paragraph 18 is adopted.

We are moving on to paragraph 19.

Mr. Khelif (Algeria) (*spoke in French*): Regarding paragraph 19, my delegation thinks that the objective of the Conference on Disarmament is to seek consensus on a programme of work in order to begin negotiations on the various agenda items, not to submit proposals for a programme of work.

Therefore, we suggest a different phrasing: “During the annual session, the successive presidents of the Conference on Disarmament led intense consultations with a view to reaching agreement on a programme of work. Despite its efforts, the Conference on Disarmament was unable to adopt a programme of work or to put in place or restore specific mechanisms for all of these matters during its 2011 session.” This would better reflect the situation of the Conference.

The President (*spoke in Spanish*): Please submit your proposal to the secretariat in writing. I think that the delegation of Mexico also mentioned this paragraph this morning.

Ms. Jáquez Huacuja (Mexico) (*spoke in Spanish*): Without questioning the merits of the proposal just made by the delegation of Algeria, which seems acceptable to me, my delegation would like to ask that the following sentence be added to paragraph 19: “During the 2011 session, no draft decision was submitted on the establishment of a programme of work; therefore, the Conference on Disarmament was not in a position to adopt or implement a programme of work during the 2011 session.” However, we remain flexible with regard to adopting the text proposed by the delegation of Algeria, which includes a reference to the consultations carried out by the presidents. Its inclusion in this paragraph is appropriate and necessary.

The President (*spoke in Spanish*): I thank the delegation of Mexico and am especially grateful for its flexibility and positive attitude towards the proposal by Algeria, which does not in fact refer to the presidency of Cuba — given that I have not broached this theme — but does recognize the intensive efforts made on the programme of work by the various presidents throughout the year. I think it is fair, although we were not successful on that front, to somehow recognize the intensive effort to reach consensus on a specific document.

Mr. Ahmad (Pakistan): Mr. President, while Pakistan would have preferred the deletion of paragraph 19, we can have a look at the language proposed by Algeria when it is circulated by the secretariat.

Mr. Suda (Japan): My delegation welcomes the Indian suggestion for improving paragraph 19. I would like just to ask a question of the Algerian delegate. When he read his proposal, I think he referred to “the mechanism”, but what does that mean? Can I have an explanation?

Mr. Khelif (Algeria) (*spoke in French*): We opted for the term “mechanism” because we wanted a generic term that could also refer to subsidiary bodies, such as ad hoc committees or working groups, special coordinators or facilitators.

The President (*spoke in Spanish*): I suggest that we take note of the text handed out by Algeria and examine the actual proposed wording in detail once we have received it.

Mr. Laassel (Morocco) (*spoke in French*): Again applying the logic that the report should reflect what has occurred rather than what has not, we were in favour of deleting this paragraph. However, since the proposal by Algeria seems interesting, we are willing to consider it.

Mr. Endoni (Nigeria): Mr. President, with reference to the suggestions by the representatives of Algeria and Mexico, we agree that it should be mentioned that a note on the establishment of a programme of work was circulated during the 2011 session. But we should not lose sight of the fact that a lot of effort went into moving the Conference out of the current stalemate. So the Nigerian delegation thinks that we can work around the Algerian proposal and come up with something for this paragraph. I would not support the deletion of the paragraph.

The President (*spoke in Spanish*): I suggest we proceed with this paragraph as follows: replace the current text with the wording proposed by Algeria and then work, on second reading, on the basis of the Algerian proposal. We will also consider the elements put forward by the delegation of Mexico and the proposals of any other delegations. Evidently, the thrust of the proposal by Algeria appears better suited for work on second reading.

With this clarification, let us leave the paragraph pending and move on to paragraph 20. Do any delegations wish to take the floor?

Mr. Ahmad (Pakistan): Mr. President, we have a few suggestions for paragraph 20. The first suggestion is to separate the paragraph into two paragraphs. The first paragraph would end with “plenary meetings of the Conference” and the next paragraph, 20 bis, would commence with the phrase “at the 1119th plenary meeting, on 29 March 2011”. We say that to make the references consistent with other areas in the draft report that mention these initiatives.

Second, in paragraph 20 bis we want to suggest additional language. After the addition of the language, the paragraph would read as follows:

“At the 1119th plenary meeting, on 29 March 2011, under the presidency of Ambassador Wang Qun of China, the Conference agreed upon a schedule of informal meetings of the Conference on its agenda items and on CD/1907. These informal discussions were neither pre-negotiations nor negotiations and complemented and in no case replaced the Conference’s ongoing activities, in particular the continuing debate towards the early adoption of a programme of work. It was agreed that, under the authority of the incumbent President, the chairs/coordinators would organize and chair/coordinate debates in a comprehensive manner and without preconditions, taking into account all relevant past, present and future views and proposals.”

Further down in the paragraph, we would suggest stating in the last sentence that the chairs/coordinators were required to report orally in their personal capacity on the discussions of the various substantive agenda items to the President, who, in connection with each of them, would finalize the report under his or her own personal responsibility. The reports would not in any way affect the position of the members of the Conference on Disarmament.

Of course, Mr. President, we know that our proposal is a detailed one. We will convey a copy of this to the secretariat.

The President (*spoke in Spanish*): Just to clarify, I understand that at least some of the reports submitted to the secretariat regarding these initiatives are ready; therefore, I will shortly be distributing them officially. I ask the delegation of Pakistan to also submit its proposal in writing so that we can consider it, now that various substantive matters have been added that deserve consideration.

Mr. Ponomarev (Belarus) (*spoke in Russian*): Mr. President, as this is the first time my delegation has taken the floor under your presidency, we would like to warmly congratulate you and wish you every success in the post.

We welcome the proposal by Pakistan with regard to the presentation of paragraph 20. As for the drafting of the proposed paragraph 20 bis, we reserve the option of responding after submission of the written draft. However, I would like to point out the need to bring the text of paragraph 20 into line with that of other paragraphs, in particular by adding “2011” after the dates mentioned there – 25 January, 22 February and 29 March.

I might add, in order to deal with this technical editorial point once and for all, that the proposal is also relevant to paragraphs 28, 29, 31, 38, 41, 44, 46, 48, 50 and 52. The aim is to standardize the presentation of dates on which activities were conducted in the framework of the Conference.

Mr. Lusiński (Poland): Mr. President, in respect of the session mentioned here that was held under the presidency of the Chinese Ambassador, it seems it was the 1219th plenary meeting, rather than the 1119th, and that is easy to amend.

The President (*spoke in Spanish*): Thank you. I am certain that those elements recently pointed out will be corrected by the secretariat. The proposal by Pakistan is basically two-pronged: it makes some substantive additions and, in terms of form, divides paragraph 20 into paragraphs 20 and 20 bis.

We will consider the substantive proposal when we have received the written text. As to the formal suggestion, do any delegations take issue with dividing the paragraph in the way suggested by the delegation of Pakistan? If that is not the case, then we will approve that part of the proposal.

Mr. Reid (United States of America): Mr. President, frankly, I am starting to have problems. Regarding paragraph 20, I still don’t understand why we need to have the entire paragraph, and, as it becomes more elaborate upon being broken into two, the logic of it escapes me even further. I would simplify this completely and just strike out all of 20. It’s all about internal workings, and I am not sure it does much to embellish our credibility with the General Assembly either, so we might want to just leave our internal business internal and strike the entire paragraph.

The President (*spoke in Spanish*): I suggest that we wait for the substantive proposal by Pakistan and return to this paragraph later. Although the paragraph does not match the stated expectations, I really do not wish to do without it since, one way or another, it reflects the work undertaken by Ambassador Marius Grinius and Ambassador Pedro Oyarce during their presidencies and the efforts, including by Ambassador Wang Qun, to move forward, albeit differently, the substantive functioning of the Conference. I realize this is not what the Conference was established for, but it demonstrates to our Governments that the salary paid to disarmament officials is at least being put towards brainstorming or exchanging views and that we are not merely wasting our time here all year. We will return to paragraph 20, at which time, in the light of the additions proposed by Pakistan, we will proceed with making a decision.

We are moving on to section E, “Expansion of the membership of the Conference”, I open the floor for discussion of paragraph 21.

Mr. Endoni (Nigeria): Mr. President, the work of the Conference on Disarmament is consensus-based, and decisions are supposed to be collective. We have not had any situation in the Conference where phrases such as “a majority of States” or “some States” have been used.

Looking at paragraph 21, where support was expressed on the part of “some member States for the appointment of”, my delegation would suggest the replacement of that with “suggestions were made for the appointment of”, just so that we do not go outside the norms of the Conference on Disarmament.

The President (*spoke in Spanish*): The representative of Nigeria has made a proposal regarding the second sentence of paragraph 21.

Mr. Ahmad (Pakistan): Mr. President, our views on paragraph 21 are related to the third sentence in the paragraph, where it is stated that “support was expressed on the part of some member States for the appointment”. While Pakistan’s delegation has clearly expressed its own national viewpoint on this issue, we feel that in other areas of this report we have not resorted to mentioning the views of some member States, and we therefore think that ...

The President (*spoke in Spanish*): Forgive me for interrupting you. I have made a mistake. In fact, I was referring to the proposal by Nigeria regarding the third sentence, not the second. I mistakenly referred to the wrong sentence. The proposal by Nigeria relates to the same sentence to which you are drawing attention – in other words, the third sentence of the paragraph.

Mr. Ahmad (Pakistan): Thank you, Mr. President, for your clarification. We think, therefore, that the third sentence is something that we can do away with in this paragraph.

The President (*spoke in Spanish*): I ask the States members of the Conference, including Pakistan, whether we can accept the recasting of the third sentence of paragraph 21 proposed by Nigeria, and thus adopt the rewritten paragraph. Are there any objections? As there are none, paragraph 21, as amended by Nigeria, is adopted.

Let us proceed, then, with paragraph 22. Do any delegations wish to comment on paragraph 22? As that is not the case, it is adopted.

We will move on to paragraph 23. Do any delegations wish to comment on paragraph 23? It is adopted.

Let us proceed with section F, “Review of the agenda of the Conference”. It consists of only paragraph 24. Do any delegations wish to comment on paragraph 24? May we adopt it? It is adopted.

We will move on to paragraph 25, which already brings us to section G on the improved and effective functioning of the Conference. This section is comprised of paragraphs 26 and 27. Let us begin with paragraph 26. Do any delegations have anything they wish to point out about this paragraph? Paragraph 26 is adopted.

Let us proceed with paragraph 27. Are there any proposals concerning paragraph 27? It is adopted.

We can now begin the consideration of part III of the report regarding the substantive work of the Conference during its 2011 session, which contains a number of paragraphs. We will once again proceed paragraph by paragraph, starting with paragraph 28. Are there any comments on paragraph 28?

Mr. Lusiński (Poland): Mr. President, I wouldn't like to cut the report too much in the sense that we wouldn't have any report, but to have it concise and without repetitions would probably save work for our translators and would be in line with what the Secretary-General of the Conference advised us about on another day. Indeed, it would be another reason to delete paragraphs 28, 29, 30 and 31, because the information contained in these paragraphs is repeated in paragraphs 38, 41, 44, 46, 48, 50 and 52, where it really belongs, so this would be the proposal – perhaps quite radical, but our delegation doesn't see any reason for writing exactly the same things twice.

The President (*spoke in Spanish*): The delegation of Poland believes that these paragraphs repeat other parts of the document. However, I think that they provide key information because they mention a group of documents that we examined, including the efforts of various presidents in relation to those topics. My personal opinion is that if the delegation of Poland does not feel strongly about it, then I would prefer to keep these paragraphs. I would like to hear the views of other delegations. If there really is a firm desire and consensus to delete the paragraphs, we could do it, but my delegation and I would prefer to keep the wording if that does not pose any particular problem for the other delegations. The paragraphs shed light on the various efforts that have been made and list all the documents, thereby forming a kind of reference document for future research or for neophytes in disarmament matters, such as myself, who avail ourselves of such references to obtain information on these topics.

Are there any objections to keeping the paragraphs despite their redundant nature? My suggestion as President is to keep the paragraphs, including the argument and opinions of the delegation of Poland. I believe that they have added value, especially as a historical reference.

We will proceed paragraph by paragraph.

Ms. Jáquez Huacuja (Mexico) (*spoke in Spanish*): Mr. President, since you have invited us to express our opinions, I would like to point out that my delegation has on several occasions expressed concern about describing as substantive work of the Conference activities that are not. In this case, I understand the point you are making. We do need to specify the activities we have carried out during the year somewhere in the report, but they are not part of the substantive work of the Conference. However, I understand that it has been the custom of the Conference to list under this heading the timetable and activities related to it. For this reason, we will not oppose it, but I wish to state my delegation's aversion to describing as substantive work the deliberative activities of the Conference that duplicate the work of the United Nations Disarmament Commission.

Furthermore, and to conclude, I would like to draw attention to the fact that paragraph 20 also mentions activities that are listed in this section. The delegation of Poland pointed out some repetitions in later paragraphs, but those activities are also mentioned in paragraph 20, to which we are introducing modifications on the basis of the delegations' suggestions.

If we are to list these activities somewhere and the Conference wants it to be in this section, my delegation would prefer that the references in other sections be removed, in order not to give the impression that work was done in areas where it was not.

The President (*spoke in Spanish*): I would like to make a suggestion. I think that the position of the delegation of Mexico is completely understandable and that the secretariat can surely help us on that score. From the outset, I also recognized the positive aspects of the concerns raised by the delegation of Poland.

I have a concrete suggestion in this regard. I ask the secretariat to attempt to resolve this issue and approach the delegation of Mexico, as I know that Ms. Jáquez Huacuja has

extensive experience with these topics and could help us ensure that we do not send false messages or lose all the references to these documents in the report. I think there comes a time when reporting on our failures and lack of success also enables us to build a future and avoid repeating the same mistakes.

Mr. Khelif (Algeria) (*spoke in French*): The delegation of Algeria does not have any particular preference regarding whether paragraphs 28, 29, 30 and 31 should be kept or deleted, but would like to say that it might be better, in terms of order and form, to begin with paragraph 32 on the Conference's official discussions. We would then go on to informal discussions, thereby ensuring a degree of continuity between paragraphs 31 and 33, which cover the activities carried out under the presidency of China.

The President (*spoke in Spanish*): In this case, I have a suggestion. I ask the delegation of Mexico, in conjunction with the secretariat and the delegation of Algeria, which has made a proposal, to assist us in drafting specific proposals for the paragraphs in question, taking into consideration the concerns raised by the delegation of Poland and any other delegations. I suggest that we conduct the second reading once a proposal has been drafted on the basis of the contributions that the Mexican delegation will make in collaboration with the aforementioned other countries.

This would take us from paragraph 28 through paragraph 32 or 33. I would like to confirm with the delegation of Mexico which paragraphs we are discussing.

Ms. Jáquez Huacuja (Mexico) (*spoke in Spanish*): We are mainly discussing paragraphs 28, 29 and 30. Those are the ones I find redundant because they refer to the timetable of informal consultations on various agenda items. The other paragraphs address administrative matters connected with the consideration of the agenda items in plenary meetings. However, I will look at them more closely in the light of your request.

Mr. Ponomarev (Belarus) (*spoke in Russian*): We agree with the reasoning outlined by Poland. In the light of the observation by Mexico that in paragraph 20 we already mention all of these documents on activities conducted by the Conference on Disarmament, it would most likely be sensible, in accordance with established tradition and following last year's precedent, to begin mention of our work in the Conference with its informal meetings. Indeed, this section of last year's report starts precisely with such a reference. If we decided to delete paragraphs 28, 29 and 30, this section would begin with paragraph 31. At the very least, we suggest that such an option be considered.

The President (*spoke in Spanish*): There are two proposals. The delegation of Algeria has suggested beginning the section with paragraph 32, while the delegation of Belarus suggests starting with paragraph 31.

I wonder if, when we redraft part III of the document, we could reorder the paragraphs and begin with paragraph 31, as suggested by the delegation of Belarus.

Mr. Khelif (Algeria) (*spoke in French*): I think that there is a certain logical order for part III. We should begin with the presidency of Canada and continue chronologically until the presidency of China. If we begin with paragraph 31, which deals with document CD/1907 on the timetable proposed by China, I do not see how we can report on the other activities.

We think that perhaps we should begin with the official discussions — in other words, what the delegations officially stated during plenary meetings — and then move on to describing the various discussions held at informal meetings.

The President (*spoke in Spanish*): I need help with this. The delegation of Poland will probably help me.

Mr. Lusiński (Poland): Mr. President, I would be very happy to be helpful, and perhaps it would be a good idea to delete all of paragraphs 28, 29, 30 and 31. Then indeed perhaps we should start, with the Canadian presidency, to draft a new paragraph 28. I would be happy to provide wording to the secretariat, and it might read something like this: “During its 2011 session the Conference had a series of plenary meetings on all substantive agenda items, as follows” — and then we would enumerate — “from 5 to 17 February, five plenary meetings in accordance with the indicative timetable proposed by Ambassador Marius Grinius of Canada on 25 January 2011”, and then “from 24 February to 17 March, five plenary meetings in accordance with the indicative timetable”. Then we could provide a reference to working paper CD/WP.564, and from then put exact dates which I cannot recall now — “The Conference held nine informal meetings on all substantive agenda items in accordance with the schedule contained in document CD/1907”, and then paragraph 31 would ideally fall into the chronological sequence of what we did during the proceedings.

Mr. Ahmad (Pakistan): Mr. President, our delegation would like to state that we preferred your earlier suggestion — not to change these paragraphs, because it would lead to a very lengthy discussion. However, since we have seen that the discussions have focused on paragraphs 28, 29, 30 and 31, one difference between these paragraphs and the earlier-mentioned paragraph 20 is that these paragraphs cover the process in much more detail. If we start redrafting again, we will probably end up with something similar.

But we think that ideally paragraphs 30 and 31 could be joined. Paragraph 31 could be incorporated into existing paragraph 30. We feel that the way it could be done is that paragraph 30 could start with “in accordance with the schedule of informal meetings contained in CD/1907 adopted during the presidency of Ambassador Wang Qun of China”. Then paragraph 31 would start with “the Conference on Disarmament discussed agenda items 1 and 2”, and this part could be brought into the first sentence of paragraph 30. We could thus combine these two paragraphs.

Also, we feel that in paragraph 29, where document CD/WP.564 is mentioned, we should add the language suggested by Ambassador Pedro Oyarce of Chile on 22 February 2011, and wherever we mention CD/1907 we can afterwards state: “adopted during the presidency of Ambassador Wang Qun of China”. This mention should be added in paragraphs 38, 41, 44, 46, 48, 50 and 52 so that the whole report is consistent.

The President (*spoke in Spanish*): Thank you. I suggest the following: regarding paragraphs 28, 29 and 30, I maintain the original mandate already given to the delegation of Mexico. Now we have a proposal by Pakistan concerning paragraphs 30 and 31, which I think Mexico should bear in mind. In any case, we will wait until the second reading to get a clearer idea of how to deal with paragraphs 28 to 31.

Given that we have not discussed the text of paragraph 31, I open the floor for comment on that topic, beyond what has already been stated by the delegation of Pakistan. Do any other delegations wish to comment on the content of paragraph 31? As that is not the case, let us move on to paragraph 32. Algeria has made a proposal in that connection. Would the delegation please restate it?

Mr. Khelif (Algeria) (*spoke in French*): The delegation of Algeria has suggested placing paragraph 32 at the start of part III. This way we would begin with the official discussions of the various agenda items and then proceed with the informal discussions.

The President (*spoke in Spanish*): The delegation of Algeria has proposed to begin the section with a reference to the discussion of those themes during the general debates and then move on to informal meetings. I think that the proposal has a certain logic. Are there any objections to proceeding this way — to placing paragraph 32 at the beginning of part III, before paragraph 28? If not, the repositioning of paragraph 32 is adopted. As to its content, I have not seen any objections, so it is adopted.

Turning to paragraph 33, I see that there are no comments.

Mr. Mantels (Secretary of the Conference on Disarmament): Mr. President, I am afraid paragraph 33 is not complete. The last sentence should end with “the work done by these coordinators during the informal meetings”. I apologize for that omission.

The President (*spoke in Spanish*): I hope that delegations have taken note of the clarification by the secretariat.

Mr. Khelif (Algeria) (*spoke in French*): In order to align paragraph 33 with document CD/1907, we suggest the following wording in English:

(*continued in English*)

“On ... 2011 the President of the Conference, Ambassador of ...” — and we will complete it — “addressed a letter to the Conference” — and we will continue with the paragraph.

The President (*spoke in Spanish*): Do we need to wait for the written text or are delegations prepared to make a decision about the proposal by Algeria? I think we could do that shortly. Do any delegations object to the rewording proposed by Algeria? As that is not the case, the paragraph is adopted in the form suggested by Algeria.

Let us move on to paragraph 34. Do any delegations wish to take the floor in connection with that paragraph? As that is not the case, it is adopted.

Let us turn to paragraph 35. As there are no comments, it is adopted.

Let us proceed to the first section of part III of the report, specifically paragraph 36 (a). Are there any comments on paragraph 36? As that is not the case, it is adopted.

Let us go to paragraph 37.

Ms. Fogante (Argentina) (*spoke in Spanish*): Argentina and Brazil submitted to the Conference a document dated 15 August with the symbol CD/1916. We would like it to be included in this paragraph, as subparagraph (h), bearing in mind that all the documents under this subparagraph will be repeated in paragraph 40.

The President (*spoke in Spanish*): Thank you very much. You have made a relevant comment. The secretariat will have to update this paragraph to adequately reflect all the documents that have been submitted. We can adopt this paragraph, including the addition by Argentina and any future modifications made in order to reflect the work of the Conference on the basis of the official documents submitted.

Paragraph 37 is adopted. Let us move on to paragraph 38.

Mr. Suda (Japan): Regarding paragraph 37, my request is exactly the same in nature as that of the representative of Argentina. My delegation submitted the report of the third side event, co-hosted by Japan and Australia, in a note verbale of 30 August, so I hope that you will consider adding a reference to that document to this paragraph.

We also have the same request as the representative of Argentina in relation to paragraph 40.

The President (*spoke in Spanish*): I hope that the secretariat has taken note of this.

Mr. Endoni (Nigeria): Mr. President, speaking on behalf of the Group of 21 at this point in time, I would just like to mention that we will be circulating four papers. Since we are on cessation of the nuclear arms race and nuclear disarmament, we will be circulating a paper on nuclear disarmament, and we will urge that that be duly recorded in the report too.

The President (*spoke in Spanish*): Thank you. We hope that you will submit it quickly so that it is given a symbol in time to be included in the report.

Mr. Wilson (Australia): Mr. President, my intervention is along similar lines, and thank you for the assurances that you have given that documents submitted in these days will also be reflected in the report.

Simply for the purposes of transparency, I just want to note that Australia submitted a document this morning to the Conference secretariat based on the statement which Ambassador Woolcott made this morning, and we have asked that it be reflected in the report in paragraphs 30, 37 and 40.

The President (*spoke in Spanish*): Thank you. Do any other delegations wish to clarify anything or inform us of their intention to submit a document? Naturally, any document submitted within the established deadlines will be included in the report.

This paragraph is therefore adopted, and we return to paragraph 38, which we were discussing before the pertinent clarifications regarding paragraph 37. Do any delegations wish to comment on paragraph 38? As that is not the case, the paragraph is adopted.

Mr. Ahmad (Pakistan): Mr. President, we just wanted to reiterate the comment that we made earlier regarding certain paragraphs of the report, starting with paragraph 38 and going on to 41, 44, 46, 48, 50 and 52. We think that Ambassador Pedro Oyarce should be referred to in connection with CD/WP.564 and Ambassador Wang Qun in connection with CD/1907. We will give our comments in writing to the secretariat.

The President (*spoke in Spanish*): Thank you. We will duly incorporate the proposed text once we receive it in writing. I was unable to note all the paragraphs to which you referred but, in any case, we cannot adopt paragraph 38 until we consider the proposal. Shall we leave it pending? I know you spoke about paragraph 41, but I ask that you remind me when we get to it and any of the other paragraphs for which you proposed alternative wording.

Let us leave paragraph 38 pending and consider the text proposed by Pakistan in due course. Let us move on to section B, "Prevention of nuclear war, including all related matters", paragraph 39.

Mr. Lusiński (Poland): Mr. President, sorry for taking the floor once again on a similar issue. Since we have just accepted paragraphs 36 through 38, it would be enough to combine the section "Prevention of nuclear war, including all related matters" with the previous section, "Cessation of the nuclear arms race and nuclear disarmament". This would allow us to get rid of repetition by deleting paragraphs 39 through 41. The heading would be changed in the way I just pointed out, and only minor amendments would have to be made, such as replacing "agenda item" with "agenda items" as needed. This would reflect our efforts to debate all of the issues, and we wouldn't need to repeat paragraphs. I hope that is reasonable enough.

The President (*spoke in Spanish*): Your proposal raises a lot of problems as it modifies the structure of last year's report. I am a human rights expert, and in human rights we talk of "necessary and unnecessary duplication".

(*continued in English*)

I think in this case it's a necessary duplication, and it takes into account the practice and structure of the report as agreed on last year. I regret to say that I cannot agree with your proposal, but thank you very much, and your document has been taken into account.

Are there any other delegations wishing to take the floor?

Mr. Khelif (Algeria) (*spoke in French*): Mr. President, if you would allow me, I would like to discuss paragraph 40.

The President (*spoke in Spanish*): I ask the representative of Algeria to be patient for a moment, as we have not finished with paragraph 39. The delegation of Poland has proposed a text, but my delegation objects to it partly because it raises the problem of changing the structure in relation to last year's report. We take note of the proposal regarding subparagraph (e), on which we have yet to reach consensus.

Before we move on to paragraph 40, do any delegations wish to comment on paragraph 39? May I consider it adopted? It is adopted. Let us then proceed to paragraph 40.

Mr. Khelif (Algeria) (*spoke in French*): Paragraph 40 mentions the working documents dealing with agenda item 2, "Prevention of nuclear war, including all related matters", that were submitted to the Conference on Disarmament. We find all those documents already cited in section A under agenda item 1, "Cessation of the nuclear arms race and nuclear disarmament". My delegation's concern is not the repetition but rather that the documents address nuclear disarmament in general and not the prevention of nuclear war. Paragraph 40 does not appear to us the best place to mention them, so we suggest simply deleting them, insofar as they are already listed in section A.

The President (*spoke in Spanish*): Thank you. First, it appears that the documents presented in section A, paragraph 37, are the same as those in paragraph 40. I would like to ask the secretariat about the practice in this regard. Since the topic is divided among sections A, B, and so on, and given that the documents relate to all those sub-topics, I assume that that is the reason why the secretariat has repeated them, for the documents relate to each of the subsections, not only A but B and all those regarding nuclear disarmament, as you have just pointed out. But section A is perhaps the most general, as it deals with cessation of the nuclear arms race and nuclear disarmament, whereas section B addresses the prevention of nuclear war. My delegation would have no issue with this. I would prefer to hear the opinion of the secretariat, as well as that of any other delegations, on the practice in this regard. The delegation of Algeria has proposed listing the documents only in subparagraph (a), which is the most general, and deleting paragraph 40, which repeats the list of documents in paragraph 37.

Mr. Wilson (Australia): Mr. President, I have listened carefully to what my Algerian colleague has said. I just wanted to point out that at least two of the documents cited in paragraph 40, CD/1906 and CD/1909, were submitted under a note verbale to the secretariat with a reference to both items 1 and 2 of the agenda, and the references to both items 1 and 2 are contained in the notes verbales and in the documents themselves. That is also the case for the document which Australia submitted to the Conference secretariat this morning.

The President (*spoke in Spanish*): The Australian delegation has helped the secretariat and me to understand that, owing to the formal nature of this process and out of respect for the wishes of the States upon submitting the documents, we must reproduce the list in both sections. Therefore, we will leave the paragraphs as they are in order to comply with the wishes of the States that requested, upon submitting their documents, that they be associated with both sub-topics.

Mr. Khelif (Algeria) (*spoke in French*): Mr. President, I would like to make a clarification. My delegation completely respects the desire of States to submit documents under the heading of their choosing, but we would like to specify that paragraph 40 states that the documents listed there address agenda item 2, "Prevention of nuclear war, including all related matters". However, these documents and those mentioned orally cover either nuclear disarmament or the fissile material treaty, and this treaty has always been considered under agenda item 1.

We are faced with a muddle. Why? Because, in 2006, we began to combine, for practical reasons, informal discussions on agenda items 1 and 2, and now we are confusing this practical decision, taken with a view to balancing discussions, with the structure of the agenda and the annual report.

We believe that the concern to hold discussions on agenda items 1 and 2 together is addressed in paragraph 41 — which states that discussions were held on both items 1 and 2, with a focus on either disarmament or the fissile material treaty — but that the documents themselves should appear under the heading to which they relate.

We believe that the fissile material treaty relates to nuclear disarmament and that relevant documents should be listed under agenda item 1.

The President (*spoke in Spanish*): I will give the floor to the secretariat. Perhaps I am mistaken, but my understanding of the matter is that member States request that the secretariat distribute a document and, when making the request, specify under which specific agenda item of the Conference's programme they wish the document to be distributed. At that point neither the Secretary-General of the United Nations, if a document relates to the work of the General Assembly, nor the secretariat of the Conference on Disarmament can take a position on what member States have requested. We can only reflect what they have requested, and that is what the report attempts to do in a factual way. I do not think that we can judge whether or not a document is relevant, for we are not giving the opinion of the Conference; rather, we are giving a factual account of the documents as they were submitted and distributed under the agenda items selected by the member States. I do not wish to have the final word on this subject. I give the floor to the secretariat for clarification of this point.

Mr. Mantels (Secretary of the Conference on Disarmament): Mr. President, from the secretariat's point of view, I can only agree with what you just said. The secretariat doesn't take any position regarding where to put the papers. But I do recognize the point that was made by our Australian delegate, which is correct, and it is requested that those documents be inserted under both agenda items 1 and 2. In putting this draft report together the secretariat has followed the precedent set last year, when identical documents were repeated under agenda items 1 and 2.

The President (*spoke in Spanish*): I would like to ask the delegation of Algeria whether this clarification suffices. If so, I would prefer to proceed with adopting the paragraph. If not, we will leave the paragraph pending.

Mr. Khelif (Algeria) (*spoke in French*): As we said earlier, the delegation of Algeria respects the wishes of member States regarding the context in which they wish to see their documents, but first I would like to stress that we adopted an agenda at the start of the year and it is this agenda that should govern our work. Second, in order to resolve this issue, we should perhaps work on paragraph 40 to find an alternative to the phrase "dealing with this agenda item", although I myself am not fluent enough in English to do so.

The President (*spoke in Spanish*): I suggest leaving this paragraph pending until we clear it up. We should try to work on the heading, since the list was established on the basis of member States' wishes as expressed upon submitting their official documents.

Mr. Reid (United States of America): Mr. President, if you would indulge me in reference to paragraphs 37 and 40, we will do the same thing as other colleagues have done, under both "Prevention of nuclear war" and the preceding "Cessation of the nuclear arms race and nuclear disarmament". We will be submitting Ambassador Kennedy's remarks on behalf of the United Kingdom, the Russian Federation, the People's Republic of China and the French Republic, to be noted under both these items in continuation of our prior

reporting on the meeting held in Paris on 30 July. So that's just an indication of an incoming document.

Second, I think – I am not proposing we have this debate now, but I am proposing that we all remember in late January 2012, when hopefully there is a Conference, and we're talking about an agenda for it, the absurdity that we are trying to get through now. The agenda is, in fact, completely antediluvian at this point. It needs to be re-debated so that we automatically roll through this process at the beginning of each year. Maybe we can clear this up for our successors and do a little bit more combing of the cloth, so to speak, at the 2012 session.

The President (*spoke in Spanish*): To repeat what has been said, we will return to this paragraph to clarify the doubts raised and will, of course, welcome any other documents submitted by any State member of the Conference. As things stand, various delegations have stated that they would submit their proposals as official documents for consideration by the Conference. Let us move on to paragraph 41.

I believe Pakistan mentioned something about paragraph 41. In any case, I will not proceed with adopting the paragraph. Aside from the proposal by Pakistan, do any other delegations wish to comment on the content of paragraph 41? We will wait for Pakistan's written proposal before deciding whether or not to adopt this paragraph. Moving on to section C, "Prevention of an arms race in outer space", I open the floor for discussion of paragraph 42. Was it also among those mentioned by Pakistan? It appears not.

Mr. Endoni (Nigeria): Just to mention again the fact that the Group of 21 will be circulating a working paper on the prevention of an arms race in outer space, and for time purposes I will go ahead and state that we will do the same for negative security assurances and the comprehensive programme of disarmament.

The President (*spoke in Spanish*): Thank you. Are there any other comments regarding paragraph 42? I think that your reference to an official document would be better placed in paragraph 43. Can we adopt paragraph 42 in its current form? Regarding paragraph 43, we already have the announcement by the delegation of Nigeria that it will submit a document on this topic on behalf of the Group of 21. Do any other delegations have anything to point out in relation to paragraph 43?

Mr. Combrink (South Africa): Mr. President, regarding the chapeau, based on the discussion that we have heard now, a possible formulation that we could suggest that could be used consistently in the chapeau in paragraph 40, as well as in paragraph 37, could read along the lines of "The following documents were submitted to the Conference under this item:". Then the important issue would just be to make sure that the documents that were submitted were indeed submitted under those respective items. I believe that could perhaps solve our problem.

The President (*spoke in Spanish*): I think that the proposal by South Africa is very relevant. We will consider it during the second reading in relation to paragraphs 37, 40 and 43 and all other paragraphs that refer to the list of official documents submitted by member States on a given theme. We appreciate the proposal by South Africa. The secretariat has taken note of it.

Are there any other comments on paragraph 43? We do not have much time left and I would like to finish the first reading, so we will not make a decision regarding the proposal by South Africa. I do consider it very relevant, so we will return to it later.

Concerning paragraph 43, I would leave the heading for consideration together with those of the aforementioned paragraphs.

Are there any comments on paragraph 44?

Mr. Ahmad (Pakistan): Mr. President, this is one of the paragraphs that we mentioned in our earlier intervention.

The President (*spoke in Spanish*): Paragraph 44 will remain pending until we receive Pakistan's contribution. Let us proceed with section D, "Effective international arrangements to assure non-nuclear-weapon States against the use or threat of use of nuclear weapons", paragraph 45. Are there any proposals regarding paragraph 45? As that is not the case, it is adopted.

Let us move on to paragraph 46.

Mr. Ahmad (Pakistan): Mr. President, regarding paragraph 46 we have the concern that we stated in our earlier intervention. We would also like to point out that in case any further documents are submitted under this agenda item, they can be accommodated in the same way as paragraphs 40 and 43.

The President (*spoke in Spanish*): Let us leave paragraph 46 pending and wait for the contributions of this delegation. Let us move on to section B, paragraph 47. Are there any comments on paragraph 47? It is adopted.

Let us move on to paragraph 48.

Mr. Ponomarev (Belarus) (*spoke in Russian*): I have a drafting proposal for paragraph 48 and, along similar lines, for paragraphs 50 and 52. We felt it appropriate to match the text in paragraph 48 with the section heading. We realize, of course, that during the current session we at the Conference have tried to combine consideration of agenda items 5, 6 and 7, but the existing practice of referring to each agenda item in separate sections seemed to us to justify revising the text somewhat.

(*continued in English*)

I am going to read out our proposal in English:

"Paragraph 48. In accordance with the schedule of informal meetings suggested by Ambassador Marius Grinius of Canada, agenda item 5, entitled 'New types of weapons of mass destruction and new systems of such weapons; radiological weapons', was considered in a plenary meeting on 17 February 2011 (CD/PV.1206). In accordance with indicative timetable CD/WP.564, agenda item 5 was considered in a plenary meeting on 17 March 2011 (CD/PV.1216). In accordance with CD/1907, agenda item 5 was considered in an informal plenary meeting on 25 May 2011 under the presidency of Ambassador Mikhail Khvostov of Belarus."

(*continued in Russian*)

Please accept my apologies for anticipating discussion of later paragraphs somewhat. We have already prepared a draft for paragraphs 50 and 52, matching them with their respective section headings.

The President (*spoke in Spanish*): Thank you. Would the wording be the same for paragraphs 48, 50 and 52, or would it be different for each one?

(*continued in English*)

Are you proposing the same or different wording for paragraphs 48, 50 and 52?

Mr. Ponomarev (Belarus) (*spoke in Russian*): They are practically the same and the texts of these paragraphs follow the same logic. Thus, we believe that it is inappropriate to mention agenda items 6 and 7 in part III, section E, "New types of weapons of mass destruction". Similarly, in part III, section F, which deals with agenda item 6, it does not make sense to mention agenda items 5 and 7. The same is true of part III, section G,

“Transparency in armaments”, which is the appropriate place to mention discussion of agenda item 7 on that same subject.

The President (*spoke in Spanish*): I suggest that the delegation of Belarus submit its proposals in writing to the secretariat for consideration during the second reading. I already know that we will not adopt paragraphs 48, 50 and 52 because there will be rewording. Do any other delegations wish to comment on paragraph 48?

Mr. Mantels (Secretary of the Conference on Disarmament): Mr. President, I’m afraid I have to come back to paragraphs 44 and 46 with respect to the remark made by our Nigerian colleague. The working paper he is referring to that would be submitted to the secretariat is in fact the statement that was read out, and, according to the rules which were approved by the General Assembly, we cannot reproduce something that has been read out in the verbatim records as a Conference document, unless I am mistaken.

Mr. Endoni (Nigeria): My delegation is going to circulate a working paper different from the statement delivered on behalf of the Group. It is a working paper from the Group and not one that I have read out.

The President (*spoke in Spanish*): That is easily fixed by changing the verb tense or the nouns. I ask the Group of 21 to be wise and help the secretariat observe the rules by making some substantive change to the document so that it is not exactly the same as the one you read out in the room and the secretariat can do its job properly.

Mr. Khelif (Algeria) (*spoke in French*): The delegation of Algeria has heard the explanations given by the secretariat, but we note that document CD/1911 also includes the text of a statement made by a certain number of delegations here at the Conference, yet it is cited as an official document. We think that the Group of 21 should receive the same treatment.

The President (*spoke in Spanish*): I think that we all need to be reasonable. For example, just today Ambassador Woolcott gave us some information and said that his delegation would submit a document. I am certain that the delegation of Australia will be discerning and will not, when it presents the document, provide the speech, but will rather recast it so that the document is in a new format. All I ask of the Group of 21 is to do the same, thus helping the secretariat to comply with existing rules and not disregard the Conference’s work procedures. I am certain that the Group of 21 is clever enough to do this work, so we welcome the statement. My apologies to the delegation of Australia for using it as an example, but I know that it will do a good job.

Mr. Wilson (Australia): I will just take the floor briefly to reassure you that we have ensured that the document that was submitted before this morning’s plenary does comply with the necessary rules.

The President (*spoke in Spanish*): The delegation of Australia is cleverer and cleverer. It submitted the document first and then read it out.

Let us proceed to paragraph 49. Are there any comments regarding paragraph 49? May we consider it adopted? It is adopted.

We cannot adopt paragraph 50 at this time. We already have the contribution of Belarus. I give the floor to any delegation that would also like to make a statement regarding paragraph 50.

Mr. Ahmad (Pakistan): Mr. President, we noted that you had deferred a decision on paragraphs 48, 50 and 52, and, notwithstanding the language provided by the delegation of Belarus, we had similar comments on these three paragraphs.

The President (*spoke in Spanish*): Let us move on to paragraph 51. Are there any comments? May we consider it adopted? It is adopted. Let us move on to paragraph 52. We have already taken note of comments on that paragraph. I give the floor to the representative of Poland, and he can also comment on paragraph 51, if he wishes. We have already adopted it, but perhaps I was too hasty and did not give him enough time to speak.

Mr. Lusiński (Poland): Mr. President, yes, you rightly anticipated my remark in connection with paragraphs 51 and 52, as well as 49 and 50, because we should really avoid repeating the same wording several times. I hope the secretariat will find another way to reflect our attachment to the traditional format of the report and to satisfy all the nations that contributed to particular parts of the debate. Reading a document with a lot of repetition would not, I am afraid, increase the General Assembly's appreciation of what we are doing in the Conference on Disarmament.

The President (*spoke in Spanish*): I was planning to go to New York at some point to present the report. Please leave me some text to present, otherwise they will ask me why I have come. If it would make Poland's job easier, we can add paragraph 51 to the list of all those paragraphs we have left pending, including number 52. Let us leave 51 pending so that we can consider it jointly with 52.

Let us move on to paragraph 53. Are there any comments?

Given that we have little time left, I suggest that we leave the remainder of the paragraphs for the second reading. What I would like to ask all the delegations is to make an extra effort to submit in writing any proposals they deem necessary and which they have drafted here in the meeting. I can also be flexible and consider any other proposals that they might not have had the chance to present here today. We need to have the proposals in writing so that we can move forward as swiftly as possible at the next meeting. I suggest scheduling the next meeting for Monday at 10 a.m. I would ask the secretariat, if possible, to have an unofficial version of the document that includes the proposals made today. Naturally, being an unofficial document, it would only be available in English. I ask all delegations to be flexible about working in English during our second round of discussions of the proposals. If necessary, we will all make an effort, including myself. We will speak the lovely language that is English in order to progress with our work. I invite you to be here at 10 a.m. on Monday and ask that the secretariat prepare, with the same efficiency with which it has supported us thus far, a revised version for consideration at the meeting, including the amendments and proposals made in English, as an "evolving document", to facilitate our work and enable us to finish within the allotted time, which I think is the fundamental goal. I thank all the delegations for their active participation and hope that we will continue to work in the same spirit of cooperation when we meet again on Monday.

Mr. Reid (United States of America): If I may have the floor, then, Mr. President, perhaps we can meet later. Monday is a United States holiday and we already have a variety of events planned. It's a federal holiday. It's not to say that we wouldn't be present here, but I was wondering if we could beg the indulgence of colleagues to see if we could revert to the normal Tuesday scheduling for a plenary. It's just a request, and I will be happy to talk to you about how to file for the visa and bring that to the attention of our authorities in Bern. We would want to facilitate that in every possible way.

The President (*spoke in Spanish*): I have no problem with that. Just let me check my diary, because I am an ambassador for disarmament, human rights and many other matters.

Do any delegations object to meeting on Tuesday at 10 a.m. instead of Monday? I think we can accommodate the delegation of the United States of America and call the next meeting for Tuesday at 10 a.m. We will decide how to proceed depending on the amount of time needed.

The 1236th plenary meeting stands adjourned.

The meeting rose at 5.55 p.m.