
Conference on Disarmament

6 September 2011

English

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

Held at the Palais des Nations, Geneva, on Tuesday, 6 September 2011, at 10.05 a.m.

President: Mr. Rodolfo Reyes Rodríguez (Cuba)

The President (*spoke in Spanish*): I call to order the 1237th plenary meeting of the Conference on Disarmament. We already announced that a new draft of the report, based on the suggestions submitted to the secretariat in writing by yesterday afternoon, has been distributed.

We are grateful for the hard work done by the secretariat to have this document ready today. Of course, we know there is no human way to make this document perfect, but not to worry – when we consider the various paragraphs, if anything has been left out or delegates have not been very clear in submitting their proposals, in any case we will not point fingers but rather look for a solution. In truth, we still have time to listen to suggestions for additions or other proposals.

I will strictly follow the procedure that we established of not allowing substantive discussions on issues that are not specifically related to the contents of the report. However, I would like to make just one exception to allow the delegation of the Netherlands to brief us on the Biological Weapons Convention (BWC) Review Conference process.

Mr. Van Donkersgoed (Netherlands): Thank you very much, Mr. President, for allowing me this opportunity, actually not to brief Conference member States and observers but to remind them of an invitation that was sent to all States parties to the Biological Weapons Convention for a briefing on the work of the BWC Implementation Support Unit that is scheduled to take place tomorrow, Wednesday, 7 September, from 11.30 a.m. to 1 p.m. in room 12 of the Palais des Nations.

The President (*spoke in Spanish*): I hope that we can be there and respond to this kind invitation from the presidency of the Review Conference. Thank you for reminding us of the invitation.

Having said that, we will now begin our consideration of the document. I remind you that there are always easier, more difficult and more complicated paths and I hope we will take the most practical path that will allow us to save resources, ensure a transparent process and reach agreement as quickly as possible.

Let us begin. Of course, in any case, to ensure that our agreements of the previous meeting still stand, for paragraphs that have been adopted, I will reiterate that they have been provisionally adopted, to confirm that there are no problems. That is the case for paragraph 1, as well as for paragraphs 2 to 4, which were all provisionally adopted. On paragraph 5 there is a specific proposal by the delegation of Morocco. I suggest that we work on the basis of this proposal by Morocco, and I invite delegations to give their views on the Moroccan proposal. If there are none, then I will take it that the proposal by Morocco is adopted as a replacement for paragraph 5. Does any delegation have any comment or objection?

Mr. Gill (India): Good morning to everyone in this room. We look forward to a productive session today, and a quick and efficient completion of our task.

With regard to the proposal on paragraph 5, I wanted to briefly recall our discussion on this paragraph at our previous meeting. The distinguished delegate of Morocco had raised the problem of selective quotation from the United Nations Secretary-General's address to the Conference, and subsequently we tried to address that problem through a simple fix.

I felt that that fix had some cross-regional support. Now, the new proposal that has been made by Morocco was not discussed at our previous meeting. In fact, it continues to pose the same problem that the delegate of Morocco raised, which is that of selective quotation from the United Nations Secretary-General's address.

So my suggestion would be, Mr. President, to go back to the paragraph as originally drafted, with the insertion of “inter alia”, which would take into account the widely shared concern about the possibility of selective quotation from the Secretary-General’s address.

The President (*spoke in Spanish*): Does any other delegation wish to speak concerning this proposal?

Mr. Khelif (Algeria) (*spoke in French*): The Algerian delegation has requested the floor to support the point made by our colleague from India because, during the most recent discussions of this paragraph, some delegations expressed the view that the report should be factual and should not be selective, especially with regard to the statement by the Secretary-General of the United Nations.

The proposal presented to us today has the same characteristics. We are trying to have the Secretary-General say a certain thing, a part of what he said, while another part of his statement is summarized.

That is why we support the proposal by our colleague from India to work on the basis of the initial paragraph of the 24 August 2011 draft of the report, WP/567.

The President (*spoke in Spanish*): Then we could, of course, work on the original paragraph. Can you accept the proposal by India to incorporate the phrase “inter alia” into this paragraph?

Mr. Ahmad (Pakistan): In line with what we said previously, on our first reading of the draft text, we feel that selective application is certainly a problem, and there was a suggestion made in our last plenary that we should not delve into the details of what was said in the message and what was not said.

Probably it would be better to include only the factual part of this paragraph, so that the paragraph should end with “Mr. Ban Ki-moon delivered an important message to the Conference”, without going into the details of what was said and what was not said.

Mr. Laassel (Morocco) (*spoke in French*): The proposal that we made the last time was indeed designed to avoid selectivity and to convey the messages of the Secretary-General of the United Nations more fully.

On this basis, we have conveyed his three main messages and have avoided referring to examples he may have cited.

We believe that these messages are very important. I don’t think anyone in this room would deny that. We therefore think that the meaning of the statement will need to be conveyed, but our initial proposal to refer only to the record of the meeting of 26 January was designed to avoid referring to any appeal by the Secretary-General.

So I think that if our proposal does not have the necessary support, we will be able to accept the proposal just made by Pakistan.

The President (*spoke in Spanish*): I wonder if the Conference could accept the latest proposal by Pakistan, namely, given the different views on how to refer to the statement of the Secretary-General, to simply include a paragraph referring to this important message, along with the symbol, without giving details of the content of the statement. Are there any difficulties with this proposal by Pakistan? Fine, then we will resolve the issue of paragraph 5 this way.

Mr. Reid (United States of America): In fact, we do have problems with the proposal as put forward by our Pakistani colleague. We appreciate the constructive suggestion our Moroccan colleague made in trying to propose bridging language, but we think the way to deal with this is just as our Indian and Algerian colleagues have said. We could use “inter alia”, reducing the text to the point where we are basically talking about a

sentence, but that doesn't convey respect for either the message or the presence of the Secretary-General, and we don't think it's the appropriate way to approach this.

The President (*spoke in Spanish*): I thank the delegation of the United States. We hope you rested yesterday on your Labour Day, which is a public holiday in your country. We had the misfortune to be working. Actually it is not possible to agree on a text right now. I propose that we suspend discussion of paragraph 5 and try to see with the delegations that have expressed the most serious concerns how to resolve the situation. Let us turn to paragraph 6.

This paragraph was provisionally approved. Some additional references have already been included. I remind delegations that if anything has inadvertently been overlooked, we can remedy that at any time. Let us turn to paragraph 7. Does any delegation wish to comment on paragraph 7? May I take it that paragraph 7 is adopted?

Mr. Reid (United States of America): There were quite a few exchanges on paragraph 7 before, and, as we are looking at them, there is a particular area here that still, as we discussed before, doesn't work for us – particularly in the middle of the paragraph, with the sentence “they also welcomed the concerted efforts by the Presidents of the Conference”.

We had mentioned it – our Secretary of State didn't in fact encourage all the work of all the presidents. In her speech — we have checked the text again — she thanked the President of that time. You yourself had suggested that we strike “the Presidents of”, so perhaps that would be a way forward.

Also, we have talked with our capital again about some of the text that occurs both at the beginning and at the end, and they don't concur with the phrase “the single multilateral disarmament negotiating forum”. A simple drafting fix for that could be to insert the word “standing” so as to have “the single standing multilateral disarmament negotiating forum” in both the second and last lines of the current draft paragraph 7.

The President (*spoke in Spanish*): Yes, it is true that we worked on this paragraph orally. It is not really the secretariat's fault. Perhaps the President is the one who should submit an amended version in writing. But, so as not to lose time, we will now work sentence by sentence on this paragraph to see if we can fix it, and I will make proposals as we go along.

The first sentence reads: “In their addresses, these dignitaries recognized the importance of the Conference, and most of them referred to it as the single multilateral negotiating forum ... They addressed a wide range of issues in the area of disarmament and international security.”

(continued in English)

Is there any problem with this sentence as redrafted?

Mr. Ahmad (Pakistan): Mr. President, pardon my failure to follow the first part of your sentence. Could it kindly be repeated?

The President: I apologize for my English: “In their addresses, these dignitaries recognized the importance of the Conference and most of them referred to it as the single multilateral disarmament negotiating forum.” There will be a full stop after this sentence.

There will be a new second sentence that will include the wording “they addressed a wide range of issues in the area of disarmament and international security”. There will not be any change in wording, only an attempt to facilitate the understanding of the sentence.

If anyone has a better proposal, I am very flexible. I am a Spanish-speaking person and even my Spanish is not so good.

Mr. Gill (India): I think, with regard to the difficulty raised by the delegate of the United States about the reference in the beginning, which you have tried to address through this formulation, that perhaps we could look at a simpler fix which would involve replacing “the” with “a”: “... these dignitaries, recognizing the importance of the Conference as a single multilateral disarmament negotiating forum ...”. With that we will remain true to the consensus language of the first special session of the General Assembly on disarmament, which is where this reference actually comes from.

Ms. Jáquez Huacuja (Mexico) (*spoke in Spanish*): Thank you, Mr. President, for your efforts with regard to this morning’s work. I believe that the solution just proposed by the delegation of India would satisfy my delegation. I would also like to propose that perhaps in this paragraph, the first reference to the importance of the Conference as the single forum for disarmament negotiations — to use the wording of the first special session of the General Assembly devoted to disarmament — should be factual, as the delegation of India said, capturing the spirit. But my delegation and the Vice-Minister who was one of the speakers referred to in this paragraph referred to the importance of the Conference not in the present but in the past tense. Then my delegation also has problems with this sentence; perhaps the first part could be much more factual if we were to say — and I’m going to read in English — “In their addresses, these dignitaries recognized the importance of the Conference as a” — or “the” — “single multilateral disarmament negotiating forum ...” and in the last sentence we would have to say:

(*continued in English*)

“the Conference will consider expressions of support for its endeavours”.

(*continued in Spanish*)

The problem I see here is the repetition of the same sentence twice, attributing it to all the dignitaries. I repeat: I would like to support what the delegate of India said about replacing “the” with “a” in order to preserve the language of the first special session on disarmament, but he also drew attention to the fact that this same phrase is repeated at the end of the paragraph.

The President (*spoke in Spanish*): Yes, thank you. We could take into account your proposed rewording, provided the last part of the sentence is kept, because other issues were in fact addressed. A wide range of topics relating to disarmament and international security were addressed and I really do not think we should omit them. But in any case, maybe we could solve this by joining the last sentence with the first part of the first sentence, as you propose, and making the last part of the first sentence into a separate sentence.

Does any other delegation wish to take the floor? Fine, let us continue step by step.

First, can we accept India’s proposal to replace “the” with “a” in the second line of the document? Are there any objections?

Mr. Reid (United States of America): Mr. President, I would very much appreciate your constructive approach to this, and you are being very logical, which I appreciate. May I suggest that we put the whole paragraph together and hear it all through once before we start breaking it apart sentence by sentence, so we can hear the total construction? I am not sure, between the Mexican suggestions and what you are starting to read out, if I get the whole flow of the paragraph. If I could hear that, I think I would be in a better position, and other colleagues might be, too.

The President (*spoke in Spanish*): I propose the following. We leave this paragraph pending. The President submits a redrafting proposal, taking into account the issues raised,

and we examine it at a future working session. Let us go, then, to paragraph 8. Here Poland has drawn attention to a document.

Mr. Khelif (Algeria) (*spoke in French*): The Algerian delegation would like to deal with paragraphs 8 and 9 together because they are linked.

Paragraph 8 concerns discussions held in the Conference on Disarmament about the high-level meeting.

As we just said about the statement of the Secretary-General, our report should not be selective. It should address all issues that have been addressed in the Conference.

We do not believe that this year the Conference addressed only the issue of the high-level meeting. Other issues were discussed here, including the outcomes of the 2010 NPT Review Conference and the establishment of nuclear-weapon-free zones in the Middle East, an issue raised on many occasions. We therefore wonder why only the issue of the high-level meeting is mentioned in this part of the report.

We believe that our report should reflect the discussions that took place as a result of the high-level meeting, but as an activity of the Conference on Disarmament. It should not cover other activities that occurred in parallel with the Conference.

That is why we believe that this part on the discussions held on the high-level meeting should be included in the section about improving the functioning of the Conference on Disarmament.

With regard to the discussions on the high-level meeting, Poland has proposed to insert in the report a reference to the relevant summary records. However, this question was discussed throughout the year and is therefore mentioned in almost all the records.

Shall we then cite the records of all the meetings at which the issue was discussed this year? We would then have to cite nearly all the records.

Yesterday we sent specific proposals to the secretariat that contained some errors. Today we corrected those errors and sent the texts to the secretariat this morning. For lack of time, the proposals are not reflected in the draft we have before us today, but I would like to draw your attention to them.

(continued in English)

We propose to move subparagraph (a) of paragraph 9 to part III, section H, as a new paragraph after paragraph 53, and to move the chapeau and subparagraph (b) of paragraph 9 to part II, section G, after paragraph 25. This paragraph would report on the discussions held in the Conference on the revitalization of the Conference, taking into account the other proposals made by some delegations here. We will discuss them when we arrive at this issue.

(continued in French)

Such was the tenor of the proposals made by the Algerian delegation.

The President (*spoke in Spanish*): Yes, thank you. Before turning to consider the content of the proposals, I believe we need to reach agreement on which of the two approaches to use. In the document submitted by Colombia there is a clear redrafting proposal, where the subject appears clearly identified as the Conference on Disarmament and therefore reflects the contents of this paragraph, which the Conference on Disarmament developed in informal plenary meetings following up on the high-level meeting. Algeria, on the other hand, has proposed not to refer to that work in this part of the document and to move that reference to the second part of the document, to which Algeria is already proposing — in fact, specifically suggesting — that we move the paragraphs. I would first

like to ask the Conference which approach we prefer. Shall we keep the reference to this follow-up work done by the Conference in informal meetings, or shall we choose the option suggested by Algeria? I want to have a clear idea before embarking on the formulation of the proposal.

Mr. Valencia Muñoz (Colombia) (*spoke in Spanish*): To help delegations with the discussion, I would like to recall a paragraph that we proposed last week. I will read it in English:

(*continued in English*)

“Members of the Conference on Disarmament reflected on the situation and the strengthening of the Conference on Disarmament in informal plenary meetings held on 9 and 19 June 2011 taking into account, inter alia, the forthcoming events on the follow-up debate to the high-level meeting on revitalizing the Conference on Disarmament and taking forward multilateral disarmament in the negotiation that took place on 24 September 2010 in New York. Their views on the issue are duly reflected in the plenary records dealing with this matter. 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” as a contribution by Colombia, in its national capacity, concerning the way in which it perceived the reflection exercise carried out on this issue at the Conference on 9 and 14 June 2011’ was submitted to the Conference.”

The President (*spoke in Spanish*): I had the privilege of receiving a copy of the paragraph, which makes it very easy for me to read. But I certainly think that it would be difficult for the other delegations to digest all its contents without having the text. I believe we must find a moment to distribute it. But in any case, before tackling the content I would like to hear from delegations which approach to follow for these paragraphs. I give the floor to the delegation of Germany.

Mr. Hoffmann (Germany): I was not here last week, so this for me is the first day when I am starting to really look at the debate you had last week on this matter. I am trying to find my way into this.

I would like to make a general remark with respect to the proposal made by the representative of Algeria just a minute ago, if I understood it correctly, and that is the following: it seems to me that there were two, can we say, major events during this session which somehow stand out, and which I think need to be reflected in part II, “Organization of the work of the Conference”. The first is the fact that the General Assembly of the United Nations dealt with what we are doing or not doing here in the Conference, and I think it is quite in order to reflect this in this section. I would indeed say it would be a bit strange not to reflect it when the General Assembly deals with what we are doing here.

The second event which took place was the meeting of the Conference with the Advisory Board. I think both are objective facts which have to be reflected in what we report back to the General Assembly. So I find it a bit difficult to delete this altogether, if I understood it correctly, from this part, although I have to say I have no problem whatsoever with also mentioning this in part II, section G, “Improved and effective functioning of the Conference”, because in terms of substance it is surely right to deal with both events and their substance and content under that heading. So that’s a general plea to leave these two elements in part II, “Organization of the work of the Conference”.

Now I understand, just looking at the text, that it’s a bit complicated to marry all these different elements here. We tried our hand at it – you will see that on page 5, where

the proposal by Germany appears. We simply made an addition to the existing text of the original draft in which we highlight the substance of what was actually the content of our meeting with the Advisory Board, just to reflect what the problem is.

Let me just conclude by saying that I heard from my deputy about the discussion last week where the position was taken that we could not reflect what was going on in other forums in our own report. I have to say I find that really surprising because when a body like the General Assembly deals with what we are doing, we should actually be proud of it, even if the substance is a bit disappointing because we aren't making progress. It is good that the General Assembly is actually dealing with what we are doing here, and why should we not report back that we took note of that?

The President (*spoke in Spanish*): Yes, thank you, Ambassador. In reality, the issue is not that we cannot include what other bodies are doing. The view most often heard in this room is that a significant number of the member delegations of the Conference on Disarmament did not want to include the reference in the report. Basically, this is clearly a stance against reflecting the work of other bodies, not because it cannot be done but because the will and a decision to seek consensus to do so are lacking. We are therefore looking for approaches to reflect in a basic way what the Conference did earlier and as a follow-up to the General Assembly session. But obviously there is nothing to stop us from referring to the work of another body, especially when, as you said, we are referring to what for Cuba is the most important body in the whole United Nations system, even more important than the Security Council itself, precisely because it is one of the few bodies in the whole system that really has democratic working methods characterized by universal participation.

Ms. Jáquez Huacuja (Mexico) (*spoke in Spanish*): During the previous discussion, my delegation expressed a preference for moving paragraphs 8 to 11 to section G to respond to the wish of delegations to include a reference to the high-level meeting. I believe that by doing so we could satisfy the desire to report on what happened here in the Conference without denying that at least from 9 to 14 June there were discussions dedicated exclusively to this subject, or that other statements were made at various times in plenary when delegations expressed their views on the situation prevailing in the Conference on Disarmament.

To summarize, the Conference held two sessions, on 9 and 14 June, on the high-level meeting or the situation of the Conference on Disarmament in view of that New York meeting. I think that if we use the wording suggested by Colombia to summarize this idea that the Conference reflected on these issues in view of the high-level meeting, but move it to section G on the functioning of the Conference, and if there we mention the documents that were submitted, the information will be much more factual than if we were to include it with all the other activities organized by the Conference during its annual session, as it does every year.

The President (*spoke in Spanish*): Before continuing with the list, namely with India, I have a question. Could we agree to address these issues, using an approach to be agreed on subsequently, in section G of the document?

Good, this is the first agreement. We are moving the consideration of paragraphs 8 and 9 to section G. Now let's see how and where to do it. I wonder whether to do it when we look at section G. It will probably be more logical to see the whole section. I suggest doing it the following way. Given that there are several proposals, in particular some by Colombia, I ask the secretariat to distribute this paragraph by Colombia so that when we reach section G, all delegations have the benefit of the text. Then I ask you to leave pending the consideration of paragraphs 8 and 9 until we get to section G. When we come to section

G, we will also agree on exactly where to put each of these paragraphs. Let us go, then, to paragraph 10. I open the floor to delegations on paragraph 10.

Mr. Khelif (Algeria) (*spoke in French*): Before tackling paragraph 10, the Algerian delegation would like to say, with regard to our annual report and the possibility of reflecting activities that take place outside the Conference on Disarmament but relate to the Conference or its activities, that it is not a question of whether or not we want to reflect these activities. The fact is that we must be guided in our work by the rules of procedure, including their paragraph 45, which sets out the elements to be included in the annual report.

That is why we are a little reluctant to see the report mention certain activities.

We support your proposal, Mr. President, to discuss paragraphs 8 and 9 under the subsection on improving the functioning of the Conference, and we believe that paragraph 10 could also be discussed in connection with that subsection.

The President (*spoke in Spanish*): Does any other delegation wish to take the floor?

Ms. Jáquez Huacuja (Mexico) (*spoke in Spanish*): My suggestion was precisely to tackle paragraph 10 and also paragraph 11, which is also in section G, because they are about topics relating to the revitalization of the Conference on Disarmament in the framework of the high-level meeting. Thank you, Mr. President.

The President (*spoke in Spanish*): Well, we had agreed to tackle paragraphs 8 and 9 when we deal with section G. There is a specific proposal that links what Algeria and Mexico said – to move the consideration of paragraphs 10 and 11 to section G as well. Are there any objections?

Mr. Ahmad (Pakistan): We wish to express our opinion on paragraph 10. As you will recall, in the last meeting we suggested the deletion of this paragraph – and let me quote rule 45 of the rules of procedure of the Conference, which states that the reports of the Conference shall be factual and reflect the negotiations and work of the Conference.

The President (*spoke in Spanish*): I would like to know if, from a procedural point of view — we are not now discussing the content of the paragraph — you would have any major objections if the consideration of paragraph 10 were transferred to another point in our work, specifically to when we deal with section G. At that time, when we start discussing the content of the paragraph, of course we will hear what your delegation has to say.

Would you object to postponing the consideration of this proposal until we consider section G of the document?

Mr. Ahmad (Pakistan): As regards the theme of this paragraph, maybe we could discuss it, but what happened in the Conference, and not what happened outside the Conference. That we could discuss under section G.

The President (*spoke in Spanish*): Well, then, if you do not have any major objections, I propose to the delegations of the Netherlands and Morocco that we return to these paragraphs when we take up section G. I repeat: I propose to move the consideration of paragraphs 10 and 11 to the consideration of section G, if there are no objections. I am opening the floor for comments on this specific proposal. I see that the delegations of the Netherlands, Morocco and Germany all wish to take the floor.

Mr. Laassel (Morocco) (*spoke in French*): As we said last time, we believe that the report of the Conference on Disarmament must deal with the work of the Conference.

Paragraph 10 refers to activities that took place in the United Nations General Assembly and we therefore think, as do some other delegations, that it would be preferable to delete the first part of paragraph 10.

I think we should, however, keep the last sentence, which refers to the meeting of the Advisory Board with the members of the Conference on Disarmament on 30 June of this year. I believe that by doing so we could shorten paragraph 10.

Moving the contents of paragraph 10 to section G seems appropriate to us, but it will need to be changed so as to link it to the work of the Conference and not to refer to the conclusion made by the Secretary-General during the high-level meeting.

The President: It is clear that there have been some substantive proposals regarding paragraph 10, starting with the proposal by Colombia that we already have in the draft, but now I am referring not to the content of that paragraph but to the wording – to the right to refer or not to refer to meetings within the system.

My concrete question now is whether we can postpone the consideration of this issue until we deal with section G of the document. I think that there is no objection to this. I ask all delegations to allow me to move to consideration of paragraph 13, and to reserve all your energy for the moment when we refer to this paragraph once we arrive at consideration of section G.

Does any delegation have any objection to this?

Mr. Van Donkersgoed (Netherlands): I just wanted to point out — and I ask your indulgence — that the report should, in this section, anyway, only deal with those things that the Conference did, not with other things.

Now in that respect I could follow the argument and even agree to dealing with this issue of paragraphs 8, 9 and 10 in part II, section G. However, I wanted to point out — and you referred to it just now yourself — that under paragraph 10 we have a proposal from Colombia to have a reference not just to the high-level meeting that took place in New York, or to the follow-up meeting to the high-level meeting, but to the fact that the Conference on Disarmament held a plenary meeting on 4 August about that plenary debate which was a follow-up to the high-level meeting of last year. In my view, if we were to adopt or to accept this proposal by Colombia, that could remain as paragraph 10 in this particular part of the report, regardless of whether we deal with the other issues as they were discussed in New York and elsewhere under section G of part II of our report.

Mr. Hoffmann (Germany): I think what I am going to say is more or less going in the same direction as what has just been said by the representative of the Netherlands. I think it is clear that one can put a lot of this material into section G, because this is where we deal with it in substance. I made that point a bit earlier, but I am a bit confused now. Are we expected to delete all references to the high-level meeting debate we had in this chamber and to our meeting with the Advisory Board from part II? That is, are we going to move all of this into section G? This, I would think, would be going a bit too far, because under the heading of “Organization of the work of the Conference” we certainly can make a relatively short reference to the fact that we had a debate here in this chamber about the high-level meeting process and a meeting with the Advisory Board, because these are two major elements which I think need to be mentioned here. In terms of substance I would be quite happy to deal with them in section G.

Mr. Gill (India): We agree entirely and completely with your suggestion to move all these paragraphs into section G and deal with them there. I just want to very quickly address the important point raised by the Ambassador of Germany, which is that there is still confusion on how we deal with this. We haven't come to substantive consideration of

these paragraphs, but we are certainly not talking about deletion – we are talking about considering them under another section.

The main reason for that is that part II is about the organization of the work of the Conference. We are not getting into the substance of issues, and we have not traditionally referred to specific meetings of the Conference in this section. We have heard proposals about specific meetings held in June, July and August, but that is not the point of this section, so your proposal seems eminently sensible to us and we can go along with it.

Mr. Khelif (Algeria) (*spoke in French*): The Algerian delegation wished to submit a proposal concerning paragraph 11, but in view of your proposal to discuss this issue in connection with subsection G, we will mention it when we get to that point.

Concerning how to reflect the discussions on the high-level meeting, we believe that the Conference must make this debate its own and state in its report what it has done in this regard, but we also need to remember the rules, our working procedures.

I apologize for mentioning the rules of procedure again, but they are the framework that governs our work, and paragraph 30 of the rules of procedure clearly indicates that the subject of statements made in plenary meetings will normally correspond to the topic then under discussion, in accordance with the agreed work programme.

However, any member State of the Conference has the right to raise in plenary meeting any subject relevant to the work of the Conference and to have full opportunity of presenting its views on any subject which it considers to merit attention.

With regard to some references in the proposal submitted by Colombia for the meetings of 9 and 19 June and 4 August, we would like to remind you that these meetings were not held following a formal decision on the programme of work and that they were, therefore, not part of an agreed-on programme of work but a result of initiatives taken by the presidency and welcomed by us. We should therefore find a way to reflect the content of these debates while indicating that they did not form part of a previously agreed work programme.

The President (*spoke in Spanish*): I thank the delegation of Algeria. Actually, based on what you are telling me, I might as well go home, because really this year the Conference did nothing relating to a programme of work, because there is no programme of work, and then we would have nothing to report. Basically, I think that the flexibility that we have used in recent years in the work of our Conference has been precisely to somehow overcome a major impasse the reasons for which are basically political. I understand this perfectly, but I think that occasionally being creative and being revolutionaries in the real sense of the word, not what the western press today considers revolutionary, helps us to be able to tackle certain challenges. Anyway, I don't think I can agree with you very much, but in any case I repeat the basic proposal that we made. I am not saying that we are going to delete anything, I am not saying that we are prejudging the consideration of any content in relation to this. Nor does this mean that we are anticipating that by moving the consideration of these paragraphs we are accepting their content. Only with regard to working methods, procedures for examining these topics, I would like to know if any delegation ... Before asking the question I will give the floor to Chile, since my friend, Ambassador Pedro Oyarce, could really help me, as always. He seems to be objecting.

Mr. Oyarce (Chile) (*spoke in Spanish*): Not to object, but merely to make things easier – that is the approach we are using here, and we want to get out of this situation. We are on our way to complete confusion, which does not seem right to me. First, I think it is important for us to be able to decide — this is fairly simple and with a certain degree of flexibility we could achieve it, it would suit everyone — to move the paragraphs to section G. Maybe we are not in complete agreement. I understand the concern raised by the

distinguished Ambassador of Germany, but I think our concern should be where to convey the political message. We can also convey it in section G. Let us try to do it that way. Second, I think it is also important to move paragraphs 8, 9, 10 and 11 as a group. And, third, let us look at the content there, and I would suggest that we seriously consider Colombia's approach. But I believe that we are willing to accept this package. We understand the concerns regarding the rules of procedure, but let us not embark on that exercise, especially not in our Conference that does not have a programme of work. I also think we have to maintain some logic and coherence, and let's be as flexible as possible. This package seems reasonable – it allows us to discuss the topic and then reach political agreement on what we mention or do not mention here, bearing in mind paragraph 45 of the rules of procedure.

The President (*spoke in Spanish*): In this constructive and flexible spirit that we are being urged to adopt by one of our presidents, who led the work with such flexibility and creativity this year without a programme of work, I ask you whether we can accept the idea of transferring paragraphs 10 and 11, as we already transferred paragraphs 8 and 9, to section G and examining their content when we reach that stage. I see no objection. It is so decided.

Paragraph 12 was provisionally adopted. We continue with paragraph 13, which was also provisionally adopted. We then go to paragraph 14, which was likewise provisionally adopted. The same is true of paragraph 15. Paragraph 16 was likewise provisionally adopted. So were paragraphs 17 and 18. We now go to paragraph 19. Here there was a proposal by Poland. There was a proposal by Algeria that referred in a positive way to the efforts made. I open the floor to delegations and would specifically like to know whether the wording proposed by Algeria could form a basis for agreement on this paragraph. I give the floor to those delegations that wish to speak.

May I take it that we accept Algeria's wording for paragraph 19?

Mr. Ahmad (Pakistan): We are just taking the floor to apprise you that we need a little time to further consider this proposal and can discuss it later.

The President (*spoke in Spanish*): Well, then, we will leave consideration of paragraph 19 pending in the hope that the delegation of Pakistan will soon be in a position to comment on Algeria's proposal. I am letting you know that I will be supporting Algeria's proposal for paragraph 19. Let us go to paragraph 20. There are several proposals regarding this paragraph.

Mr. Khelif (Algeria) (*spoke in French*): I would like to return to paragraph 19 and our proposal.

I would just like to say, perhaps to enlighten our colleagues here, that the Algerian proposal is nothing new. It borrows wording used in the annual reports of previous years – 2007, 2006 and 2005, and perhaps also earlier. This wording is designed to convey a certain positive image of the Conference on Disarmament.

The President (*spoke in Spanish*): I ask the delegation of Pakistan to take into account the fact that the wording in question already appears in previous reports. Anyway, we will give you the time you need to hold consultations. Let us turn to paragraph 20.

I open the floor for discussion of paragraph 20. In particular, there was a proposal by Pakistan to divide paragraph 20 into two parts. You have a text showing how Pakistan proposes to divide the paragraph. As I have no other written proposals, I am specifically asking whether we would be able to accept to work on the basis of the proposal by the delegation of Pakistan for this paragraph.

Are there any objections to working with the format proposed by Pakistan for this paragraph?

Mr. Reid (United States of America): We appreciate the suggestion of our Pakistani colleagues, but — particularly given that what we are describing here is described in three other places in the document — we find it a little unnecessary to expand this even further. As it is, we are being redundant in our report. We go over this material over and over again. I don't see why we need to take the third instance of it here and further pad it out — because that is essentially what this is going to look like. We are just padding out a description of what we are doing here. So I appreciate the manner in which they have put forward the proposal, but I don't find its logic compelling, and I don't think it reflects well on us. We are going to have outside readers who know what's not going on here. Look at our work. Let's not stretch this too far. I'm afraid that's what this would have the effect of doing.

The President (*spoke in Spanish*): Yes, thank you. Does any other delegation wish to speak regarding paragraph 20, which refers in particular to several of this year's presidencies and how they tackled various aspects of our work?

Mr. Ahmad (Pakistan): We listened to the comment made by our distinguished colleague from the United States, and we think that, though there are repetitions in the report, they are there for a reason, and they have been there in the past as well, especially in 2009.

What we have proposed in the second paragraph of our proposal is a substantive addition. This particular part that is highlighted in the draft in bold is not repeated elsewhere in the report, and we think that it is a substantive proposal and one that is important for the delegation of Pakistan.

The minor adjustments in the last three lines of this paragraph would, we feel, add clarity to it. We do not think that they are substantive — we just provided language that would provide further clarity.

The President (*spoke in Spanish*): I think that for the moment we are not in a position to adopt this paragraph, but I would like to hear other delegations' views.

Mr. Daryaei (Islamic Republic of Iran): We also believe that we need to repeat something here because it would add to the clarity of the issue, and, when we compare this report with the previous report, I think it's helpful to have this repetition, so we would like to support the proposal of our distinguished colleague from Pakistan to separate the paragraph into two parts. The addition in the middle would also add to the clarity of the situation.

The President (*spoke in Spanish*): Well, if I don't see any other delegation wishing to speak, I propose to leave paragraph 20 pending and return to it later.

Let us go to paragraph 21. It was already adopted. Paragraph 22 was also adopted, as were paragraphs 23 and 24. We now come to paragraph 25, and here we are already in section G. We will stop here to entertain any proposals that you may have. I am opening the floor for comments about paragraph 25. There is a proposal by Algeria to refer to the handling by the Conference of the high-level meeting of the General Assembly.

I think that this would somehow be linked with other proposals reflected in the document. In any case, I open the floor to delegations wishing to speak specifically about this paragraph.

Mr. Khelif (Algeria) (*spoke in French*): The Algerian delegation has already submitted specific proposals concerning this paragraph but, given the proposals we have before us now, we will perhaps amend our proposals slightly. We would like to start with the Colombian proposal, because we believe that in this paragraph we must deal with the

high-level meeting; the discussions that took place in the Conference on the reform of this body; the discussions that took place on 9 and 19 June, as Colombia proposed; the meeting we held with the Advisory Board of the Secretary-General of the United Nations; and our discussions in the plenary meeting of 4 August 2011 of the General Assembly meeting of 27 to 29 July 2011 in New York.

Second, we can mention the documents submitted by Colombia on its diagnostic assessment of the Conference on Disarmament, and also the letter submitted as a working document by 29 delegations (CD/1911).

Regarding Colombia's proposal on the discussions of 9 and 19 June 2011, we suggest ending the paragraph after the sentence that ends with "after 24 September 2010 in New York" and deleting the following sentence, because there are no records of the informal meetings.

Then, regarding the second proposal for the meeting with the Advisory Board, we can —

The President (*spoke in Spanish*): Forgive me, Sir. To make sure we are all following along — basically, you proposed, as I understood it, to work on the basis of the version of paragraph 8 bis distributed by Colombia — is that the proposal? — and to replace paragraph 25 and even replace your proposed text for paragraph 25. Is that how far you have reached? Fine. Colombia's paragraph — do you mean ending with the sixth line, where it reads "24 September 2010 in New York"? Is my interpretation correct? When you refer to Colombia's paragraphs, I ask you please to cite the place in the document where they appear, so that we can all follow.

Mr. Khelif (Algeria) (*spoke in French*): The Algerian delegation would like to clarify that it wishes to keep paragraph 25 in its current form, because, in the formal meetings, statements focused on improving the functioning of the Conference on Disarmament. Another paragraph can be drafted on the basis of Colombia's proposal (para. 8 bis), to follow paragraph 25, using our suggestions as a guideline.

The President (*spoke in French*): Would paragraph 25 bis be based on your proposal or on what Colombia has proposed as paragraph 8 bis, which would end with "24 September 2010 in New York"? Which do you propose?

Mr. Khelif (Algeria) (*spoke in French*): That is what we propose, Mr. President.

Mr. Hoffmann (Germany): I would like to make a practical or procedural proposal here. Now that we are, it seems, more or less reaching consensus to move what was in paragraphs 8 to 11 into paragraph 25 of section G, we have a rather complicated task before us and this is reflected in the different pieces of paper which are on our table. I for one find it a bit difficult to really follow the debate. Maybe others are quicker than I am, but it's not so easy.

So my practical or procedural proposal would be that you consolidate what is on the table, maybe with variants in it, into a piece of text for our next meeting, and now you would only collect additional ideas which you might want to put into this consolidated paper. Then we will have a more sensible basis to work on.

In that vein, if I may, I would like to make such a proposal for an additional element. It seems to me that we certainly have to mention the fact that the Conference held a plenary meeting on 4 August dealing with all these issues of the high-level meeting process. In that regard I find important what the Secretary-General of this body has said in that context, so let me just slowly read out the text, and I will give you a copy later.

It starts in a very formal way:

“At its plenary meeting on 4 August the Secretary-General of the Conference on Disarmament, Mr. Tokayev, reported from the plenary debate of the General Assembly on revitalizing the work of the Conference on Disarmament and taking forward multilateral disarmament negotiations. He highlighted the prevailing grave concern about the lack of progress in the Conference after having remained stagnant since 1998.”

That is more or less a quote from what he said. Let me also say in this connection, because we had a debate at the beginning of our meeting today about quoting selectively and so on – we all know that this is always a problem in our work, but I think one has to admit when someone makes a point, and this is, I think, a very serious point, when the Secretary-General says in this body that this body has remained stagnant since 1998 and expresses his grave concern about the lack of progress of this Conference. I think this is surely something we should report back to the General Assembly.

But that is, as I said, just an element which you might want to consider in such a consolidated draft.

The President (*spoke in Spanish*): There is a specific procedural proposal before I give the floor to the Nigerian delegation. There is a specific proposal regarding procedure by the delegation of Germany, namely the Ambassador, that really seems to me very logical, because in reality we now have paragraph 8 bis in a document circulated in hard copy, we have section G of the document, separate from paragraphs 8, 9, 10 and 11. I understand that the paragraph mentioned by Germany is already in the aforementioned document as number 10, but if that is not the case I would ask the delegate of Germany to provide in writing the paragraph that he read out. I understand that it is the one that appears on page 5 as “proposal by Germany”, but in any case I would ask the secretariat to prepare, as a separate document, section G as a compilation of all the proposals that have been made, and we will come back to it another time.

Mr. Endoni (Nigeria): I think whatever I was going to say has been said by the distinguished Ambassador of Germany. At the moment there is some form of confusion. We have moved paragraphs 8 to 11 to section G. Sincerely, I do not know whether these paragraphs will be combined into one paragraph as 25 or if we are going to have separate paragraphs. So I just want to suggest, echoing the distinguished Ambassador of Germany, that we keep this discussion pending while we ask the secretariat through you to come up with a clearer draft for us to discuss, so that we have a clearer picture of what the paragraphing will look like and what the contents will be.

The President (*spoke in Spanish*): To summarize: the President endorsed the proposal by the Ambassador of Germany and requested the secretariat to prepare a separate document showing the proposed structure of section G on the basis of all the proposals that had been made. The President also proposed to postpone consideration of section G in its entirety until this document is available, which would render our discussions more logical and practical. I open the floor to delegations that wish to comment on this proposal by the President or make any other comments they deem appropriate.

Mr. Khelif (Algeria) (*spoke in French*): The Algerian delegation listened with great interest to the proposal just made by the Ambassador of Germany.

Of course, the Algerian delegation has no objection to mentioning a part of the statement by the Secretary-General of the Conference, but if we express our concern over the deadlock that has persisted in the Conference on Disarmament since 1998, by the same logic we have to mention the reasons for this situation.

I would like to say a word of caution about quotations. If we are going to quote, we can even quote the assessment by the Secretary-General of the Shannon report on the issue of a treaty on fissile material.

We believe that by taking such a tack we will not solve the problem of the report and will in fact risk complicating matters further.

That is why we do not wish the report to include certain references or quotations. However, if no other delegation objects to such a quotation, Algeria can but join the consensus.

The President (*spoke in French*): I thank Algeria warmly for all the information it has provided, but now I would like us not to engage in substantive debate and merely to determine whether we can proceed, given the proposal by the delegation of Germany to enable the secretariat to prepare a consolidated text. Once all delegations have a complete and clearly structured document, we can begin to debate its merits.

Now I ask all delegations not to submit substantive proposals and to comment only on the proposal by the delegation of Germany: If any delegations wish to add a paragraph for consideration once the secretariat has prepared the consolidated text, I invite them to do so.

In other words, I am asking all delegations to refer only to procedural issues.

(*continued in English*)

Is there any objection to the proposal presented by Germany? That is my real question, because I think there is going to be a mess for any of us entering the current discussion, because we are going to have so many papers. For that reason, I think it is going to help me also in the discharge of my mandate to act on the basis of the proposal of the Ambassador of Germany. Is there any objection to this?

Iran, you are objecting to my proposal. In that case, I ask you to refer to the issue once we have the paper and can have that kind of discussion.

Mr. Sareva (Deputy Secretary-General of the Conference on Disarmament): Mr. President, I would just like to let you and the members of the Conference know that we will be compiling a separate paper which will encompass section G as proposed by the Ambassador of Germany, and we will do so after the conclusion of this meeting. If we continue our meeting this afternoon, we can then have that paper ready for everybody. So this is just to clarify that yes, we will provide you with all proposals which would fall under section G.

The President (*spoke in Spanish*): I give the floor to the delegation of Algeria. I would like to assure all delegations that there is no hidden agenda and that with this approach the President will not give preferential treatment to any particular topic. It is simply a procedural proposal to facilitate our work and the follow-up to the negotiation by all delegations. I think the secretariat understands, and that is basically what I requested. Not to reproduce the whole document, because we have to economize on behalf of the United Nations and our Governments, which are, after all, paying for all this, and our peoples and our taxpayers, who furnish our States' budgets – not to prepare the document in its entirety but to have a separate document consisting of section G and including all the proposals that have been made regarding this section. We mean any paragraph that has been presented in connection with the old paragraphs 8, 9, 10 and 11, plus what currently appears in section G, namely, paragraph 25 along with Algeria's proposal for that paragraph. That is what we are talking about: a compilation that will facilitate our efforts, plus Germany's paragraph, though I am not sure if it differs from what is already in the document. In any case, if any delegation wants to include something in section G, it has time to do so during this morning's meeting, as long as the proposal is provided to the secretariat in writing.

Mr. Khelif (Algeria) (*spoke in French*): The Ambassador of Germany submitted his proposal in the context of paragraph 10, proposed by Colombia and dealing with the meeting of 4 August.

To help us move forward, the Algerian delegation would like to amend the Colombian proposal for paragraph 10 as follows:

(*continued in English*)

“During its plenary meeting of 4 August 2011, the Conference on Disarmament discussed the meeting held in New York from 27 to 29 July 2011 as follow-up of the high-level meeting held on 24 September 2010.”

The President: We are going to reflect your proposal exactly. I ask you, please, to present the proposal in written form to the secretariat, and there is no doubt it is going to be included in the compilation.

Mr. Daryaei (Islamic Republic of Iran): I think we are trying to reflect a topic that is not separate from the other topics, so we have to be consistent with the other part of the report, where we are dealing with substantive work.

The question is how to factually reflect what happened inside the Conference with regard to this issue. We have to cover the informal plenary meetings held on 9, 19 and 30 June, and on 4 August. These are the plenaries where we discussed these issues. So we can either have one paragraph which refers to all of these meetings, or two or three paragraphs which refer to the meeting factually, and then we again have to be consistent with other parts of the report. We can say, “The following documents dealing with this issue were submitted to the Conference ...” and then list the documents, which include the document presented by our distinguished colleague from Colombia. In that way we are factually reporting what has been discussed inside the Conference. I think it would be better and would circumvent a long debate on partial quotation from one meeting to another, which creates problems for some delegations.

The President: Dear friends, please be ready to do that when we consider the paper. If you have a concrete proposal for a structure, please present this in writing so that we can include your proposal in the paper that we are going to distribute.

Mr. Hoffmann (Germany): I welcome the fact that you are planning together with the secretariat to produce a consolidated draft, let’s say, of paragraph 25, comprising all the paragraphs from 8 to 11, which is a somewhat complicated matter. But I would encourage you to try your own hand at it and not simply to mechanically list all the proposals which were made, because that will only help us to some extent. I think you have heard the opinions, and since there is a lot of redundancy in all these elements, it would be a complicated task to somehow collectively edit this text. That is why I would really encourage the secretariat and you as President to try to consolidate the elements and make a proposal which you think might reflect the consensus or near-consensus of this group.

Now I want to come back again to this point of how one can quote someone in such a report, and it’s a complicated matter, but I have in front of me the statements made by the Secretary-General of the United Nations in the high-level debate on — I think — 27 July. The Secretary-General is not talking just about some general topic. He is talking about the situation of this body, and he says at some point — and I quote — “Indeed, I am among the many who have warned that the status quo will simply render the CD irrelevant and obsolete.” That is the Secretary-General of the United Nations. I just cannot follow the logic of someone who simply says that when you want to quote the Secretary-General you have to go into the reasons why this is so. He doesn’t give the reasons himself – wisely, I would say. I think we would be going down the wrong alley if we were to try to list all the

reasons, because we could be discussing this for the next 10 years, just as we have been discussing for the last 10 years why we don't make progress.

But simply to say that the Secretary-General says that we will become irrelevant really goes to the heart of the matter. I argue that it would be in order to quote back to the General Assembly that this was the assessment of the Secretary-General and, likewise, of the Secretary-General of this body, of the Conference. That's why I find it perfectly in order to include such quotes.

The President: To me it is amazing that we are negotiating the summary of what has been said by the Secretary-General, I don't know of a magic solution for referring to some elements and not to others, not respecting the core and essence that have been determined by him – the main ideas that he would like to propose to the Conference.

I will defer to the advice of all those who are real experts on disarmament, and I count on you, Ambassador, because I know that you have a lot of knowledge, and all those who can help me will be willing at all times to listen to you and get advice from you.

Well, now we have a procedural decision. We are going to go back to these issues when we have the paper that will be prepared by the secretariat, and, once again, a note of thanks for the very hard work by our friends from the secretariat.

Let's move, in that case, to section H. Paragraphs 26 and 27 were provisionally adopted, so we can move to part III on the substantive work of the Conference during its 2011 session.

Poland suggested deleting paragraphs 28 to 31. I was not really happy with this proposal because there are some very important sentiments that are at the core of the position of the Non-Aligned Movement and some other developing countries and the G21, not to mention Cuba in its national capacity.

Can delegations agree to the proposal by Poland to delete those paragraphs?

Mr. Zaleski (Poland): There is now a proposal to replace this whole paragraph. I would like to make an addition in order to somehow recognize the work of our presidents. I would make no revision to my country's own revision, and to the proposal on page 10 I would add simply "five plenary meetings in accordance with the indicative timetable (CD/WP.564) suggested by Ambassador Pedro Oyarce of Chile on 22 February 2011". Also at the end of this proposed revision by Poland, I would propose recognizing the work done by Ambassador Wang Qun of China by simply adding "adopted during the presidency of Ambassador Wang Qun of China". Frankly speaking, I think that the deletion of the paragraphs mentioned in our proposal will not change anything and will make the text more readable and avoid a lot of repetition.

The President (*spoke in Spanish*): I see that Poland's proposal is not so drastic. It is not to delete it entirely – there are some counterproposals. In any case, I am opening the floor for discussion of the wording proposed by Poland. Would it be acceptable to delegations?

Mr. Endoni (Nigeria): I would like to ask the delegate of Poland if his suggested amendment is to replace paragraph 28 or to replace paragraphs 28 to 31.

Mr. Zaleski (Poland): It's exactly like that, because in our proposal all those meetings held according to the timetables proposed by three ambassadors are in fact listed very briefly, but when you look at another part of the report — part III, sections A, B, C, D and the others where the consideration of those agenda items is covered in detail — you will find all the information that is repeated in paragraphs 29, 30 and 31, so this is just to make it simpler and nicer and to put the information about the discussion on concrete agenda items under the parts which belong to those agenda items.

The President (*spoke in Spanish*): Again, I turn to the Conference. I do not like Poland's proposal because, while my friend Ambassador Marius Grinius is mentioned, the reference to the work of other great friends, among them Pedro Oyarce of Chile, would be eliminated, which I do not want to do. Thus I prefer the paragraph as it is.

Ms. Jáquez Huacuja (Mexico) (*spoke in Spanish*): Mr. President, first I would like to echo your comment about Poland's suggestion and whether it would eliminate material that so many countries are attached to. Mexico's concern — and I expressed it at the previous plenary — is that the section entitled "Substantive work of the Conference on Disarmament" gives the impression that substantive work was done in the Conference on Disarmament this year, when in reality there was none. There were discussions and debates, and I repeat my country's position that these debates, despite being on the topics that are of top priority for Mexico and other countries, are not what the Conference is mandated to do and in fact duplicate those of the Disarmament Commission in New York.

My delegation is therefore drawn to the suggestion of Poland, which at least makes this section a lot smaller and slimmer and easier to read, not by removing the reference, but by not repeating the names of the presidents who have done an extraordinary job of bringing these issues to the table for discussion.

In conclusion, I think that in order to maintain the factual sense of what happened here, the proposal by Poland — or any other proposal, because if we leave the previous one, it would also have to be amended in this manner — could include the words — I will read them in English — first for Poland's proposal:

(*continued in English*)

"During its 2011 session, the Conference held a series of plenary meetings to discuss ..."

(*continued in Spanish*)

This would reflect the fact that what took place in the Conference in 2011 was debate and discussion, not substantive work on these agenda items. In the same vein, my delegation could accept Poland's proposal and even Pakistan's more disaggregated proposal to merge paragraphs 30 and 31, which we will address later, as long as it is specified that what occurred here was debate, not substantive work on these topics.

In the same sense, Mr. President, in response to your concern and your comment regarding the original proposal, which is more extensive and retains the idea of the consultations that the various presidents held on various proposals for informal programmes of activities, I think that should be reflected in the same way. I will read the original paragraph 28 in English:

(*continued in English*)

"In accordance with the indicative timetable suggested by Ambassador Marius Grinius, the Conference on Disarmament, in plenary meeting, discussed agenda item 1 ..."

(*continued in Spanish*)

... and then all the agenda items. If we used this wording it would give the impression that we merely held discussions, which is correct.

The President (*spoke in Spanish*): Well, then, I will ask the question, and each delegation more or less already has a preference. Let me summarize once more. Poland's proposal would mean the removal of paragraphs 28, 29, 30 and 31 and the inclusion of the paragraph that appears on page 10, which has been further amended by Mexico with the inclusion in the second sentence of the phrase "to discuss": "plenary meeting to discuss all substantive agenda items". Mexico's proposal would be taken care of in the current

wording, because basically nowhere is there a reference to negotiations, only to discussions. I will now go in order. Amendments should be considered first. Procedural ones are normally withdrawn.

Would we be prepared to work on the basis of Poland's proposal, deleting paragraphs 28 to 31 and replacing them with the paragraph appearing on page 10 as amended by Mexico? If that is the case, it is adopted.

Mr. Ahmad (Pakistan): We had, as is evident in the draft text, made a proposal on amending paragraphs 30 and 31, which we feel would be redundant in the light of the new paragraph. We propose that the proposal as you highlight it should be reflected in the next draft and then a decision be taken on that.

The President (*spoke in Spanish*): I am sorry, Mr. Ahmad, I misunderstood. Regarding your proposed paragraph to replace paragraphs 30 and 31, can you agree to what we have agreed regarding Poland's proposal, or will you insist on some element that was not included in the proposal? Please could you clarify this?

Mr. Ahmad (Pakistan): We feel that paragraphs 30 and 31 will become irrelevant if the Polish proposal is accepted. So we propose that the Polish proposal as amended by Mexico be circulated and a decision be taken on that afterwards.

The President (*spoke in Spanish*): Well, to sum up, paragraphs 28, 29, 30 and 31 are eliminated. The paragraph proposed by Poland, as amended by Mexico and which replaces those paragraphs, is awaiting confirmation of acceptance until we have a clear indication from all delegations. This is what we are agreeing on.

Mr. Zaleski (Poland): Thank you for what we have just heard about this proposal, but I would like to remind you that I made an addition to this proposal, namely to add to the reference to CD/WP.564 the author of this proposal — "suggested by Ambassador Pedro Oyarce of Chile on 22 February 2011", as proposed by Pakistan — and also to add at the end of the paragraph, after the reference to document CD/1907, "adopted during the presidency of Ambassador Wang Qun of China". Then we will have the proponents of those three mini-programmes of work listed here as authors of those proposals.

The President (*spoke in Spanish*): Yes, I think your addition to the report is very appropriate, and it will be reflected in the paragraph at the time of the new reading of the draft, because really, I repeat, the paragraph is awaiting confirmation.

Let us turn to paragraph 32. Paragraph 32 was agreed on, as were paragraphs 33, 34 and 35. Then, when we start considering section A, there is a Polish proposal to combine sections A and B.

Mr. Khelif (Algeria) (*spoke in French*): The Algerian delegation proposed in the previous plenary to insert the text of paragraph 32, on the discussions that took place at the Conference on Disarmament on all the agenda items, at the beginning of part III, before the current paragraph 28.

The President (*spoke in Spanish*): Yes, I give the floor to the delegation of India.

Mr. Gill (India): With regard to paragraph 33, perhaps with agreement on ...

The President (*spoke in Spanish*): Forgive me for interrupting. Regarding Algeria's proposal, are there any objections to moving the paragraph as Algeria proposes? I see no objections. It is so decided.

I now give the floor to the delegation of India to speak about paragraph 33.

Mr. Gill (India): My apologies for jumping the gun. On paragraph 33, there was a proposal from Algeria to refer to the reports prepared by the coordinators on the informal

meetings. We would suggest adding to that proposal a specific reference to CD/1907, because these reports were prepared on informal meetings held under CD/1907.

The President (*spoke in Spanish*): There is a specific proposal by India regarding paragraph 33. Are there any objections? The proposal by India is adopted. Regarding these other paragraphs that were already approved, does any delegation wish to comment on them before we go to section A?

Well then, let us go to section A. I already mentioned that Poland had suggested combining sections A and B.

Mr. Khelif (Algeria) (*spoke in French*): Throughout this year's discussions, the Algerian delegation has been saying that agenda items 1 and 2 were combined only for practical reasons, in particular to make it possible to allocate time equally among agenda items, but that this was in no way a tacit amendment or a prelude to changing the agenda.

That is why the Algerian delegation is troubled by Poland's proposal to combine agenda items 1 and 2 in the report. We prefer your original proposal, Mr. President.

The President (*spoke in Spanish*): Yes, at this point I ask the delegation of Poland not to insist on its proposal, given that it would change not only our work agenda but also the structure used in preparing reports in previous years, particularly last year. Anyway, we will give our Polish friends time to consider this, but with the suggestion that they refrain from insisting on their proposal so as to promote consensus.

We will leave this structure issue pending. For now we will work with the structure.

Mr. Zaleski (Poland): We can consider retaining those paragraphs, but I at least think that, if the distinguished delegations really want to have the consideration of both agenda items kept separately, then, for example, paragraph 38 should be redrafted a little bit to take out the references to the prevention of nuclear war, because they belong in section B, and similarly in paragraph 41. When you look at sections A and B, they are identical, but there is now an opportunity to delete references to the other agenda items and to keep just the agenda item that is referred to in this part.

The President (*spoke in Spanish*): Yes, thank you, Poland. First, we appreciate your flexibility regarding the proposed consolidation. We saw at the previous meeting that there were documents submitted by member States that clearly referred to both items. Anyhow, if in formal session there is any proposal that could resolve the substantive issue and help to avoid the impression left by all these duplicate texts, which undoubtedly involve expenditure of resources, I would have no problem with that as long as members' desire to submit their documents under these two agenda items is clearly respected.

We will now consider the paragraphs one by one. We will start with paragraph 36, which likewise was already provisionally adopted. Poland had a proposal but has now indicated its flexibility.

Let us turn to paragraph 37. Here there was already a proposal, basically two proposals, by South Africa. In the first place they said,

(continued in English)

Poland's proposal is as follows: "The following documents were submitted to the Conference under this agenda item."

The proposal of South Africa is to keep, in paragraphs 37 and 40, a list of all documents referring to this concrete agenda item.

Another option is to avoid merging sections A and B – to have the list of documents and a chapeau that refers to both agenda items and avoid having the same list appear twice in the document.

I now open the floor for consideration of the issue.

Mr. Zaleski (Poland): The Polish revisions to paragraphs 37 and 38 should be disregarded, because right now we are not insisting on merging those. Thus there would be no need to change “this agenda item” to “these agenda items”. Just keep it as it was in the original.

The President (*spoke in Spanish*): Well, then we can keep paragraph 37 as it was presented.

Ms. Fogante (Argentina) (*spoke in Spanish*): Yes, of course. I am not taking the floor to talk about the chapeau that we are considering, but to confirm that we are working with the original version – simply a technical issue. At the previous session my delegation asked to include in the list of documents contained in paragraphs 37 and 40 the document submitted by Argentina and Brazil concerning the twentieth anniversary of the Brazilian-Argentine Agency for Accounting and Control of Nuclear Materials. According to the secretariat, this document was circulated under the symbol CD/1916. I apologize for not submitting this request in writing, but it was my understanding that the secretariat had all the technical information. I would like to request that the correct number and date be included in the next version as was done with the document of Japan.

The President (*spoke in Spanish*): Yes, I reiterate what was said at the previous meeting – that any document that has been submitted to the Conference and therefore has an official document symbol will be included in the list as long as the State submitting the document wishes it to appear under a particular agenda item. That is to say, if, at the time of submitting the document the State or States indicated clearly in their letter that they wished the document to be considered under certain agenda items, they will appear there. I do not think any delegation needs to stress that individually because, as you pointed out, that was agreed at the previous meeting and the President confirmed it. In short, the agreement provides for the list that you mentioned to be amended.

Mr. Hoffmann (Germany): I apologize for coming in with this point somewhat belatedly, but I did want to put on the record that I have a lot of sympathy for the original proposal by Poland to merge these two sections. The representative of Poland has graciously already said that his country is flexible on this, but when I looked at this again I thought of our readers, who might look at this and find that the two are practically identical. We are all aware of the fact that what we produce is difficult to understand for the outside world anyway, but I think we should not go to extremes in making it difficult for the outside world to follow what we are trying to do. When people see identical texts like this, they really need a magnifying glass of, I would say, dogmatism to understand why it would not be possible to simply write the two agenda items into the headline and cover both items in one section.

The President (*spoke in Spanish*): I thank the delegation of Germany for a very logical statement. I am also grateful for the flexibility shown by Poland, Germany and all the delegations that have concerns about the format, which could have been more rational, but I prefer to respect the irrationality of the Conference last year and to avoid entering into discussions of format and rather devote our best efforts to the substantive elements that we still disagree on.

Then I take it that paragraph 37 is approved with the amendment proposed by the delegation of South Africa, which makes it much clearer, because the list here reads:

(continued in English)

“The following documents were submitted to the Conference under this agenda item” – and it was clear that the member States were willing to refer to this particular item at the time of submitting their official document.

Are there any other comments? Can I take it that the Conference wishes to adopt paragraph 37?

It is so decided.

There have been some references to paragraph 38 here, and there is an addition by Pakistan. Here there are also references to paragraphs 41, 44, 46, 48, 50 and 52, but the content of the proposal by Pakistan has not been inserted, has it? Where is it? In paragraph 41? Does anyone have the exact wording of the proposal by Pakistan? Can we agree on paragraph 38 as amended by Pakistan? Are there any objections? I give the floor to the representative of the United States.

Mr. Reid (United States of America): I’m sorry to take the floor again, Mr. President, but this goes back to the issue I raised many paragraphs ago – that we just keep saying the same things over and over again. I don’t agree with it. It doesn’t make any sense, and it also makes us look really bad. God forbid someone actually picks up and reads this report, but if they do, it doesn’t make any sense to be repeating all this.

Again, like you, I appreciate the flexibility of our German and Polish colleagues, but they are making a very good point about the construction of this document. It’s just going over and over these things, and at some point we have to draw a line. I am suggesting that it’s here. We make Pakistan’s point in one place. It’s bad enough that we are adding pocket rules of procedure — that’s exactly what this is about — but let’s not take that foolish step and then repeat it five times. We need to come to an agreement on this.

The President: The problem is that the reference to Pakistan occurs because the plenary discussions have been referring to different agenda items. Politically I can understand why. The only thing that I can request — but I don’t know what has been the practice for such cases in the report — it’s possible to have a footnote indicating that this wording also refers to the other paragraphs that Pakistan would like to refer to. We can then avoid reusing the same wording. I think we can be rational and that it will be easily solved. But, anyway, I would like to ask for the views of the representative of Pakistan on this particular case. You have the floor, Sir.

Mr. Khan (Pakistan): You know, I don’t want to comment on the sensibilities of the United States delegation, and some of the other delegations also talked about a lot of redundancy and how people outside this room are going to read this report. Of course the delegations are entitled to their views. The distinguished Ambassador of Germany has also mentioned this point. I just want to say that most of the delegations here have much longer experience than I do in multilateral diplomacy.

You know, often a product which comes out of consensus is important, and you know, Mr. President, how documents are structured in the Human Rights Council, in the Third Committee, in the Fifth Committee ... Which is more important – the aesthetic value of the document or the consensus underpinning it? That’s the first point I want to make.

Some delegations may not find these documents worth anything. Well, it’s up to them to make their choice. For us these documents are very important. Some delegations may feel that what we negotiate here is frivolous, and they are entitled to their opinion, but I think that for my delegation, as for most delegations in this room, the work we are doing is very important. If some delegations don’t take it seriously, that’s their choice. That’s the first point – let’s make that very clear.

Secondly, if the United States delegation goes through our proposal carefully, they will see that one Conference president is mentioned by name, so why shouldn't the other two be mentioned, for consistency? This is all that we are suggesting. So I don't see any particular problem with how it challenges the linguistic or aesthetic sensibilities of a particular delegation or how it strikes an outside reader when he is reading. If Mr. Grinius is mentioned, why shouldn't the presidents from Chile or China be mentioned? That is all we have suggested, just for consistency.

The President: I think that what we can do to maintain consistency is to do this in only one paragraph and to drop the references to Cuba's close friends, Ambassador Marius Grinius, Ambassador Wang Qun and Ambassador Pedro Oyarce, in other paragraphs, and to use a consistent approach in all paragraphs. Does that resolve the concern of the representative of Pakistan?

Mr. Khan (Pakistan): You just followed the logic which I was trying to apply. We should try to reflect on and respect other delegations' views. If we cannot agree with them, there should be logic in how we disagree with them. If people tried to focus a bit, they would have grasped my logic at a very early stage.

The President: Can we all agree to refer to all the proponents of the documents in paragraph 38 and to drop all of them — Ambassador Marius Grinius of Canada, Ambassador Pedro Oyarce of Chile and Ambassador Wang Qun of China — in the rest of the paragraphs? Are there any objections? I give the floor to the representative of Egypt.

Mr. El-Atawy (Egypt): I am just taking the floor to say that I see the logic of what Pakistan suggested initially. Paragraphs 38, 41, 44, 46, 48, 50 and 52 are identical, so if we are repeating them anyway, we have to repeat the reference to the presidents anyway in those paragraphs. If you want to have a reference in one paragraph that would apply to all paragraphs, with all three presidents, we can do that. However, if we are going to repeat paragraphs 41, 44, 46, 48, 50 and 52, then it makes perfect sense to our delegation that we should have references to all three presidents.

The President: Can we agree to use the reference to ambassadors only in paragraph 38, and in the rest — 41, 44, 46, 48, 50 and 52 — to refer only to documents and not to the presidencies?

Mr. Sareva (Deputy Secretary-General of the Conference on Disarmament): This would need to be reflected further down the line in paragraphs 41, 44, 46, 48, 50 and 52, because there is no Conference document forming a basis for the first reference to the schedule of informal meetings suggested by Ambassador Grinius. It was simply a suggestion from the Canadian presidency. It would then require some editorial changes in the paragraphs listed by Pakistan. We would need to perhaps say "in accordance with a schedule of informal meetings" — that's, of course, up to the member States to decide. I just want to flag it. There is a kind of qualitative difference between the suggestion made by the presidency and subsequent actions for which there is a Conference document that can be referred to.

The President (*spoke in Spanish*): I give the floor to the delegation of Pakistan.

Mr. Khan (Pakistan): This was precisely the reason. One idea was to ask for the deletion of all the names, and instead we suggested the addition. I think that as long as these two documents and their authors are mentioned, it is not really going to complicate the document. I would request, if it is possible, for the Conference to agree to that.

The President: Can we agree to have the addition of these two presidents and to keep all of them in the same paragraph, without repeating?

Mr. Khelif (Algeria) (*spoke in French*): It is not a proposal, just an idea.

The presidents who launched initiatives that have aided us in our debates, the ambassadors of Canada, Chile and China, are already mentioned in paragraph 20 of the draft report with references to the corresponding documents: for Canada, document CD/PV.1198; for Chile, document CD/WP.564; for China, document CD/1907. It is not necessary to mention them in each paragraph.

In the other parts of the document, we can mention the symbols of these documents without mentioning the authors.

Mr. Reid (United States of America): Building on our Pakistani and Algerian colleagues' comments and your own earlier comments, this is the situation as we see it. As our Algerian colleague was just saying, in paragraph 20 we go through the whole litany of everyone's names. We are not talking about cutting anyone out. Then, with Pakistan's suggestions later on in the individual substantive sections, we are repeating all that again. The thrust of my proposal is that we should pick one.

If right now the view, as we have heard as well from the secretariat, is that there were some subtle differences, then in the subsequent discussions we can reflect that. If we do that then we can delete all of what we have in paragraph 20. But we don't need, if you will, both belts and suspenders – we should pick one.

If the preference is for the latter part, as our Pakistani colleagues are saying, and as the secretariat is reminding us that there were subtle differences, so be it – we do it there. But then we don't need to do it as well in all of paragraph 20. So my proposal would be to strike it from paragraph 20. That's the thrust of my argument.

The President (*spoke in Spanish*): Yes, I give the floor to the delegation of Germany. Anyway, I would propose the following. Let us listen to what the delegates have to say. Let us give the secretariat additional time to assess this and later propose to us how to resolve the issue. But let us perhaps listen to the distinguished delegates of Germany or the Netherlands, who with their experience can help us to resolve the issue immediately. Ambassador, you have the floor.

Mr. Hoffmann (Germany): Let me first of all assure the delegate of Pakistan that I do take this work seriously, because he seemed to imply that I did not do so. I do take it seriously.

Secondly, of course it is important for our work to reflect a consensus here, but at the same time I think we should really try to make such documents readable to the extent possible, and that we should not turn them into rather absurd exercises. When one reads the repetition of such paragraphs, I think we reach really the dimension of absurdity, I have to say. By the way, this also costs money, because it's pages of printed material.

But now on the substance itself ... there is a sort of consensus that we should deal with all agenda items separately, not merge them. In that case I think I would say is it not enough when we say — after paragraph 36, and the same will apply to the other sections — that “during the general debate, delegations reaffirmed or further elaborated their respective positions”. One could simply add that, in accordance with the schedule, informal meetings were held on the agenda item on such and such a date, because that's the only information we need to have. Otherwise it's terribly repetitious, and we lose nothing at all, because it was mentioned earlier, just a minute ago, under whose presidency this was decided. For our purpose here, where we simply report on what has been done, on the respective agenda items, it is enough to say we had an open plenary debate, and that on top of that there were informal meetings on certain dates on this specific agenda item, period. I think that would really be enough and would shorten the text considerably rather than inflating it with additional elements which are not necessary.

The President (*spoke in Spanish*): There is a specific proposal by Germany that seems interesting. The other option is here in this sentence, which refers to the dates on which discussions were held. It is clear who was President at the time. I wonder if it is necessary to include the President's name. Perhaps the simplest would be to make a replacement in that first sentence:

(*continued in English*)

"In accordance with the schedule of informal meetings suggested by the President, two plenary meetings ...", and everyone is going to know who has been the President for that period. And then we can avoid naming anyone, because in paragraph 20 we have a very clear picture.

Mr. Van Donkersgoed (Netherlands): I do not wish to prolong this debate, but I do feel that some consideration should be given, as was just said by the distinguished Ambassador of Germany, to the readability of our text. I mean, as it is, this is not going to be a riveting read, but then again very few documents that come out of this or other multilateral institutions are. Nevertheless, I think we could try our best to at least make it as acceptable as possible. In that sense, I think your suggestion to have, for instance, one detailed listing of the references and the proposals that we had, on the basis of which we worked, and then to have, in the further paragraphs that you listed, such as 44, 45, 48, 50 and 52, just a general reference back to that first list, might be a good way forward.

Perhaps I could add my two cents' worth by suggesting that in those paragraphs we refer back to paragraph 38 and say, "in accordance with the schedules as mentioned in paragraph 38", or something along those lines, which would then perhaps cover all the presidencies that have submitted, in one form or another, work schedules that we have based our work on in the course of our session.

The President (*spoke in Spanish*): I will briefly summarize the situation. It would seem clear that there are no major disagreements regarding the content of this paragraph. The basic concern is to respect the principle that if a particular presidency is mentioned, then for consistency the other presidencies reflected in the paragraph should be mentioned. There would be no difficulty with not mentioning any of the presidencies by name. At the same time, the secretariat still has the great challenge of how to resolve this without mentioning any particular presidency and at the same time having clarity, from the standpoint of the practice and working methods of the Conference, that we are fulfilling our mandate. We will, then, give our vote of confidence to the secretariat which, together with the presidency, will try to resolve the issue, which would seem to be one of form more than content. I believe we should not spend any more time discussing this topic.

I suggest that we apply the approach used in paragraph 38 to the other paragraphs on this list – 41, 44, 46, 48, 50 and 52.

Mr. Ponomarev (Belarus) (*spoke in Russian*): It seems to us that we are very close to consensus on this agenda item. However, with regard to the wording of paragraph 38, I would like to draw the secretariat's attention to the fact that after the reference to document CD/1907 and to agenda items 1 and 2, only the phrase "Prevention of nuclear war, including all related matters" appears and not the title of agenda item 1. I think that this is simply a technical omission and, in this case, since these items were mentioned earlier in the text, we can simply keep the agenda item numbers and remove this mention of the title of agenda item 2.

The President (*spoke in Spanish*): Yes, we appreciate the views voiced by the delegation of Belarus. Would any other delegation like to speak on paragraph 38? I recall that we decided to look for an approach that would permit us to avoid referring to any of this year's presidents by name and to keep the references to the documents and to the work

accomplished by the Conference. We heard several proposals, including one by the Ambassador of Germany, which could help us resolve this issue. In any case, we will be consistent and use the same approach to avoid making any references. If in the end it is not possible to resolve the situation in this way, we will return to what is done in each multilateral meeting, namely repeat over and over, but facilitate consensus.

Let us, then, go to paragraph 39, which was provisionally adopted. With regard to paragraph 40, we have again the list of documents, here is the case of Japan, I imagine that what the delegate of Argentina said also applies here, but I reiterate once again that the secretariat will make all necessary corrections to ensure that all official documents submitted under this agenda item appear in the list.

Does any delegation wish to speak on paragraph 40, which in my view can, under these conditions, be adopted?

Mr. Reid (United States of America): A simple idea to test. It is geared to legibility, and to condensing and conserving.

To the extent that the lists in paragraphs 37 and 40 contain the same documents, can we just make a short reference, please? We could either say “the list of specific documents on pages” — whatever the pages are — “also applies here”, or make the same list of documents that appears under 37 (a) and so on also apply here. It saves almost a page and a half of translation work involving at least six United Nations languages.

If there is some other addition that isn’t in 37, please by all means list it, but let’s make it a little bit more readable.

The President (*spoke in Spanish*): In particular, the presidency has no objections if wording can be devised that reads something like “the list of documents appearing in paragraph 37 was also submitted under this agenda item” – something like that. I believe that the secretariat can find a way to avoid having to include another list. Certainly it would seem unnecessary and actually a bit incomprehensible to a reader to reread the same lists with the same documents if a more rational solution could have been found.

Does any delegation object to handling paragraph 40 as mentioned? Anyway, the secretariat would submit the wording proposal and it would remain pending for approval once we have it in writing.

Mr. Khelif (Algeria) (*spoke in French*): The Algerian delegation understands very well what our United States colleague has proposed, and that is why, at the most recent plenary meeting, we proposed simply deleting the reference to the documents mentioned in paragraph 40 – first, because these documents are already mentioned in paragraph 37, and, second, because not all of these documents deal with nuclear disarmament.

However, as some delegations have expressed their desire to submit these documents under the two agenda items, we have accepted the consensus, but we believe that it might be a good idea to delete the reference to these documents in paragraph 40 and simply mention them indirectly, so as to improve the quality of the report.

The President (*spoke in Spanish*): I thank the delegation of Algeria. Let us, then, wait for the next reading of the document with the new wording to be submitted by the secretariat.

Mr. Gill (India): The debate we are having just now is a repetition of the debate we had earlier, and I just wanted to note that we could try to shorten the references to the documents, perhaps by not listing the titles and just mentioning the number and the date. There is a reason why they are being listed here under this item, and that reason is that the delegations which submitted those documents have asked for them to be listed here.

Now, there are a number of reasons why we have these two separate agenda items and why we have this practical device for mentioning these documents twice over. I do not want to prolong the debate we had last time, but there are reasons, and for those of us who have been in this room long enough, those reasons are very clear. I don't wish to go into those reasons in detail, but if you want to shorten the references to those documents, perhaps we can consider doing away with the titles, but a listing with the numbers and the dates could be maintained.

The President (*spoke in Spanish*): Well, the Indian delegation has made a specific proposal: to dispense with the document titles and include the symbol and submission date of each document. I think it is also a valid option for preserving the right of the State that submitted the document to have the submitter mentioned here in the report, also under this agenda item. In any case we will never question the need to safeguard this right. I believe that the Indian proposal would be acceptable. Specifically, it would be to include in this paragraph a list of the documents with their symbols and the dates on which they were submitted to the secretariat, without their titles, which are listed in paragraph 37.

Are there any objections to handling paragraph 40 in this manner? If not, then the proposal is adopted.

We now go to paragraph 41.

Mr. El-Atawy (Egypt): Just as a matter of enquiry, does the amendment that the representative of South Africa has proposed to insert under this agenda item not apply to article 40 as well?

The President (*spoke in Spanish*): Yes, you are right. I think that really it would have to be worded in such a way as to be consistent with paragraph 37. You are right. Thank you for your helpful clarification. Then, with this clarification by the delegation of Egypt, which is correct and accepted by the Conference, we will turn to paragraph 41. I was saying that, as I understood it, paragraph 41 basically included Pakistan's proposal. We already said we would look for a way to resolve it. Are there any other questions or comments with respect to paragraph 41?

Mr. Ponomarev (Belarus) (*spoke in Russian*): Mr. President, I am sorry to take the floor again, but I would like to propose an amendment to paragraph 38 in the part that includes the title of document CD/1907, and to use the same approach in paragraph 41: to omit the titles of agenda items 1 and 2 in connection with the reference to document CD/1907.

The President: I need to ask some advice. Could you repeat your proposal?

Mr. Ponomarev (Belarus) (*spoke in Russian*): Mr. President, for paragraph 38 I highlighted the fact that, after the reference to document CD/1907, only the title of agenda item 2, "Prevention of nuclear war, including all related matters", appears, and not the title of agenda item 1. To simplify the text, I propose to remove the title and keep only the item numbers. In this connection, I think that for paragraph 41 we can use the same logic and, in the reference to document CD/1907, keep only the item numbers.

The President (*spoke in Spanish*): Yes, I think I understand now. Basically to apply to paragraph 41 the same logic that you suggested for paragraph 38, and to avoid having to include the full title of the agenda item. I believe that the secretariat took note of this for paragraph 38, so I think that there should be no objections. If no member indicates otherwise, your suggestion for paragraph 41 is accepted.

Are there any concerns regarding paragraph 41? Well, then, with the understanding that we should find a solution that would accommodate several paragraphs, from 38, 41 and 42 and onwards, which the secretariat will present to us, I will not consider paragraph 41

adopted. We will adopt it once we have the suggested solution, but bearing in mind that it does not present major issues. Paragraph 42 was provisionally agreed on. For paragraph 43, we had the suggestion by South Africa, which would apply to all the paragraphs that contain a list of the documents submitted under a particular agenda item. I do not think there are major problems.

Does any other delegation wish to take the floor to speak about paragraph 43? In that case, paragraph 43 is adopted. Paragraph 44 essentially has the same problem which we have to resolve with references to the distinguished ambassadors who held the presidency at various points in the documents.

Mr. Ahmad (Pakistan): Regarding paragraph 43, have we adopted the language as it appears here, or was it agreed to delete the phrase “dealing with this item”, so that the text would read “the following documents were submitted to the Conference under this agenda item”?

The President: We need to use exactly the same chapeau in all paragraphs referring to the list of documents, and we need to agree on the way that we are going to do it. I think paragraph 37 reads: “The following documents were submitted to the Conference under this agenda item ...”. My proposal is to keep using the same language, because I think that most accurately reflects everyone’s preference.

We need to release the interpreters. After that we can continue for a few minutes to discuss how we are going to continue.

I would like to make a proposal to you. Let’s stop now. I think that we have worked intensively during the morning. Can we agree to continue at 3.30 p.m.? Probably at that time, if our friends from the secretariat have section G, we can even consider that section.

We will meet here at 3.30 p.m.

The meeting rose at 1.05 p.m.