
Conference on Disarmament

21 June 2013

English

Final record of the one thousand two hundred and ninety-first plenary meeting

Held at the Palais des Nations, Geneva, on Friday, 21 June 2013, at 10.10 a.m.

President: Mr. Mohsen Naziri Asl(Islamic Republic of Iran)



The President: I declare open the 1291st plenary meeting of the Conference on Disarmament.

The Islamic Republic of Iran strongly believes that the Conference on Disarmament, as the sole multilateral disarmament negotiating forum, maintains its credibility and relevance to international peace and security despite its current difficulties. As a member of the Non-Aligned Movement, nuclear disarmament has always been our highest priority, and we are committed to efforts towards the attainment of a world free of nuclear weapons. Given the high importance that we attach to the work of the Conference, Iran assumed the presidency of this august body with a view to helping it to overcome the current deadlock that overshadows its credibility as well as its effectiveness.

Since the beginning of our presidency, we have repeatedly stated that breaking the impasse is a collective responsibility. We are also fully aware of the complexity involved in breaking the impasse in the Conference and reaching consensus on a programme of work. But this difficulty has not by any means discouraged us from doing our utmost to overcome the challenges. On the contrary, the valuable support that I have received from many delegations, which I appreciate, has encouraged us to spare no effort in closely consulting members so as to find a creative way to break the deadlock in the Conference.

Thus, my main focus during our presidency has been to seek agreement among the members on a comprehensive and balanced programme of work. We began our tireless efforts by consulting delegations from different corners of this chamber and at various levels on possible concepts, approaches and alternatives. After three weeks of intensive consultations, we have reached the conclusion that, for the time being, the best feasible approach is the pragmatic or, as it was called by some, the clever approach, provided that an eventual programme of work adopted under this approach benefits from all the innovative efforts of past Presidents to try to simplify or streamline the programme of work, to treat all core issues equally with respect to the mandate, modality and language used, and to avoid any kind of divisive mandate. In accordance with these criteria, we prepared a draft decision on the programme of work, which was distributed at the beginning of this week at the meeting with regional group coordinators. This document was formally tabled, in the light of our initial assessment as well as the input received. It was determined that the text represents the common denominator found in all positions put forward during the consultations, although a few members expressed their hesitancy. However, recent further consultations, including those held today, demonstrated that some members still need more time to come along with various elements of this proposal, and some members have yet to receive instructions from their capitals.

As I mentioned earlier, my main guiding principles during our presidency have been those of impartiality, inclusiveness, transparency and adherence to the rules of procedure of the Conference, particularly the rule of consensus. Furthermore, we also attach great importance to the credibility of the Conference and would not like to see another failure that might undermine its credibility and integrity.

It is an unfortunate fact that the situation is not yet ripe for taking action on our proposal. The text will be left as is, and we will not insist that any formal action on the text be taken at this plenary meeting.

Let me make it very clear that, from our national point of view, my delegation would strongly prefer to have a negotiating mandate in the programme of work, which should include a very clear reference to the negotiation of a nuclear weapons convention. Presenting document CD/1952 as the President of the Conference should

in no way prejudice the future position of the Islamic Republic of Iran on the programme of work.

Once again, I thank you for your understanding and support.

Would any delegation like to take the floor at this stage? I recognize the representative of Kazakhstan.

Mr. Nurtileuov (Kazakhstan): Mr. President, as your term of office is drawing to an end, allow me to express my deep appreciation of the transparent, inclusive and flexible way in which you have presided over this body for the past several weeks. Once again, I assure you of our full support and cooperation in implementing your mandate.

Despite my country's serious concerns about the long-lasting deadlock in the Conference on Disarmament, today I will try to avoid any critical clichés. It is obvious to us that the absence of a positive shift and political will might result sooner or later in various scenarios. We are confident that it is our common responsibility to seek out every opportunity in critical situations like this.

With this in mind, we have given careful consideration to document CD/1952 presented by the Iranian presidency. In this respect, let me commend your active efforts as the President of the Conference to seek a compromise solution. Many elements and approaches contained in the draft programme of work have been in circulation within the Conference for the past several months or more. The draft rather deftly draws together and connects many ideas put forward by various delegations. In this sense, the draft programme of work is viewed by our delegation as the result of the collective efforts of your predecessors and other colleagues.

The delegation of Kazakhstan also notes that the proposed draft programme of work incorporates the simplified approach, and we are ready to go along with it. Needless to say, document CD/1952 is not necessarily ideal from our national perspective. We would prefer to have much stronger language, envisaging negotiations on nuclear disarmament, a fissile material cut-off treaty (FMCT), prevention of an arms race in outer space and negative security assurances. As far as an FMCT is concerned, we have not lost hope of finding common ground on the basis of the Shannon mandate. At the same time, we clearly understand that existing differences in priorities do not allow us to identify which items are ripe for negotiation. However, if we could start substantive work on all four core issues while glossing over these differences for a while, this would still be a step forward. We are all well aware that, in the past, the Conference on Disarmament and its predecessors often started work on various issues without having negotiating mandates. That was the case with the negotiations leading to the Chemical Weapons Convention and to the Comprehensive Nuclear-Test-Ban Treaty. I think my fellow colleagues with longer records and more experience in the Conference will correct me if I am wrong.

Also, I wish to share some views on the text of the programme of work itself. The document has been simplified to such a degree that the whole concept of negotiations has become barely visible, except for a hint about possible negotiations in the second paragraph. Some delegations have already highlighted this problem last Tuesday. For the reasons I mentioned earlier, it would not be productive to reinsert the reference to negotiations in any of the mandates on the four core issues, but we would be grateful if a stronger reference to negotiations, or at least to the responsibilities of the Conference on Disarmament as the sole multilateral negotiating forum, could be included somewhere in the first two paragraphs of document CD/1952. This is our modest and, I believe, constructive suggestion, which may help us to overcome the present deadlock and concentrate on issues of substance. But we are not making the acceptance of these proposals a condition for the adoption of the programme of work.

At this critical juncture when we attach high priority to commencing substantive work in the Conference and to finding a solution this year, we believe that improvements in the working methods and rules of procedure of the Conference are important. Among other things, it would help us to avoid lengthy deadlocks in the future, which have already become a trademark of this distinguished body. We share the view that the key to our progress is political will. Nevertheless, we also believe that political will is not something that can appear like a *deus ex machina*. It has to be developed, nurtured and assisted. It also takes a lot of continuous interaction among delegations on issues of substance.

In this context, we welcome the proposals presented on 18 June 2013 by the Secretary-General of the Conference, namely, the proposals to establish an informal working group to produce a new type of programme of work that is robust in substance and progressive in implementation, to set up a subsidiary body on improving working methods and to designate a special coordinator on membership expansion and on the role of civil society. This is something that, in our view, could help to generate a broader discussion on the role and work of the Conference and eventually overcome certain negative preconceptions and introduce a greater collective spirit into our common work.

Before concluding my remarks, I would like to briefly share our preliminary reaction to the arms control and disarmament proposals contained in the speech given by the President of the United States, Mr. Barack Obama, two days ago in Berlin.

We certainly welcome that country's continuous support for a fissile material cut-off treaty, and this is an issue of direct relevance to the Conference. For Kazakhstan, which unrelentingly stresses the significance of the Comprehensive Nuclear-Test-Ban Treaty and champions its early entry into force, it was heartening to see the Obama administration's firm commitment to the ratification of this treaty. Without any doubt, the most far-reaching element of the speech was the conclusion that, for the United States, deterrence could still be guaranteed with far lower numbers of deployed strategic nuclear weapons. We hail all these efforts to reduce reliance on nuclear weapons and to move beyond the cold war nuclear postures, and we call on other States possessing nuclear weapons to join this positive trend to contribute to the achievement of our common goal — a world free from nuclear threat.

The President: I thank the representative of Kazakhstan for his statement. I now give the floor to the representative of Russia.

Mr. Vasiliev (Russian Federation) (*spoke in Russian*): Mr. President, the Russian delegation wishes to extend its gratitude to the Iranian presidency of the Conference on Disarmament for the extensive work it has carried out in preparing a programme of work for our forum. We commend the way in which this work was organized and the intensive consultations that took place both bilaterally and with the participation of regional groups. We view the draft in document CD/1952, submitted by the Iranian delegation, as an attempt to reach a consensus on the programme of work for our forum.

We note that a number of delegations have mentioned on various occasions that we must change the rules of procedure of this forum and that the Conference cannot base its work on consensus. My delegation is part of the majority that believes that the rule of consensus is a fundamental principle of our forum's work, as issues relating to security cannot be resolved by a simple vote. They must be resolved by taking into consideration the interests of all States.

We note as well that you have wisely understood that there is currently no consensus regarding the proposal put forward by the presidency. This is yet another example of the constructive approach pursued by the Iranian delegation and its acute

understanding of the situation that has developed in this forum. We thus welcome the wisdom shown by your delegation in not putting this decision to a vote today.

With regard to future steps, the Russian delegation has on numerous occasions expressed its readiness to negotiate on three of the four core issues on our agenda. At the same time, we understand that there are misgivings on the part of one, two or even ten delegations. Here again, I wish to emphasize that we must work based on the principle of consensus in order to safeguard the security interests of all member States as well as of observer States. The approach set out in your draft regarding the agenda for discussions in our forum is, in our view, currently the only practical and pragmatic approach to resolving the complex problems facing the Conference.

In his statement of 18 June, the Secretary-General of our Conference, Mr. Kassym-Jomart Tokayev, put forward a number of specific proposals on the basis of which we could hold such consultations. The Russian delegation stands ready to consider these proposals carefully and I am able to say that we actively support many of them. Therefore, I would like to seize the opportunity presented by today's meeting to again urge all colleagues to seriously consider the current situation of the Conference and to continue to actively seek a foundation for the programme of work which, I repeat, we feel lies in the area of discussion mandates. However, this in no way means that we should dismiss the prospect of negotiations. We should actively work on preparing an appropriate foundation and platform for such negotiating activity.

In this regard, I heard a number of delegations say that this was not part of the Conference's mandate, but that is not true. Pre-negotiating activity took place concerning the Chemical Weapons Convention at a time when the Conference had no negotiating mandate but rather a mandate to develop proposals. We also know that many States are now actively participating in an open-ended group of the General Assembly to consider nuclear disarmament issues, without this posing any problem. As that group does not have a negotiating mandate, I therefore see no problem in returning this item to the Conference's agenda so that we can hold relevant consultations and dialogue here in the Conference. The same applies for issues regarding the fissile material cut-off treaty. The Group of Governmental Experts, which will begin its work next year, does not have a negotiating mandate, so — here too — we see no problem in returning these discussions to the Conference so that the work conducted in this forum by all member and observer States may inform the work of the Group of Governmental Experts.

In conclusion, allow me, Mr. President, once again to congratulate you on the wise decision you have made.

The President: I thank the representative of Russia for his statement. I now give the floor to the representative of Syria.

Ms. Issa (Syrian Arab Republic) (*spoke in Arabic*): Allow me to begin by thanking the Ambassador of Iran for his diligent efforts as President of the Conference on Disarmament to secure agreement on a programme of work. We wish to express our appreciation also for his transparent and inclusive approach during the consultations conducted in that regard.

Mr. President, we thank you for the draft programme of work that you have submitted in document CD/1952, although we would have preferred to see it include a negotiating mandate on nuclear disarmament as that is the highest priority for us as a member of the Group of 21 and of the Non-Aligned Movement. Nevertheless, we feel that the draft programme is well-balanced insofar as it addresses the four core issues of the agenda in an equitable way and does not accord precedence to any of them at the expense of the others. In the light of the prolonged deadlock in which the

Conference finds itself, we view this draft as an opportunity for us to begin substantive work in a balanced and comprehensive manner. It should help to break the deadlock by way of detailed and in-depth discussions that could bring us closer to negotiating new instruments in the nuclear disarmament sphere.

The President: I thank the representative of Syria for her statement. I now give the floor to the representative of Pakistan.

Mr. Akram (Pakistan): Mr. President, let me first of all express our deep appreciation of and admiration for the work you have done and the way in which you have conducted your presidency. I congratulate you and your colleagues for the most pragmatic, transparent and constructive approach that you have adopted during your tenure as President. I would also like to express my country's support for the proposal that you have made in document CD/1952. We believe that this is a realistic and pragmatic approach and that this is a realistic and pragmatic document which would have enabled us to start substantive work, even if it did not amount to negotiations on any of the four core issues. Nevertheless, we feel that, even though the ideal situation would be to negotiate in the Conference on Disarmament, the absence of consensus on negotiating on any of the items on our agenda should not mean that the Conference should be in a state of deep freeze. We need to conduct substantive work in a structured manner, and in the long run this can contribute to eventual negotiations on different issues. This point has been made by some of the delegations today, as well as in the past, and the primary example of this process, or this evolution, is the negotiations that eventually took place on chemical weapons in this forum.

If I may, I will share with you my own experience at that time. For several years we simply engaged in discussions on different aspects of the chemical weapons convention, and, eventually, when all of us were ready to negotiate such a convention, those discussions that we had had were very useful in establishing the basis for these negotiations. So, any discussions that can take place on any of our four core issues, or preferably on all four of our core issues, would be very useful in the long term, and we should take a long-term view of the work of the Conference.

I recognize that there are different approaches and different preferences regarding the four core issues on our agenda. This is natural, because every member State has different priorities. We as a delegation have always argued that all four core issues need to be treated equally, because that way the concerns and priorities of all member States can be taken on board.

It has been an unfortunate fact that certain delegations have tried to argue and impose their view that only one issue is ripe for negotiations. This approach is unacceptable, and I think that it is this approach which has led to the absence of acceptability, the absence of consensus on the document that you have presented, which, as I have said, is the most balanced and pragmatic document we have seen in this forum for years.

Essentially, this forum must take the security interests of all States into consideration, and obviously there are certain delegations that feel that adopting your proposed approach to a programme of work is not consistent with their security interests. We respect that just as much as we ask them to respect our security interests when it comes to deciding on negotiating other items on our agenda.

Let me conclude by again saying, Mr. President, that we greatly value the work you have done. We greatly value and appreciate your presidency. Today is the last day of your presidency, and we would like to express our deep appreciation to you.

The President: I thank the representative of Pakistan for his statement. I now give the floor to the representative of China.

Mr. Wu Haitao (China) (*spoke in Chinese*): China has consistently supported and worked towards the early adoption of a comprehensive and balanced programme of work by the Conference on Disarmament and the start of substantive work in the Conference. China stands ready to work together with all parties to reach this common goal. The adoption of a programme of work is an urgent priority for the Conference, and over the course of this year several Presidents have made able attempts to achieve this.

China supports the view that, as the sole multilateral disarmament negotiating forum, the Conference should begin negotiations as soon as possible. At the same time, given the current state of affairs, we are also in favour of the Conference taking realistic and pragmatic steps to begin its substantive work in preparation for future negotiations.

China would like to thank Iran for the draft programme of work it has put forward during its presidency and for the many plenary meetings and formal and informal consultations it has held on the subject. This is conducive to bridging differences and finding a solution that is acceptable to all parties.

Mr. President, we take note that, as you have just indicated, member States still have differing views on some aspects of the programme of work, and we still have more work to do to reach consensus. We are in favour of continuing broad consultations under the next presidency, giving consideration to each other's concerns and actively seeking to break the stalemate. We hope that the member States can show great political will, flexibility and a spirit of compromise, so as to promote the early adoption of a programme of work and the start of substantive work in the Conference.

The President: I thank the representative of China for his statement. I now give the floor to the representative of New Zealand.

Mr. Ballard (New Zealand): Mr. President, at the outset, and given that this is the first time my delegation has spoken during your presidency, allow me to express my country's appreciation for your efforts — like those of the Presidents who have preceded you this year — to get the Conference on Disarmament back to work.

New Zealand regrets that once again it has not been possible for the Conference to reach an agreement on a programme of work. Seeking such an agreement is, of course, the role that has fallen to successive Conference Presidents since the late 1990s. My country's priority since it joined the Conference in 1996 has been to see negotiations get under way on legally binding multilateral instruments that will take nuclear disarmament forward. We have held consistently to this view, and we examine each proposal put before the Conference in that light. Our support for the negotiation of a treaty on fissile material is founded on the view that it could contribute meaningfully to the cause of nuclear disarmament. For that reason, it remains a priority for many members of the Conference. This sense of priority was of course reflected in the outcome of the 2010 Non-Proliferation Treaty Review Conference, as others have mentioned this morning, and it has been reflected in all draft programmes of work over the last several years, and indeed in document CD/1864, which was adopted in 2009.

Mr. President, the draft programme of work that you have tabled took a different approach. As we have stated in this body in the past, New Zealand does not object to such an approach in principle, but we are concerned as always to see the Conference return to substantive work as soon as possible. What we are not keen to see is this body, bound as it is by the role of consensus, working its way downwards towards the lowest common denominator. Such an approach, we feel, will not take us forward.

New Zealand took careful note of the statement made in this body on Tuesday by the Secretary-General of the Conference, Mr. Tokayev. Like many others here, we consider his proposals to have considerable merit, particularly in relation to the way this Conference goes about formulating its programme of work, and we would support their forming the subject of discussions under the next presidency.

The President: I thank the representative of New Zealand for his statement. I now give the floor to the representative of Iraq.

Mr. Ismail (Iraq) (*spoke in Arabic*): Mr. President, as this is the first time that I am taking the floor during your presidency of the Conference on Disarmament, I would like to take this opportunity to commend your professional and expert leadership of the proceedings, as well as the endeavours that you have made to break the deadlock which has beset the Conference for the past 16 years. I also wish to draw attention, through you, to the need for all member States to show flexibility, political will and a desire to find consensual solutions in order to move forward and enable the Conference to once again play the meaningful role incumbent upon it. Iraq attaches special importance to the Conference on Disarmament as the sole multilateral negotiating forum on disarmament and notes its record of previous successes. We therefore need to intensify our efforts to reach agreement on a balanced programme of work that will respond to the concerns of all member States in a manner consistent with the Conference's rules of procedure. We also need to make progress on the core issues while according priority to nuclear disarmament.

I wish to reaffirm that Iraq will support any proposal or initiative that is acceptable to all member States and aimed at breaking the deadlock in the Conference so that it can play the role for which it was mandated in the interests of international peace and security.

Finally, I would like to express our appreciation for the transparent and diligent manner in which you have endeavoured to revitalize the Conference so that it may play a positive role in addressing issues relating to disarmament and non-proliferation.

The President: I thank the representative of Iraq for his statement. I now give the floor to the representative of Sri Lanka.

Mr. Aryasinha (Sri Lanka): Mr. President, as this is the first time I am taking the floor to speak during your presidency, I wish at the outset to express my delegation's sincere appreciation for the manner in which you have steered the discussions in the Conference on Disarmament and the inclusive and transparent approach you have adopted during your tenure. There is no doubt that all delegations understand that coming up with a programme of work that satisfies the aspirations of each and every member is indeed a daunting task for any president of this Conference. It is for this reason that the Conference has remained in deadlock for such a long period of time without the commencement of any substantive work. It is in this context that my delegation wishes to express its appreciation for your efforts to produce a draft programme of work for the 2013 session of the Conference, to be issued under the symbol CD/1952.

During our previous deliberations, my delegation has noted that focused debates on all agenda items could help create a better understanding of members' positions. It is also noteworthy that your proposal attaches equal importance to all core issues of the Conference, and we hope that this will be considered in the future as well. I want to reiterate that Sri Lanka attaches utmost importance to the Conference as the sole multilateral disarmament negotiating forum. In order to continue to preserve the unique role of this body, it is vital that the Conference begin its substantive work on the basis of a balanced programme of work. It is in this spirit that my delegation commends you and, through you, your delegation for your efforts.

The President: I thank the representative of Sri Lanka for his statement. I now give the floor to the representative of Germany.

Mr. Hoffmann (Germany): I would like to thank you, Mr. President, for the work and the effort you have put into trying to get the Conference on Disarmament back to work by seeking consensus on a programme of work. We have always taken the view that every President has an obligation to make an effort in that regard.

Now, we have had extensive debates in the last couple of days about the draft programme of work that you submitted in informal and formal meetings, and I would like to express my appreciation to you for taking the approach you have, namely that of basing yourself on what appears to command consensus, for drawing conclusions from the debates we have had that I have just referred to today and for acting accordingly, because I believe that this is in the best interests of the Conference.

The President: I thank the representative of Germany for his statement. Would any other delegation like to take the floor? I recognize the representative of Switzerland.

Mr. Schmid (Switzerland): Mr. President, let me also thank you for your efforts towards the adoption of a programme of work by the Conference on Disarmament, and let me also say that Switzerland takes note with regret that the Conference remains unable to adopt a programme of work.

Switzerland has long indicated that it stands ready to take part in negotiations on all four core issues on the Conference agenda. We believe that, to be of value, a programme of work should take us forward in terms of substance. It should be ambitious enough so that we either undertake negotiations or at least move in that direction.

The events of the past few days have once again highlighted the fact that the methods of work of the Conference do not facilitate reaching consensus; rather, they make it more difficult. I am not referring necessarily to a change in the rules of procedure, nor am I questioning the rule of consensus. But let me highlight again how the difficult task of developing a programme of work is handed to one individual, the President, instead of taking the form of a collective exercise. Delegations are not provided with the opportunity to develop ownership of a draft programme of work.

These events highlight once again the urgent need for us to look at our methods of work. In this context, my delegation, like others, would like to reiterate the proposal recently been made on this matter, and I would especially like to commend Mr. Tokayev, Secretary-General of the Conference, for his statement earlier this week and for the thoughtful proposals he has made. His proposal that we should establish an informal group tasked with drawing up the programme of work in a subsidiary body that looks at our methods of work warrants further consideration, and we urge other delegations to study it carefully. After 17 years of fruitless attempts at adopting and implementing a programme of work, we hope that the Conference will now rapidly act on the basis of such proposals.

The President: I thank the representative of Switzerland for his statement. I now recognize the representative of Algeria.

Mr. Khelif (Algeria) (*spoke in Arabic*): The Algerian delegation has requested the floor, Mr. President, to express its appreciation for the diligent endeavours that you have made while presiding over the work of the Conference on Disarmament. We also wish to thank you for presenting document CD/1952 in which you proposed a new, pragmatic, balanced and realistic approach to the programme of work. As indicated by the Algerian delegation in its consultation with you, Algeria is prepared to join any consensus of opinion on a programme of work that would enable us to begin

negotiations on matters included on the agenda or, at least, to begin preparations for such negotiations. We find it regrettable, Mr. President, as you yourself have observed, that the Conference is not yet ready to agree on a programme of work. You are well aware of the real reasons that are currently preventing a consensus on the proposal that you submitted.

Accordingly, we urge the incoming President of the Conference, by virtue of the responsibility vested in him, to endeavour to reach agreement on a programme of work by basing his consultations on the guidelines provided in that document and by adopting a more pragmatic approach focused on the differences of opinion that have prevented a consensus on that programme. We are all aware that the reasons for those differences lie in only one or two components of the programme of work and we therefore urge the incoming presidency to concentrate on the controversial issues that prevented the adoption of that document with a view to resolving them in a consensual manner that will enable us to adopt a programme of work.

The President: I thank the representative of Algeria for his statement. I now recognize the representative of Cuba.

Mr. Romero Puentes (Cuba) (*spoke in Spanish*): Cuba appreciates the work you have done, Mr. President, and the transparency you have demonstrated during your presidency. We also appreciate the efficiency with which you have led the work of the Conference on Disarmament over the past four weeks. My delegation finds it regrettable that some delegations have shown little flexibility and have thus prevented the Conference from reaching consensus at this juncture and that, as a result, no programme of work has been adopted. We hope that in the future your proposal will be duly considered when seeking a consensus that will allow the Conference to move forward.

The President: I thank the representative of Cuba for his statement. Would any other delegation like to take the floor at this stage? That does not seem to be the case.

Before concluding, I would like to express my thanks and appreciation for the kind words addressed to me personally and to my delegation. My thanks go to my P-6 colleagues, who have worked together very well throughout the session and have been most supportive. I am most grateful to the Secretary-General of the Conference, Mr. Kassym-Jomart Tokayev, for his sustained engagement with the Conference and his valuable contribution. In this connection, I wish to thank all the members of the secretariat for their professionalism as well as their assistance. I include the interpreters, who help me to communicate with you. I would like to express my gratitude to those who produce reports on plenary meetings of the Conference on a regular basis, including the representatives of civil society. Last but not least, I wish to thank the members of my own team, Mr. Reza Najafi and Mr. Mohammad Hassan Daryaei, for their unfailing support and untiring efforts to promote the cause of the Conference during my presidency.

This concludes our business for today. The next plenary meeting of the Conference will be held next Tuesday, 25 June 2013, at 10.30 a.m. On that occasion we will hear an address by the Minister for Foreign Affairs of Iraq, His Excellency Mr. Hoshyar Zebari, and a statement by the High Representative for Disarmament Affairs, Ms. Angela Kane.

The meeting rose at 11.55 a.m.