

# Preparatory Committee for the 2015 Review Conference of the Parties to the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons

Distr.: General  
15 May 2014

Original: English

---

## Third session

New York, 28 April-9 May 2014

### Summary record of the 17th meeting\*

Held at Headquarters, New York, on Friday, 9 May 2014, at 10 a.m.

*Chair:* Mr. Román-Morey . . . . . (Peru)

## Contents

Adoption of the final report and recommendations of the Preparatory Committee to  
the 2015 Review Conference of the Parties to the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of  
Nuclear Weapons on its third session

Closure of the session

---

\* No summary records were issued for the 7th to 16th meetings.

---

This record is subject to correction.

Corrections should be submitted in one of the working languages. They should be set forth in a memorandum and also incorporated in a copy of the record. They should be sent as soon as possible to the Chief of the Documents Control Unit ([srcorrections@un.org](mailto:srcorrections@un.org))

Corrected records will be reissued electronically on the Official Document System of the United Nations (<http://documents.un.org>).



*The meeting was called to order at 10.20 a.m.*

**Adoption of the final report and recommendations of the Preparatory Committee to the 2015 Review Conference of the Parties to the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons**  
([NPT/CONF.2015/PC.III/CRP.6](#) and [NPT/CONF.2015/PC.III/WP.46](#))

1. **The Chair** drew attention to the draft final report of the Committee, in document [NPT/CONF.2015/PC.III/CRP.6](#), which would be issued as document [NPT/CONF.2015/1](#). Information concerning the number of meetings held and the summary records would be filled in by the Secretariat after the conclusion of the session; the list of documents would also be updated. He suggested that the Committee should adopt the draft report paragraph by paragraph.

*Paragraphs 1 to 25*

2. *Paragraphs 1 to 25 were adopted.*

*New paragraph 26*

3. **The Chair**, recalling the suggestion made by the representative of the Islamic Republic of Iran at the 13th meeting, introduced a new paragraph 26, which would read: "The Committee agreed at its third session that, upon communication of the nomination of the President of the 2015 Review Conference by the Chair of the Group of Non-Aligned and Other States, the Chair of the third session of the Preparatory Committee will seek endorsement by States parties of that nomination." The remaining paragraphs would be renumbered accordingly.

4. *New paragraph 26 was adopted.*

*Paragraphs 26 to 36*

5. *Paragraphs 26 to 36 were adopted.*

6. **The Chair**, replying to a question from **Ms. Del Sol Dominguez** (Cuba), said that the working paper submitted by the delegation of Cuba would be included in the list of documents in the final report.

7. *The draft final report of the Preparatory Committee, as amended, was adopted.*

**Closure of the session**

8. **Mr. Countryman** (United States of America) said the United States had benefitted from the many discussions held during the current session, in particular those involving member States of the Non-Aligned Movement, and civil society. His delegation looked forward to continuing and intensifying that dialogue, emphasizing the importance of a comprehensive and balanced review of the implementation of the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons. His Government's signing on 6 May of the Protocol to the Treaty on a Nuclear-Weapon-Free Zone in Central Asia had been another step towards the achievement of the international community's common objective of a nuclear-weapon-free world. The United States would continue to assist the States of the Middle East to reach consensus on the convening of a conference to establish a zone free of nuclear weapons and all other weapons of mass destruction in that region. His Government remained firmly committed to achieving the peace and security of a world without nuclear weapons, and was working to achieve that objective step-by-step, through national, bilateral and multilateral actions.

9. **Mr. Sano** (Japan), speaking on behalf of the Non-Proliferation and Disarmament Initiative (NPDI), said that despite the Committee's failure to reach consensus on its recommendations, NPDI welcomed the agreement on procedural matters and looked forward to the 2015 Review Conference.

10. **Mr. Bylica** (Observer for the European Union) said that the procedural decisions that had been taken were necessary to ensure the success of the 2015 Review Conference.

11. **Mr. Laggner** (Switzerland) said that although time constraints and the complexity of the issues raised had prevented the Committee from reaching consensus on its recommendations, the text submitted by the Chair, in document [NPT/CONF.2015/PC.III/WP.46](#) would serve as a valuable reference point. Switzerland welcomed the contribution of civil society to the Committee's deliberations.

12. **Mr. Motta Pinto Coelho** (Brazil) expressed strong regret that despite the willingness to proceed of many delegations, including his own, the Committee had failed to fulfil its mandate and reach consensus on the recommendations for the 2015 Review Conference.

Nevertheless, Brazil anticipated a positive outcome for the Conference that would promote the balanced implementation of all three pillars of the Non-Proliferation Treaty.

13. **Mr. Cassidy** (Indonesia), speaking on behalf of the Group of Non-Aligned States parties to the Treaty, urged States parties to exercise greater political will and flexibility, and to show greater cooperation with a view to ensuring the success of the 2015 Review Conference.

14. **Mr. Adejola** (Nigeria), speaking on behalf of the African Group of States parties, said that the Group aligned itself with the statement made on behalf of the Group of Non-Aligned States parties. Although it was regrettable that the Committee had been unable to reach consensus on its recommendations to the 2015 Review Conference, it was important to remain realistic and positive. The cooperation and flexibility of all parties to the Treaty were necessary to realize its objectives.

15. **Mr. Wu Haitao** (China) said that China would continue its cooperation with other countries with a view to ensuring the success of the 2015 Review Conference and the comprehensive and effective implementation of the Treaty.

16. **Ms. Del Sol Dominguez** (Cuba) said that Cuba regretted the failure of the Committee to fulfil its mandate. Her delegation believed, as a matter of principle, that the highest priority should be placed on nuclear disarmament. The current session had revealed a sizeable gap between the rhetoric of nuclear-weapon States and the commitments those States were actually prepared to undertake. The “step-by-step” approach advocated by some States could no longer be accepted as a pretext to maintain the status quo. Well-defined actions to completely eliminate nuclear weapons should be taken to ensure the success of the 2015 Review Conference; in that regard, the 2010 action plan should be used as a starting point.

17. Her Government insisted on the adoption of a convention on nuclear disarmament that would establish legally binding measures to eliminate and completely ban all nuclear weapons within a set period. In anticipation of the complete elimination of nuclear weapons, a universal, unconditional and binding instrument should be established providing negative security assurances for non-nuclear-weapon States.

18. The commitments made during previous review conferences had not been fulfilled due to a lack of political will on the part of some States. Cuba anticipated a different outcome for the 2015 Review Conference. The international community should not rest until a world free of nuclear weapons had been achieved.

19. **Ms. Martinic** (Argentina) said that circumstances not strictly related to the Treaty had influenced the debate. The Committee had nevertheless shown maturity in taking into account processes as well as documents and, although its mandate was to issue recommendations, it should have the flexibility to adapt that mandate according to circumstances and direct the processes now under way towards a positive outcome.

20. **Mr. Al-Hakim** (Iraq), speaking on behalf of the Group of States parties that were members of the League of Arab States, said that the Group fully supported the statement made on behalf of the Group of Non-Aligned States parties and reaffirmed the principles set forth in the statement it had made two days earlier.

21. **Ms. O’Brien** (Ireland) said that Ireland accepted that there had been insufficient time to reach a consensus on the recommendations. It had taken note of the comments and concerns of other States and of regional groups and welcomed the active participation of civil society.

22. **Mr. Louis** (Colombia) said that his delegation regretted that the Committee had not been able to reach consensus on the recommendations set forth in the Chair’s working paper. It called on all States parties to show flexibility and the necessary political will throughout the review process in 2015.

23. **Mr. El Oummi** (Morocco) said that vast differences of opinion and lack of time had prevented the Committee from reaching a consensus. All States parties must be realistic and flexible, fulfil their commitments, show the necessary political will and work together. His delegation hoped to see progress in the implementation of the plan of action agreed to at the 2010 Review Conference since that would increase the chances of success at the 2015 Conference.

24. **Mr. Guzmán** (Chile) said that Chile regretted the fact that no consensus had been reached on the Chair’s working paper.

25. **Ms. Urruela Arenales** (Guatemala) said that her delegation also regretted the fact that no consensus had been reached on the working paper. That paper had, however, brought the States parties closer and would serve as a point of reference and make a positive contribution to the 2015 Review Conference.

26. **Mr. Badr** (Egypt) said that it was his understanding that the working paper (NPT/CONF.2015/PC.III/WP.46) had been submitted under the Chair's own authority and without prejudice to the position of any delegation or to the final outcome of the 2015 Review Conference. He asked for his comment to be reflected in the final report.

27. **The Chair** said that he would also like that point to be reflected in the report.

28. **Mr. Lomonaco** (Mexico) said that it was regrettable that it had not been possible to consider the draft recommendations submitted in the Chair's working paper on the previous day. Since that document had been issued under the Chair's sole authority, it could not have a different status from that of the other working papers submitted during the session, and he therefore agreed with the representative of Egypt that that point should be reflected in the report.

29. His delegation wished to make a number of comments on the Chair's working paper. The modest progress made by the nuclear-weapon States in reducing their nuclear arsenals was by no means comparable with the high level of compliance among non-nuclear-weapon States with non-proliferation commitments and the peaceful use of nuclear energy. That double standard was a source of widespread dissatisfaction, and should be the central topic of the 2015 Review Conference. The proposal to establish a subsidiary body to address the implementation of article VI of the Treaty should have been reflected in the recommendations; the New Agenda Coalition's working paper on the subject had been referred to by numerous delegations and had the backing of civil society. The action plan agreed to at the 2010 Review Conference could not be simply rolled over; the 2015 Review Conference had to adopt an ambitious new route that took into account the developments of the current cycle. The references to the catastrophic humanitarian consequences of the detonation of nuclear weapons did not reflect the serious concern and consternation voiced at the 2010 Conference and by

practically all delegations at the current session, and also at the two conferences held so far on the humanitarian impact of nuclear weapons.

30. **The Chair** said that he was pleased that his paper had been thought-provoking. The paragraph on the humanitarian consequences of the use of nuclear weapons had been taken from the preamble to the Treaty.

31. **Mr. Ulyanov** (Russian Federation) said that his delegation hoped there would be more accomplishments to report at the opening of the 2015 Review Conference. The signing by five States of the Protocol to the Treaty on a Nuclear-Weapon-Free Zone in Central Asia on 6 May 2014 marked an important step forward, and it was to be hoped that a similar treaty would be signed for North-East Asia before the 2015 Conference. The Russian Federation was also firmly in favour of a conference on the establishment of a nuclear-weapon-free zone in the Middle East being convened in December 2014.

32. **Mr. Ahn Young** (Republic of Korea) said that, although no consensus had been reached on the recommendations to be included in the report, that did not mean that the Committee had not produced any meaningful results. His delegation looked forward to achieving further progress at the 2015 Review Conference.

33. **Mr. Al Saad** (Saudi Arabia) urged the international community to take all necessary steps, in the time that remained, to make the 2015 Review Conference a success.

34. **The Chair**, in closing the session, said that although consensus had not been reached on the recommendations, the positive atmosphere and respectful tone of the discussions had made the current session stand out from previous sessions. The necessary political will must be demonstrated to make progress in strengthening the Treaty and ensure the success of the 2015 Review Conference.

*The meeting rose at 11.30 a.m.*