

Preparatory Committee for the Second Review
Conference of the Parties to the Treaty on
the Prohibition of the Emplacement of
Nuclear Weapons and Other Weapons of Mass
Destruction on the Sea-Bed and the Ocean
Floor and in the Subsoil thereof

Distr.
RESTRICTED
SBT/CONF.II/PC/SR.4
5 May 1983
ENGLISH
Original: FRENCH

PREPARATORY COMMITTEE FOR THE SECOND REVIEW CONFERENCE
OF THE PARTIES TO THE TREATY ON THE PROHIBITION OF THE
EMPLACEMENT OF NUCLEAR WEAPONS AND OTHER WEAPONS OF MASS
DESTRUCTION ON THE SEA-BED AND THE OCEAN FLOOR AND IN
THE SUBSOIL THEREOF

SUMMARY RECORD OF THE 4th MEETING (CLOSED)

held at the Palais des Nations, Geneva,
on Tuesday, 3 May 1983, at 4 p.m.

Acting Chairman: Mr. LÖVALD (Norway)

CONTENTS

Organization of the Review Conference

Follow-up to the conclusions of the First Review Conference concerning
articles V and VII of the Treaty

Financial implications

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 within one week of the date of this document to the Official Records Editing Section, room E.6108, Palais des Nations, Geneva.

Any corrections to the record of this meeting and of other meetings will be issued in a corrigendum.

GE.83-61140

The meeting was called to order at 4.40 p.m.

ORGANIZATION OF THE REVIEW CONFERENCE (item 2 of the programme of work)

- (c) Composition of the bureau
- (d) Rules of procedure
- (e) Background documentation

1. The ACTING CHAIRMAN said that, at the end of the third meeting of the Committee, three questions had remained outstanding. With regard to the first, namely the composition of the bureau of the Review Conference, the Bureau of the Preparatory Committee, in view of the fact that only one post of Vice-President had been allocated to Latin America at the first Review Conference, had decided to recommend to the Committee that Latin America be given a second post of vice-president and the total number of vice-presidents increased to 17. If he heard no objection, he would take it that the Preparatory Committee wished to allocate an additional post of vice-president to Latin America and thus increase the total number of vice-presidents to 17.

2. It was so decided.

3. With regard to the second outstanding question, namely that of participation in the Drafting Committee (rule 35 of the rules of procedure prepared for the first Review Conference (SBT/CONF/2)), the Bureau had decided to recommend that the Preparatory Committee base itself on the most recent precedent, namely that of the Second Review Conference on the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons. The new wording for submission to the Preparatory Committee had been distributed.

4. Mr. MELESCANU (Romania) proposed that the word "particular", in the last line of the second paragraph of the draft text, be deleted.

5. The ACTING CHAIRMAN said that, if he heard no objection, he would take it that the Preparatory Committee wished to adopt the proposed wording for rule 35 of the rules of procedure of the Review Conference, as amended by the representative of Romania.

6. It was so decided.

7. With regard to the third outstanding question, namely the date by which the background documentation for the Review Conference would be distributed; the Bureau recommended that the Preparatory Committee should decide that the documentation would be sent to the States Parties two weeks before the opening of the Conference.

8. Mr. MELESCANU (Romania) said that he would like to know whether the Secretariat intended to invite organizations such as the United Nations Environment Programme and the International Atomic Energy Agency, which dealt with questions allied to the topic of the Second Review Conference, to contribute to the preparations for the Conference.

9. The ACTING CHAIRMAN recalled that, at its third meeting, the Preparatory Committee had already taken some decisions concerning the background documentation for the Second Review Conference. It had decided to request the Secretariat to prepare two documents. The first was an information paper relating to the Treaty which would constitute an updating of the document (SBT/CONF/4) that had been prepared for the first Review Conference; the second was a document concerning any official communications with regard to the implementation of the objectives and provisions of the Treaty which the Secretary-General might have received and any technological developments (military or peaceful) relevant to the Treaty which the Parties might wish to provide or which were otherwise officially available to the Secretary-General; that second document would be drawn up in accordance with the same procedure as the document (SBT/CONF/6) prepared for the first Review Conference.

10. Mr. RAMAROZAKA (Madagascar) said that he hoped the permanent missions of the interested countries at Geneva would receive the documents at the same time as the Governments.

11. The ACTING CHAIRMAN said that that would be arranged.

12. Mr. CANKOREL (Turkey) said that the proposed two-week period was too short.

13. The ACTING CHAIRMAN said that the Secretariat would do all it could to ensure that the documentation was available as soon as possible, but everything would depend also on the speed with which it received the information requested from the Governments.

14. If he heard no objection, he would take it that the Preparatory Committee wished the background documentation to be circulated to Governments two weeks before the opening date of the Second Review Conference.

15. It was so decided.

FOLLOW-UP TO THE CONCLUSIONS OF THE FIRST REVIEW CONFERENCE (item 3 of the programme of work) (SBT/CONF.25/II)

16. Mr. NORBERG (Sweden) drew the Committee's attention to the paragraphs of the Final Document of the first Review Conference relating to articles V and VII of the Treaty, in which the Review Conference requested the Conference of the Committee on Disarmament, taking into account any relevant technological developments, to give consideration to further measures in the field of disarmament for the prevention of an arms race on the sea-bed and the ocean floor and the subsoil thereof. The Committee on Disarmament had recently discussed that question but had not taken any decision on the subject owing to lack of time. He believed it was essential, for the thorough preparation of the Review Conference, that the Committee on Disarmament should proceed with a consideration of the technological developments that had taken place. He proposed that consultations among the delegations should continue so that, at its fifth meeting, the Preparatory Committee would have before it a draft text reiterating the request made at the first Review Conference.

17. Mr. MIDDLETON (United Kingdom) said that, if any members of the Preparatory Committee had any objection in principle to a request being made by the Preparatory Committee to the Committee on Disarmament that the latter Committee should, as and

when it found it convenient to do so, review any major technological progress which might affect the operation of the Treaty, they should make it known immediately, since that would facilitate the preparation of a draft text.

18. Mr. NOIRFALISSE (Belgium) recalled that, at its third meeting, the Committee had decided to ask the Secretariat to prepare a document concerning the matter raised by the representative of Sweden. Moreover, the programme for the 1983 summer session of the Committee on Disarmament was already a very heavy one. It would thus be difficult to ask it to set up an ad hoc group of experts as provided for in article VII of the Treaty.

19. Mr. THIELICKE (German Democratic Republic) said that, although he was well aware that the work of the Committee on Disarmament was hampered by lack of time, he felt that the Preparatory Committee should give appropriate attention to the contents of articles V and VII of the Treaty and to paragraph 79 of the Final Document of the tenth special session of the United Nations General Assembly; those texts requested the Committee on Disarmament to consider, taking into account any relevant technological developments, further measures in the field of disarmament for the prevention of an arms race on the sea-bed and the ocean floor and the subsoil thereof.

20. Mr. LANG (Austria) said that he, too, felt that the request should be reiterated, if only because it was not certain that the request addressed to the Conference of the Committee on Disarmament was still valid with respect to the Committee on Disarmament.

21. Mr. NÚÑEZ-MOSQUERA (Cuba) said that not all the members of the Preparatory Committee had participated in the first Review Conference and asked if a document reproducing the relevant paragraphs of the Final Document of that Conference could be distributed.

22. The ACTING CHAIRMAN read out the paragraphs of the Final Document of the Conference which related to articles V and VII of the Treaty.

23. Mr. MELESCANU (Romania) said that he agreed with the representative of Sweden that the Preparatory Committee should address to the Committee on Disarmament a request couched in the same terms as that which the first Review Conference had addressed to the Conference of the Committee on Disarmament. In his opinion, the suggestion made by the United Kingdom representative that the Committee on Disarmament be left entirely free to decide on the timing and modalities would meet the concern expressed by the representative of Belgium.

24. The ACTING CHAIRMAN said that, if he heard no objection, he would take it that the Preparatory Committee wished to suspend its consideration of item 3 of its programme of work, and to resume it at its next meeting when consultations had been held which should make it possible to arrive at a draft decision.

25. It was so decided.

FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS

26. The ACTING CHAIRMAN drew the attention of the members of the Committee to document SBT/CONF.II/PC/1, concerning the estimated cost of the Second Review Conference, which had been distributed by the Secretariat.

27. Mr. STEELE (Australia) said he noted from the document that the preparation of summary records represented one of the largest items of expenditure of the Conference and asked whether it would not be cheaper to replace them by verbatim records.

28. The ACTING CHAIRMAN replied by referring the representative of Australia to rule 41 of the rules of procedure of the Conference (SBT/CONF/2) which specified that summary records were to be prepared. Moreover, a decision on that subject had already been taken.

29. Mr. LANG (Austria) asked whether it would be possible to find out the difference between the estimated cost and the actual cost of the 1977 Conference, as well as the percentage increase over the real cost of the 1977 Conference represented by the estimated cost of the 1983 Conference.

30. Mr. ANDREWS (Budget Officer) said that he would supply the information requested by the Austrian representative at a later meeting.

31. Mr. MIDDLETON (United Kingdom) said it was his understanding that the cost of a session depended on the number and the length of the meetings held during that session. If that were so, since the meetings of the Preparatory Committee had been remarkably short, he wondered whether the corresponding expenditure had been reduced in consequence.

32. Mr. ANDREWS (Budget Officer) said that the estimated cost of the Committee's meetings had indeed been worked out on the basis of the estimated number and estimated length of the meetings and that, consequently, if the meetings were actually shorter and less numerous, the cost would be less than estimated.

33. Mr. SARAN (India) said he was interested in the alternative solution suggested by the representative of Australia with regard to summary records. Even if there was a rule in the draft rules of procedure which specified that summary records should be prepared and that rule had been approved, it could no doubt be amended if necessary. The Secretariat might, perhaps, examine the question whether verbatim records might not be cheaper than summary records.

34. Mr. ANDREWS (Budget Officer) said that there were no teams of verbatim reporters at the Geneva office. However, if the Preparatory Committee so desired, he would try to give it more detailed information on the subject.

35. Mr. MARTIN DA CRUZ (Portugal) said that he had before him the documents relating to the 1977 Review Conference and was thus in a position to reply to the question asked by the representative of Austria. In 1977, the session of the Preparatory Committee had cost \$54,400. The cost of the session for 1983 had been estimated at \$116,200. In 1977, the total cost of the Conference and the Preparatory Committee had amounted to \$180,200; in 1983, according to the calculations in document STB/CONF.II/PC/1, the cost would be \$465,800. The increase seemed enormous, even taking into account inflation at Geneva.

36. Moreover, his delegation noted that table 1 of document SBT/CONF.II/PC/1 contained an item entitled: "Pre-session documentation (10 pages)". Since delegations had received copies only of the documents distributed for the 1977 Conference, he wondered what were the documents to which that table referred. His delegation noted also that, in 1977, the quotas payable by the participating States in the Conference were based on the scale of the United Nations, slightly increased. He therefore wished to know how the quotas of the participants would be calculated on the current occasion.

37. The ACTING CHAIRMAN replied to the representative of Portugal by drawing his attention to rule 12 of the provisional rules of procedure (SBT/CONF.2). He reminded him, in addition, that the Committee had already considered the question and taken a decision on the subject.

38. Mr. NOIRFALISSE (Belgium) said that if the reduction in the number of meetings was going to make it possible to save money, the Committee might perhaps endeavour to complete its work before Friday by making the best possible use of the time allotted to it.

39. The ACTING CHAIRMAN said that the representative of Belgium had made a constructive proposal which would undoubtedly be endorsed by all the members of the Committee. He was certain that the Secretariat, for its part, would help the Committee to achieve that goal, if it were possible.

40. Mr. SY (Senegal) asked the Secretariat to supply to the Committee information on the cost of participation by all States, and in particular the signatory States, in the Conference and the Preparatory Committee.

41. Mr. ANDREWS (Budget Officer) said that the exact cost of the Conference would be known only after the Conference ended, when it would be known who had taken part and the extent of all the expenses. As for the Preparatory Committee, the problem was somewhat similar because certain expenses were incurred after the session, particularly with regard to documentation, and could not be calculated exactly in advance. The Secretariat could, however, supply a more detailed statement than that appearing in the document under consideration.

42. The ACTING CHAIRMAN drew the attention of the members of the Committee to the documents which had been distributed by the Secretariat, namely the list of States parties to the Treaty (SBT/CONF.II/PC/Inf.2) and the record of a decision (SBT/CONF.II/PC/DEC.1).

The meeting rose at 5.35 p.m.