
Conference on Disarmament

English

Final record of the one thousand three hundred and fifty-fifth meeting

Held at the Palais des Nations, Geneva, on Tuesday, 9 June 2015, at 10.05 a.m.

President: Mr. Maung Wai.....(Myanmar)



The President: I call to order the 1355th plenary meeting of the Conference on Disarmament.

Distinguished colleagues, please allow me to congratulate you once again for the adoption of the decision on the schedule of activities for the 2015 session and also for the re-establishment of an informal working group with a mandate to produce a programme of work. As this is the first time that I am taking the floor as President of the Conference on Disarmament, please allow me to make a statement in this capacity.

It is indeed a great honour for me and for Myanmar to assume the presidency of the Conference for the period from 8 June to 5 July 2015. In my capacity as the President of the Conference, I would like to congratulate my immediate predecessor, Mr. Mohamed Auajjar, Permanent Representative of Morocco, and his team for their excellent work which made the adoption of those two documents possible. They are document CD/WP.587, titled "Decision on the schedule of activities of the 2015 session of the Conference on Disarmament", and document CD/WP.588, titled "Decision for the re-establishment of an informal working group on the programme of work of the Conference". I would also like to express our sincere thanks and deep appreciation to the other Presidents before him for their dedicated work to move forward the work of the Conference.

In this context, it would be remiss of me not to pay tribute to the next two Presidents, the Netherlands and New Zealand, who will be successively assuming their responsibilities in the coming months. They equally and truly deserve our deep appreciation and respect for their constructive contribution to the work of our 2015 session from the very beginning of this year.

Myanmar is committed to disarmament, including the disarmament of weapons of mass destruction. In September 2013, my country signed an additional protocol to the agreement between Myanmar and the International Atomic Energy Agency for the application of safeguards in connection with the Treaty on Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons (NPT). In December 2014, we ratified the Biological Weapons Convention, and Myanmar has now completed its internal procedures for ratifying the Chemical Weapons Convention.

We in Myanmar continue to believe that the establishment of nuclear-weapon-free zones is imperative for realizing a world without nuclear weapons, thereby ensuring regional and international peace and security. Myanmar participated in the 2015 Review Conference of the Parties to the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons (NPT). Although we had high expectations for the Review Conference, in the end they were only false hopes; despite that, we have not lost hope. We wish to reaffirm our commitment to the principles and objectives of the NPT, and we will continue our efforts to achieve the goal of a world without nuclear weapons.

Myanmar, as one of the original members of the Eighteen-Nation Committee on Disarmament, continues to attach great importance to the Conference on Disarmament as the single multilateral negotiating forum on disarmament, created at the first special session of the United Nations General Assembly devoted to disarmament. In the past, the Conference played a central role in the emergence of several multilateral treaties; however, it has been in a state of continued stagnation for almost two decades now, despite all our efforts to respond to the calls from the international community for the Conference to fulfil its mandate and resume its substantive work.

In the domain of disarmament and arms control, nuclear disarmament remains the highest priority for Myanmar, while we remain committed at the same time to the other core issues of the Conference. Bearing this in mind, during my presidency I will work closely with Ms. Kairamo of Finland, Co-Chair of the informal working group on the programme of work, for the early commencement of the group's work. I will also work

closely with the coordinators of the respective agenda items to achieve fruitful outcomes. I intend to carry on consultations with interested delegations on the establishment of an informal working group on the Conference's methods of work. I am fully aware that this is not an easy task. It is, indeed, a very challenging one but one worth trying. When one door closes, another opens. In our work, let us keep in mind the words of Richard Branson, who said: "Opportunities are like buses — there is always another one coming."

I will always welcome your views, comments and suggestions, and my door will be open to you all the time. I look forward to working closely together with you to conduct productive and fruitful deliberations in this Conference. Your kind cooperation and support for the success of the Conference's 2015 session would be highly appreciated.

At our last plenary session, this past Friday, a number of delegations made reference to the draft decision that had been under consideration during the presidency of Morocco, namely the draft decision on the establishment of an informal working group to review the Conference's methods of work. In order to avoid repeating the discussion we had earlier, I would like to invite all delegations who so wish to engage in bilateral consultations with the presidency over the coming days to discuss specifics that may be of concern to them concerning the best way to address the Conference's methods of work.

I would like now to turn to the list of speakers for today. The following delegations have requested to take the floor: Malaysia, speaking on behalf of the Association of Southeast Asian Nations (ASEAN); Pakistan; and Brazil.

I now give the floor to the Permanent Representative of Malaysia, Ambassador Muhammad, who will speak on behalf of ASEAN.

Mr. Muhammad (Malaysia): I have the honour to deliver this statement on behalf of the member States of the Association of Southeast Asian Nations (ASEAN), namely Brunei Darussalam, Cambodia, Indonesia, the Lao People's Democratic Republic, Malaysia, Myanmar, the Philippines, Singapore, Thailand and Viet Nam.

Mr. President, at the outset, we warmly congratulate you, a close ASEAN member, on your assumption of the presidency of the Conference on Disarmament at this important juncture. We are confident that under your able guidance and leadership the deliberations at this august body will produce a fruitful outcome.

The ASEAN member States reiterate that nuclear weapons disarmament has always been our utmost priority. Furthermore, we reaffirm the importance and validity of the Conference on Disarmament as the single multilateral negotiating forum on disarmament. It is regrettable that the 19-year stalemate has prevented this body from commencing negotiations on substantive issues. We therefore call upon the Conference to establish — as soon as possible and as the highest priority — an ad hoc committee on nuclear disarmament.

To ensure that the Conference is able to fulfil its purpose and objectives, it needs to have a clear timetable. A positive step in this direction would be for the Conference to consider working on the programme of work for 2016 during the remainder of this year. This modest step would allow for the Conference to begin substantive deliberations immediately early next year.

ASEAN, with its sustained development, strategic geographical location and peace-oriented values, plays a pivotal role in maintaining and promoting peace and stability in the region, aiming towards the prevalence of international peace and security. We stress the importance of continuing to strengthen cooperation under the Treaty of Amity and Cooperation in Southeast Asia, the declaration on the Zone of Peace, Freedom and Neutrality and the Treaty on the South-East Asia Nuclear-Weapon-Free Zone. We

reaffirm the Treaty of Amity and Cooperation as the key code of conduct for governing inter-State relations in the region and the foundation for regional peace and security.

We underscore that multilateralism and multilaterally agreed solutions, in accordance with the Charter of the United Nations, provide the only sustainable method of addressing disarmament and international security issues. Despite the great efforts made by States parties, we regret to see that the 2015 Review Conference of the Nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty (NPT) was not able to reach consensus. However, ASEAN reaffirms its commitment to the principles and objectives of the Treaty and will redouble its efforts to achieve a world free of nuclear weapons. The NPT continues to remain relevant and, although no agreement was possible this year, there are valid conclusions and recommendations for follow-up actions from the Final Document of the 2010 Review Conference, particularly the 22-point action plan on nuclear disarmament, which remain outstanding and still require full and effective implementation. All States parties should restate their commitment to uphold the NPT and fulfil their respective commitments and obligations.

ASEAN calls for renewed efforts to resolve the current impasse in achieving nuclear disarmament and nuclear non-proliferation in all its aspects. In this regard, we welcome the successful convening of the high-level meeting of the United Nations General Assembly on nuclear disarmament in 2013 and reaffirm Assembly resolution 68/32. We hope that, building on the outcomes of that meeting, we can move forward to achieve the common goal of nuclear disarmament. Furthermore, we also welcome the work of the Open-ended Working Group to develop proposals to take forward multilateral nuclear disarmament negotiations for the achievement and maintenance of a world without nuclear weapons.

ASEAN continues to believe that nuclear-weapon-free zones created by the treaties of Tlatelolco, Rarotonga, Bangkok, Pelindaba and the Nuclear-Weapon-Free Zone in Central Asia as well as the nuclear-weapon-free status of Mongolia contribute significantly to strengthening global nuclear disarmament and non-proliferation regimes. In this regard, we welcome the signing of the legally binding Protocol to the Treaty on a Nuclear-Weapon-Free Zone in Central Asia by the nuclear-weapon States in May 2014 in New York. We also welcome the proclamation of Latin America and the Caribbean as a zone of peace, which was done on the occasion of the second summit of the Community of Latin American and Caribbean States in Havana, Cuba. We also note the convening of the Third Conference of States Parties and Signatories that Establish Nuclear-Weapon-Free Zones and Mongolia in New York on 24 April 2015, hosted by Indonesia. While nuclear-weapon-free zones play an important role in nuclear disarmament and non-proliferation, they should not be an end in and of themselves. The establishment of nuclear-weapon-free zones is not a substitute for nuclear disarmament.

ASEAN underscores the importance of establishing nuclear-weapon-free zones where they do not exist, especially in the Middle East region, and expresses its continued support for the convening, at the earliest, of the conference on the establishment of such a zone in the Middle East. We would like to stress that it is necessary to provide unconditional assurances against the use or threat of use of nuclear weapons to all States in the zones by the nuclear-weapon States.

We stress the importance of strengthening the nuclear non-proliferation and disarmament regime to maintain peace, security and prosperity in the region. We reaffirm our commitment to preserve South-East Asia as a nuclear-weapon-free zone and free from all other weapons of mass destruction, as enshrined in the ASEAN Charter. We further reaffirm our commitment to uphold the Treaty on the Southeast Asia Nuclear-Weapon-Free Zone. We underline the importance of full and effective implementation of the Treaty and of the 2013-2017 plan of action to strengthen the implementation of the Treaty, which was adopted by the ASEAN Ministers for Foreign Affairs on 30 June

2013. We reiterate our commitment to work closely with the nuclear-weapon States on the early signing and ratification of the Protocol to the Treaty without reservations by the nuclear-weapon States. We also acknowledge the need to work closely with the nuclear-weapon States to address our concerns over their proposed reservations to the Protocol to the Treaty.

Mr. President, we agree with the United Nations Secretary-General that there is substantial growth of interest in better understanding the catastrophic humanitarian consequences of any use of nuclear weapons. In this regard, we welcome the successful convening of the Conference on the Humanitarian Impact of Nuclear Weapons, in Oslo, Nayarit and Vienna, and welcome the endorsement of over 100 States for the Humanitarian Pledge. We also welcome the ninth Regional Round Table on the Humanitarian Impact of Nuclear Weapons and Prospects for a Ban Treaty, which was held in Bangkok in March 2015.

ASEAN supports the appointment of a special coordinator on the expansion of the membership of the Conference.

In conclusion, ASEAN further emphasizes the necessity of redoubling efforts to reach the goal of general and complete disarmament with particular attention to a nuclear-weapon-free world as a matter of utmost priority.

The President: I thank the Permanent Representative of Malaysia, Mr. Muhammad, for his statement and also for the kind words addressed to the Chair.

I now give the floor to Ambassador Akram of Pakistan.

Mr. Akram (Pakistan): I congratulate you, Mr. President, on your assumption of the presidency of the Conference on Disarmament and assure you of my delegation's full support and cooperation. I also welcome the new Secretary of the Conference, Mr. Marco Kalbusch, and wish him every success.

I take this opportunity to thank the Ambassador of Morocco for the outstanding manner in which he conducted his presidency. We welcome the adoption of the two draft decisions by the Conference last Friday, which provide for the optimum utilization of available time both to hold informal discussions on the four core issues and to strive for the development of a balanced and comprehensive programme of work.

I have requested the floor to address some of the points raised by the Permanent Representative of France at the last plenary meeting, held on 5 June 2015, regarding the draft fissile material cut-off treaty text submitted by his delegation.

Pakistan appreciates the efforts made by France in drafting that text. Clearly, a lot of technical and legal expertise went into it, which is very praiseworthy. Pakistan carefully examined the French draft with an open mind and without any preconceived notions in the hope that it might offer some innovative alternatives for dealing with the existing stocks or, at least, a feasible middle ground between the various positions. Unfortunately, we ended up deeply disappointed with the treatment of the fundamental issues of scope, as well as definitions, verification and entry into force.

The views of Pakistan on the issue of fissile materials are well known and need not be repeated. Pakistan is opposed to the commencement of negotiations on a treaty that only bans the future production of fissile material without addressing the asymmetries in fissile material holdings between States. A treaty that does not cover past production — that is, the existing stockpiles of fissile materials — would be detrimental to the security of Pakistan and to regional stability in South Asia as it would freeze and perpetuate the asymmetry in stocks to my country's permanent strategic disadvantage. This predicament has been compounded by the discriminatory waivers, bilateral civil nuclear cooperation agreements and promises of membership in multilateral export control regimes in

complete disregard of the prevalent norms and principles of the international non-proliferation regime.

In the face of such a vital threat to our national security interests, coupled with discriminatory policies that have a serious negative impact on stability in our region, Pakistan is left with no option but to continue to oppose negotiations on a cut-off only treaty in the Conference.

The French draft treaty, which is claimed to be based on the Shannon mandate, has also reinforced the fact that France is not ready to include existing stocks in the scope of the treaty. In fact, none of the nuclear-weapon States, except Pakistan, is ready to do so. This has been stated in so many words on different occasions by the representatives of these nuclear-weapon States. This clearly means that, at least according to their interpretation, the Shannon mandate does not provide for the inclusion of existing stocks in this treaty's scope. Therefore, there is no point in deluding ourselves into believing otherwise.

To continue arguing counter-intuitively that we should start negotiating a treaty on the basis of the Shannon mandate in the hope that somehow, miraculously, the objections to the inclusion of stocks would be overcome during negotiations is illogical and amounts to misleading oneself. Pakistan cannot do that. Clearly, the Shannon mandate with its so-called "constructive ambiguity" is no longer acceptable or valid as the negotiating mandate. The sooner we accept this reality, the greater are the chances of making some progress on this issue on the basis of a new negotiating mandate that is consistent with the security interests of all Conference members.

The French draft treaty is a compilation and codification of that country's well-known views on a fissile material cut-off treaty (FMCT) — not just on the issue of scope but also on other fundamental treaty elements, such as definitions, verification and entry into force. On those issues as well, the French draft falls short of our expectations and the preferences expressed by other Group of 21 members. France has submitted a treaty that is completely cost-free for its own security calculus, encompassing certain basic obligations that are more or less already being applied by France and its western partners and allies on a unilateral and voluntary basis. We recognize and respect the sovereign right of France to determine its own national security requirements and to submit a draft treaty that fully safeguards them. In the same vein, Pakistan is also entitled to exercise its own sovereign right — based on our genuine national security considerations — to reject the French draft treaty as well as any attempt to commence FMCT negotiations on the basis of the Shannon mandate.

In our view, the Conference does not need draft treaties based on maximalist national positions to make progress on the issue of fissile materials. What is required is the genuine political will to address the concerns of all States that oppose the start of negotiations which do not address the issue of existing stocks. On that account, we regrettably do not see any progress.

We have stated on several occasions in the past that Pakistan is ready to join efforts for finding a new compromise to arrive at an acceptable basis, or mandate, to commence negotiations on a fissile material treaty, or FMT, in the Conference. This new mandate should respond to the legitimate call by the vast majority of Conference members to negotiate a treaty that genuinely advances nuclear disarmament and contributes to regional and international stability and security. The Shannon mandate does not fulfil these conditions.

Member States will recall that last year in the informal discussions on an FMCT, my delegation had made substantive proposals in regard to how we can make progress in line with what I have just stated. We are ready to start from that point this year as well.

Let me also take this opportunity to reiterate that the Conference should not be made hostage to one issue. We should devote equal, if not greater, attention to the commencement of negotiations on other issues on the Conference's agenda, including nuclear disarmament, which is the *raison d'être* of the Conference, as well as negative security assurances and the prevention of an arms race in outer space. We have yet to hear any argument against negotiations on any of these agenda items based on the security interests of States. Draft treaties submitted by different delegations exist on each one of these three issues as well. In view of the foregoing, we do not see the French draft treaty as having any potential in addressing our core national security concerns or even as a bridge between the Conference members' fundamental divide on the issue of a fissile material ban.

The President: I thank Ambassador Akram of Pakistan for his statement and for the kind words addressed to both the President and the Secretary.

I now give the floor to the Permanent Representative of Brazil.

Mr. Motta Pinto Coelho (Brazil): I take this opportunity to congratulate you on your assumption of the presidency of the Conference on Disarmament. I am fully confident that your diplomatic skills will help us guide the work of the Conference in a productive manner. I assure you of my delegation's full support and cooperation. I wish also to welcome the new Secretary of the Conference, Mr. Marco Kalbusch.

As we start the second part of the Conference's annual session, I would like to commend our colleague, Ambassador Kairamo of Finland, who has accepted the challenge of co-chairing the informal working group and trying to bridge the differences that prevent us from agreeing on a programme of work. I also congratulate our colleagues Ambassador Ramadan of Egypt, Ambassador Biontino of Germany, Ambassador Rowland of the United Kingdom and Ambassador Aryasinha of Sri Lanka for agreeing to coordinate the informal discussions on the items of the agenda and the schedule of activities.

I would like to make a few remarks about the outcome of the ninth Review Conference of the Parties to the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons (NPT), if I may. The participation of Brazil at the Conference was guided by the general objective of giving new impetus to the implementation of article VI of the Treaty, which refers specifically to the commitments of States parties regarding nuclear disarmament. Unfortunately, the Review Conference did not adopt any decision that would give effect to the provisions contained in article VI or, alternatively, would urge the General Assembly of the United Nations to take action on this issue, in particular with regard to effective measures leading to the prohibition and elimination of nuclear weapons. We deeply regret the lack of consensus on the adoption of the final substantive document of the ninth NPT Review Conference. We also regret that States parties to the NPT were not able to overcome their differences with respect to the establishment of a Middle East zone free of nuclear weapons and other weapons of mass destruction, on the basis of the 1995 resolution adopted by the fifth NPT Review Conference.

The Brazilian delegation worked constructively throughout the negotiations to reach consensus in the belief that cooperation is the only way to ensure compliance with the Treaty in all its pillars and thereby correct its original imbalance. The compromise achieved after formal and informal sessions on the language relative to nuclear non-proliferation and peaceful uses of nuclear energy showed the virtues of States parties' constructive approach. Despite the final draft's shortcomings on the nuclear disarmament part, which was far less incisive than what the majority of States parties wanted it to be, Brazil was ready to adopt the final document as proposed by the President. Regrettably, differences on the convening of a conference on the establishment of a Middle East zone

free of nuclear weapons and other weapons of mass destruction could not be resolved, thus preventing a successful outcome.

It is particularly disappointing that, due to this disagreement, a recommendation to the United Nations General Assembly to establish an open-ended working group to identify and elaborate effective measures for the full implementation of article VI, including legal provisions and other arrangements that contribute to and are required for the achievement and maintenance of a world without nuclear weapons, could not be adopted.

However, the failure to adopt the draft final document of the ninth Review Conference — which was due to the fact that some delegations could not accept the agreed language relating to the establishment of a Middle East zone free of nuclear weapons and other weapons of mass destruction on the basis of the 1995 resolution adopted by the fifth NPT Review Conference — does not necessarily mean that the whole exercise was meaningless. After all, in the final days of the Conference most delegates expended a great amount of effort to negotiate relevant consensual formulations in all three pillars of the NPT. Brazil considers that, in spite of the fact that there was no agreement, the final draft should be considered an important point of reference on its own merit for discussion in the Conference and in other forums.

Among the positive aspects of the final draft which, in our view, warranted its adoption were some key references to the role of the International Atomic Energy Agency (IAEA) and IAEA safeguards within the NPT regime. We would like to highlight, in particular, the reaffirmation in paragraph 22 of the final draft that it is the sovereign decision of any State to conclude an additional protocol; the emphasis given in paragraph 33 to the assurances and clarifications regarding the State-level concept provided by the IAEA General Conference and secretariat; the reaffirmation of the central role of IAEA in strengthening nuclear security globally as well as in the development of safety standards and in promoting international cooperation on nuclear safety-related matters as stated in paragraphs 41, 91 and 93; and, finally, the recognition of the Agency's role in the verification of nuclear disarmament, as per paragraph 154, item 17.

Notwithstanding the failure of the States parties to produce a consensual final document, Brazil believes that the overall proceedings at the ninth Review Conference have further highlighted the strengths and weaknesses of the NPT and of the broader disarmament and non-proliferation regime, and set expectations for the immediate future. While we continue to fare well on the non-proliferation front, the fulfilment of disarmament commitments needs urgent action and innovative thinking. Brazil therefore welcomes the endorsement of the Humanitarian Pledge by over 107 countries and the growing awareness that the humanitarian impact of nuclear weapons should underpin all efforts for nuclear disarmament. Brazil does not consider that the ninth NPT Review Conference was a failure, despite the lack of an outcome. The NPT, however, risks being a failed treaty for its inability to move forward in the implementation of article VI. The NPT seems to have reached its conceptual limits, for it has been unable to adopt decisions to develop and implement its three pillars in a balanced and non-discriminatory manner.

Mr. President, as you may be aware, the National Congress of Brazil approved the country's accession to the Treaty on the understanding that effective measures would be taken with a view to the cessation of the nuclear arms race at an early date and the total elimination of nuclear weapons, as stated in Legislative Decree No. 65, which approved the Treaty in 1998. More than 45 years after the Treaty was concluded, and 25 years after the end of the cold war, the continued existence of nuclear weapons, both within and outside the Treaty's regime, runs counter to the Treaty's provisions, in particular, article VI, and remains a powerful stimulus for proliferation.

Brazil understands that the indefinite extension of the Treaty in 1995 cannot in any way be interpreted as permission for the perpetual possession of nuclear weapons. States parties to the NPT would not have agreed to extend the Treaty indefinitely as they did in 1995 if nuclear-weapon States had tried to claim that they were not obliged to pursue nuclear disarmament.

The failure to achieve a consensual outcome at the NPT Review Conference should not prevent us from moving forward. We believe nuclear-weapon States have political, moral and legal obligations to seek to eliminate all nuclear arsenals. These obligations stem from article VI of the NPT. Therefore, it is high time to continue to explore possible ways to implement the effective measures called for in article VI.

We consider launching multilateral negotiations on a comprehensive convention on nuclear disarmament to be a priority. We support, in particular, the establishment of an open-ended working group in the United Nations General Assembly to identify and elaborate effective measures for the full implementation of disarmament commitments under the NPT. We also believe that other options being brought to the table, such as a legal ban on nuclear weapons, deserve full consideration.

While we are indeed encouraged by the consolidation of the humanitarian process, which will hopefully bring back some optimism and positive thinking to the disarmament arena, Brazil has endorsed the Humanitarian Pledge like the majority of participants in the NPT Review Conference. We hope that this process will lead to the prohibition of nuclear weapons on the basis of their unacceptable humanitarian consequences.

With respect to the situation in the Conference, I would like to reiterate that it is incumbent upon members to act to overcome its deadlock, in particular by raising the level of attention in their capitals to its persistent failure to promote nuclear disarmament. Rather than advancing the cause of international peace and nuclear disarmament, one has to admit that the Conference has worked over the past two decades mainly to maintain the status quo in the nuclear field, contrary to the expectations of most of its members. If this situation does not change, the Conference runs the risk of being sidelined for its inability to play a significant role in disarmament efforts. Once again, I would like to express our full support for your endeavours. We look forward to taking part in the informal discussions on the items of the agenda as well as in the consultations aimed at the adoption of a programme of work.

The President: I thank the Permanent Representative of Brazil for his statement and for the kind words addressed to both the Chair and the Secretary.

I recognize the representative of Finland.

Mr. Järviäho (Finland): First of all, let me congratulate you, Mr. President, on your assumption of the presidency of the Conference on Disarmament. We wish you every success in this important endeavour. You will have the full support of this delegation, of course. I also wish to welcome the new Secretary of the Conference, Mr. Marco Kalbusch.

As Co-Chair of the informal working group on the programme of work, my Ambassador looks forward to working closely with you and the whole of the Conference in order to find a way forward with the programme of work.

Regarding the draft decision on the informal working group on working methods, we were ready to adopt the Moroccan draft proposal last week. Although this was not possible, we stand ready to support all your efforts in order to find a suitable proposal that can be adopted as soon as possible. The informal working group on working methods could provide space for much-needed discussion on how we conduct our work here in the Conference. While aware that this would not solve all our problems, it could

enable discussions on issues that are hindering or slowing down our ability to work. Any proposals that might come up during these discussions would naturally be looked at in the Conference under the consensus rule. In our view, it would be beneficial and important for all of us to reflect on the way we work here in the Conference.

The President: I thank the representative from the Permanent Mission of Finland for his statement. Would any other delegation like to take the floor? That does not seem to be the case.

I have taken due note of all the views expressed during this plenary meeting. You may rest assured that I will keep them in mind during my consultations. In line with the schedule of activities adopted last Friday and contained in document CD/WP.587, this coming Thursday, 11 June, we will meet in this chamber from 10 a.m. to 1 p.m. and from 3 to 6 p.m. for informal plenaries on agenda items 1 and 2, with a general focus on nuclear disarmament.

The next plenary meeting of the Conference on Disarmament will be held next Tuesday, 16 June 2015, at 10 a.m. This concludes our meeting today.

The meeting rose at 10.55 a.m.