

CONFERENCE ON DISARMAMENT

CD/PV.1075*

28 June 2007

ENGLISH

FINAL RECORD OF THE ONE THOUSAND AND SEVENTY-FIFTH PLENARY MEETING

Held at the Palais des Nations, Geneva,
on Thursday, 28 June 2007, at 10.15 a.m.

President: Mr. Jürg STREULI (Switzerland)

* Reissued for technical reasons.

GE.07-63823 (E) 041007

The PRESIDENT (spoke in French): I call to order the 1075th plenary meeting of the Conference on Disarmament. I have the following speakers on my list: the representative of Germany, who will speak on behalf of the European Union, then the representative of the United Kingdom, the representative of Germany speaking on behalf of its own country, and lastly the representative of Turkey. Before giving them the floor, I would like, on behalf of the Conference on Disarmament and on my own behalf, to bid farewell to our distinguished colleague Ambassador Kavanagh, who is not here - but I shall ask his colleague to convey our greetings to him - whose term as representative of Ireland in Geneva is coming to an end. Ambassador Kavanagh joined us less than a year ago, but in this short period his vast knowledge and great experience enabled him to make a lively and valuable contribution to the work of this body. On behalf of the Conference on Disarmament and on my own behalf, I should like to convey to Ambassador Kavanagh our best wishes for success in his future assignments, assignments which will not be taking him too far away from the United Nations system. I would ask you to convey these wishes to His Excellency.

Now I would like to give the floor to the first speaker on my list, Ambassador Brasack, who will be speaking on behalf of the European Union.

Mr. BRASACK (Germany): Mr. President, I have the honour to take the floor on behalf of the European Union. As it is the first time that I take the floor on behalf of the EU under your presidency, I would, first of all, like to congratulate you on the assumption of the post of President of the Conference on Disarmament. I would like to assure you and the other members of the P-6 platform of the EU's continued fullest support in your efforts to guide the work of this Conference, especially at this crucially important time. We are confident that under your able guidance the Conference can finally achieve what has been its objective for nine years, namely bringing the CD back to substantive work.

At the end of the first part of the annual session of the CD in March 2007, the European Union was encouraged by the constructive, structured and substantive discussions on a high-quality level led by the coordinators during the sessions of the first nine weeks, which were brought about by the six 2007 CD Presidents' "organizational framework". The momentum developed as a result of the initiative taken jointly by the six Presidents of the CD last year had clearly been taken up and brought to an even higher level. This had fostered our hope that finally the deadlock in the work of the CD could be overcome and significant work resumed.

The G-8 Summit in Heiligendamm early this month expressed strong support for the endeavours under way to overcome the stalemate in the Conference on Disarmament and reaffirmed its support for the early commencement of negotiations on a fissile material cut-off treaty. This view is fully supported by the European Union, which has consistently stated that it attaches a clear priority to the negotiation, without preconditions, in the Conference on Disarmament, of such a treaty.

In his message to the Conference on Disarmament on 14 June 2007, the Secretary-General of the United Nations stated, inter alia, that if the CD were to move forward, this would have a positive impact on the international security atmosphere. It would demonstrate to the international community at large that the security challenges before us are not overwhelming, but

(Mr. Brasack, Germany)

can be addressed collectively. On the other hand, he also stated that if we do not move forward in the CD, this will have a devastating impact on multilateral and bilateral disarmament efforts. The European Union appreciates the continued support of the United Nations Secretary-General to the CD.

Under the Swedish CD presidency two further documents were issued in a serious, patient and strenuous process to add clarity and to provide answers to questions raised by a few delegations as regards document L.1. The European Union would like to take the opportunity to thank Ambassador Elisabet Borsini Bonnier of Sweden for her tireless efforts.

The European Union now urges those remaining three member States of the CD to go along with consensus on the basis of the documents on the table, which are, as you know, L.1, CRP.5 and the draft decision by the Conference.

The PRESIDENT (spoke in French): I thank the distinguished representative of Germany for his statement and the kind words addressed to the Chair

(spoke in English)

and I now give the floor to the distinguished representative of the United Kingdom, Ms. Fiona Paterson.

Ms. PATERSON (United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland): I should like to flag up to colleagues a major speech which my Foreign Secretary, Margaret Beckett, made on 25 June in Washington to the Carnegie International Non-Proliferation Conference. Her overriding message was a clear call for a reinvigoration of the collective commitment to a world free from nuclear weapons. The speech is posted on our delegation's website, which - for those of you who would want to note it down - is www.fco.gov.uk/ukdis.

My point in speaking to you today is that, as you all know, as of yesterday the United Kingdom has a new Prime Minister, who is currently drawing up a new cabinet of ministers, and some people are speculating that Mrs. Beckett's speech represents new policy, and others are already asking: will it alter if the United Kingdom has a new Foreign Secretary?

I should like to affirm that the ideas expressed in Mrs. Beckett's speech are a logical progression from what the United Kingdom has been saying and practising for some time in different arms control and disarmament forums, including the Conference on Disarmament, the United Nations General Assembly First Committee and the Non-Proliferation Treaty PrepCom.

These ideas do not represent a new United Kingdom policy, but they are a continuation and a deepening of our overall approach, which acknowledges that there must be parallel progress on both nuclear disarmament and non-proliferation. And the key points of our policy, as expressed in that speech, are the following: first, a recognition that the "bargain" between the haves and the have-nots requires nuclear-weapon States to do more on nuclear disarmament, to get more on the non-proliferation front, a recognition also of the pressure on the NPT regime; second, a call for the ratification of the CTBT by those who have yet to do so, a call for the commencement of

(Ms. Paterson, United Kingdom)

negotiations on an FMCT and a call for further cuts in the United States and Russian nuclear arsenals upon the expiry of the SORT and START-I treaties; third, a United Kingdom commitment to engage in multilateral negotiations on the elimination of nuclear weapons, once the United States and Russia have reduced those arsenals considerably, and to engage in the meantime in discussion of transparency and confidence-building measures with any other willing nuclear-weapon States.

And finally, Mrs. Beckett made an announcement that the United Kingdom will, as a “disarmament laboratory”, participate in a new project by the International Institute of Strategic Studies on the practical steps required for the elimination of nuclear weapons, and would also undertake further detailed work by the United Kingdom’s Atomic Weapons Establishment on what we call the “nuts and bolts” of nuclear disarmament.

The PRESIDENT: I thank the delegate of the United Kingdom for her statement

(spoke in French)

and I now give the floor to the distinguished delegate of Germany, who will make a statement on behalf of his country.

Mr. BRASACK (Germany): Thank you, Mr. President, for allowing me to take the floor again. I have the pleasure to provide, as the EU presidency, the following information.

On the German EU presidency’s initiative, a workshop on “Security and arms control in space and the role of the EU” was held on 21 and 22 June 2007 in Berlin. The seminar was the first of its kind and covered a broad range of issues. Some elements of the discussions have been summed up by the organizers of the workshop along the following lines.

Firstly, it is obvious that dependence on assets in outer space, together with the number of users, is increasing. Thus, new attention must be given to security in space. However, to date, this has unfortunately not been the case. Secondly, the security of space is in the interest of all States and must be the concern of the whole international community. This is illustrated by the threat posed by the increasing amount of space debris endangering space assets. Space debris results in indiscriminate insecurity. Thirdly, the complex nature of the issue of outer space security mitigates against a partial or compartmentalized approach. Instead, a comprehensive and holistic approach is called for.

Of particular relevance in this regard is the Janus-like character of space security. It is apparent in a number of different ways at different levels. The same vulnerabilities affect civil applications as well as military ones, the dual-use character of civil and military technologies and assets. Also, space situational awareness systems have the same Janus-like character. Therefore, when addressing space security challenges, it is often hardly possible to make a distinction between the military and the civil approaches. The complexity of the subject matter not only has implications for how, but also for where - in which forum - the related issues should be

(Mr. Brasack, Germany)

addressed. Unfortunately there is a lack of coordination and cooperation between the relevant forums today. Thus, there is for example a lack of communication between the CD and COPUOS that needs to be rectified.

Germany will provide these and more specific inputs once the relevant work in the CD on these issues is continued in a substantive manner.

The PRESIDENT (spoke in French): I thank the distinguished delegate of Germany for his contribution and I now give the floor to the distinguished representative of Turkey, Ambassador Üzümcü.

Mr. ÜZÜMCÜ (Turkey): Mr. President, since this is the first time that I take the floor under your presidency, allow me to begin by congratulating you on your assumption of the high office. Through you, let me also thank your predecessor Ambassador Borsini Bonnier of Sweden for her tireless efforts to bring the CD back to substantial work. I am confident that you, Mr. President, along with the other members of the P-6, will spare no effort in continuing these efforts. I therefore pledge my delegation's full support in your difficult tasks ahead.

As we have reached the end of the second part of the 2007 working year, we have a way forward. A way forward that would mean a historic end to a decade of stagnation and impasse. A way to return to meaningful work, and a chance to contribute to efforts aimed at building a safer and more secure world through arms control and disarmament. In short, we are not at a loss for direction. We have the product of many months of debate, exchange and elaboration. This product, carefully drafted word by word by the P-6, is draft Presidential decision CD/2007/L.1. This proposal, which we continue to believe represents an accurate reflection of where we stand in the CD, has been further clarified by the "Complementary Presidential statement reflecting an understanding of the CD on the implementation of CD/2007/L.1" and a draft decision of the Conference. We hope that these additional documents will allay the concerns of delegations that have not been able to join the consensus so far.

As previously expressed by my delegation, kick-starting substantive work on the basis of L.1 and the documents I have just mentioned will constitute only the beginning of a multilateral negotiating process. This process will allow all delegations to voice their concerns and negotiate their alleviation. Moreover, the commencement of this multilateral process will have a knock-on effect on other areas of multilateral affairs. It will create a new synergy.

My delegation is eager to commence negotiations, as are so many others. Since this is the closest we have come to consensus for some time, we call on delegations that are awaiting instructions from their capitals to try to speed up their delivery. Two weeks ago the Secretary-General of the United Nations, in an urgent message, reminded all decision makers that "finding a fair accommodation now would deprive no member of the ability to assert its national position in the phases of the Conference's work to follow the adoption of the Presidential decision". We believe that interested capitals should carefully consider this observation.

(Mr. Üzümcü, Turkey)

We shall have a whole month of recess ahead of us. However, once we come back, we shall only have seven weeks to make a difference.

The PRESIDENT (spoke in French): I thank the distinguished delegate of Turkey for his statement and his kind words addressed to the Chair

(spoke in English)

and I now give the floor to the distinguished delegate of Pakistan, Ms. Janjua.

Ms. JANJUA (Pakistan): Mr. President, on behalf of my delegation, we would like to warmly congratulate you on taking over the presidency of the Conference on Disarmament. We look forward to working with you.

We would also like to take this opportunity to thank Ambassador Borsiin Bonnier of Sweden for her efforts in leading the Conference in its collective efforts to find consensus on the CD's programme of work. We would also like to thank all the previous Presidents for 2007 for their efforts in this regard.

The first part of this year was devoted to the consideration of all issues on the agenda of the Conference on Disarmament. In the second part, we have been considering the Presidential draft decision which was tabled under the presidency of Sri Lanka. A number of States have expressed specific concerns regarding the Presidential draft decision. My delegation has also repeatedly identified our difficulties with the Presidential draft decision contained in L.1. These are not procedural concerns, but serious concerns of substance. These concerns have not been fully addressed.

We all want the CD operational and performing its responsibilities as the sole multilateral disarmament negotiating forum. We all want to see it revitalized.

We fully agreed with the Brazilian delegation's comment at the sixtieth United Nations General Assembly that "the four core issues cannot be evaded, nor can we pick and choose from among them". Treatment of all issues, we believe, has to be equal. We believe that the CD has the capacity to move forward to negotiations on all four issues: nuclear disarmament, FMT, PAROS and NSAs.

Why is there insistence for the CD to start negotiations in one area only? And that, too, in complete disregard of consensus, as reflected in the Shannon mandate, especially at a time when regional asymmetries are deliberately being allowed to increase?

Commitment to nuclear disarmament has been referred to in the CD. This commitment does not find adequate reflection in L.1. L.1 should provide the parameters to start negotiations on general and complete disarmament. SSOD-1 identified general and complete disarmament as the *raison d'être* of the CD. The world outside and those in the gallery here today await agreement in the CD on starting work towards nuclear disarmament.

(Ms. Janjua, Pakistan)

Pakistan's clear concerns about the global security implications of the PDD are evident from the fact that we insist on the inclusion of stocks and verification in paragraph 2 of L.1. This reflects a clear interest in global security and not just national security.

If we all agree that the scope of the FMT instrument should include stockpiles and verification, why are we unable to include them in L.1? A fissile material treaty that would promote nuclear disarmament is not one that does not include verification and stocks, and not just existing stocks.

Pakistan tables a resolution every year in the United Nations General Assembly entitled "Conclusion of effective international arrangements to assure non-nuclear-weapon States against the use or threat of use of nuclear weapons". We believe the conclusion of effective arrangements on negative security assurances would constitute a major confidence-building measure between the nuclear- and non-nuclear-weapon States. Hence we also have a particular interest in commencing negotiations on a legally binding international instrument on effective international arrangements to assure non-nuclear-weapon States against the use or threat of use of nuclear weapons.

On PAROS as well, enough work has been done in the CD. In this context we thank the delegations of China, the Russian Federation and many others for their efforts. We should be able to start negotiations on a legally binding treaty on the basis of material provided by China and the Russian Federation, for example.

Mr. President, in your statement of 26 June 2007, you expressed the desire to have a decision on the programme of work of the Conference early in part 3 of the 2007 session. We also appreciate your intention to keep in touch with delegations on finding solutions. We hope that our collective quest led by you for a programme of work will lead to concrete solution-oriented discussions within the Conference. The answer lies in undertaking a comprehensive look at the PDD. The Presidential draft decision is a proposal that has yet to obtain consensus in the Conference.

I would also recall again that the Secretary-General, in his statement to the CD, called for compromise and accommodation. This is required to take into account the security interests of all member States. Pakistan is committed to work with the Conference and with you in finding agreement on a balanced programme of work.

The PRESIDENT: I thank the distinguished delegate of Pakistan for her declaration and for the kind words addressed to the presidency.

(spoke in French)

For the time being there are no other speakers on my list for today. Does any other delegation wish to take the floor at this stage? I give the floor to the distinguished representative of New Zealand.

Mr. MACKAY (New Zealand): Mr. President, could I echo the compliments of other colleagues to you in assuming the presidency of the Conference on Disarmament, and also reiterate the appreciation that has been expressed to former Presidents for the work that they have done in bringing us very close to a point where we can begin work. And I think we are talking about a bit more than revitalization here, as the sole negotiating body - and a negotiating body which has not in fact been negotiating for a great many years. We are talking about actually getting the CD down to what it should be doing.

I would like to express appreciation to those colleagues who have spoken to clarify their positions with regard to L.1, and particularly to thank our distinguished colleague from Pakistan for her additional comments with regard to document L.1. With regard to the issue of stocks and verification in an FMCT, we very much share Pakistan's position that an FMCT should include stocks and verification, and that is the basis on which we will enter negotiations on an FMCT. But it was not clear to me from the statement made by the distinguished colleague from Pakistan whether Pakistan's objective is to gain acceptance that those issues can be discussed and negotiated in the context of negotiating an FMCT - and clearly they can, because clearly it is open to any delegation to propose whatever it wishes to propose, and to negotiate whatever it wishes to negotiate within an FMCT negotiation. So I do see a particular problem there, and it seems to me that it is not an issue. If, on the other hand, Pakistan is endeavouring to obtain an advance, an outcome, on the negotiation of stocks and verification before they have actually been negotiated, then I think we have a bigger problem.

As I say, we certainly share Pakistan's position on the substance, but we accept - and I think all colleagues must accept - that when one goes into a negotiation, one does not predetermine in advance what the outcome will be, however much one may want it, and I hope that it may be possible to obtain clarification with regard to that from our distinguished colleague from Pakistan, which may bring us hopefully a little bit closer towards resolving this particular issue.

Again, in terms of the issues that Pakistan has identified as issues of importance to Pakistan, these are also - it goes without saying - issues of importance to New Zealand. The reality is, however, that it is not possible for us to negotiate all of these issues seriously at the same time. So to talk about the need to have equality of treatment and four contemporaneous negotiations on nuclear disarmament, FMCT, PAROS and NSAs is frankly not practicable. I do not think it is practicable for the largest and best-resourced countries who are members of the CD. It is certainly not practicable for those of us who are somewhat smaller, but equally sovereign in the CD, and those of us who are also a lot further away and will need to bring experts to participate in the negotiations. To have experts able to participate in negotiations on these four substantive issues contemporaneously simply does not work. I think we need to accept the practicality of all of this.

In terms of the issues that we have mentioned, as I say, they are all issues of importance to us, just as they are of importance to other colleagues who have addressed them. With regard to NSAs, there is frankly, I think, a potential complication in negotiating NSAs in this forum. By their very nature, NSAs are commitments between those countries that have nuclear weapons and those countries that do not have nuclear weapons, and there is an issue clearly with regard to

(Mr. Mackay, New Zealand)

the potential conferring of the status of nuclear-weapon States on all of the States that possess nuclear weapons, or may possess nuclear weapons, through entering negative security assurances. There is not that problem in doing it within the context of the NPT, but there is a potential complication in doing it here in the CD that will take quite a lot of working through. I think we should be quite frank in acknowledging this.

If countries that have nuclear weapons wish to give an assurance to countries that do not have nuclear weapons that they will not use nuclear weapons against them, then obviously it is open to those countries to give those assurances unilaterally. Colleagues will be as aware as I am that the International Court of Justice has determined that a unilateral assurance that is given and is intended to have other States act on it is legally binding, and in fact comes from a judgment of the International Court of Justice in a case to which New Zealand was a party that in fact related to nuclear weapons.

So it would certainly be very interesting to know from colleagues from those States that possess nuclear weapons and that are arguing that NSAs should be actively pursued in this topic, it would be interesting to know from them what they have done in terms of giving unilateral assurance to non-nuclear-weapon States that nuclear weapons will not be used against them, since that would take us some direction along the track that our distinguished colleague from Pakistan has suggested that we should be pursuing in the CD with regard to NSAs. I look forward on a future occasion to hearing more about the action that has been taken unilaterally by nuclear-weapon States in this respect by those States that possess nuclear weapons. In this respect I think that would be useful for us to learn.

So again, we very much share the hopes that have been expressed by others that it will be possible to move our work forward to enable us to actually do what we should be doing. Clearly there will be a balancing of the various issues, all of which, as I say, are of primary importance to New Zealand. There will be a balancing of issues required, but it is simply not practicable to talk about negotiating at the same time these four issues. I think we need to be quite realistic about this, and I think we need to be quite realistic about the level of resources that all members of the CD - and all of us will want to participate thoroughly, deeply, energetically and in good faith in these negotiations - we simply cannot do them all at the same time.

The PRESIDENT (spoke in French): I thank Ambassador Mackay for his statement and his kind words addressed to the Chair. I now give the floor to the distinguished representative of Brazil, Mr. da Rocha Paranhos.

Mr. da ROCHA PARANHOS (Brazil) (spoke in French): Mr. President, first of all, I would like to assure you of the full support of the delegation of Brazil.

(spoke in English)

Turning to English, I would like once again to praise the excellent work done by our colleague Elisabet Borsiin Bonnier in trying to find consensus around the proposal on L.1, plus the complementary statement and the draft decision on the two documents.

(Mr. da Rocha Paranhos, Brazil)

I have no prepared speech, but the reason I have requested the floor is given by the reference that was made to a Brazilian statement at the United Nations General Assembly. We effectively give a lot of importance to the four core issues that have been discussed here at the CD for years now, but we have always indicated here at the CD, at least during the four years during which I have been in Geneva, that we are flexible on the way to handle these four issues.

As you know, in the year 2000, our present Minister for Foreign Affairs, Ambassador Celso Amorim, in his second term as Ambassador here in Geneva, presented as President of the CD the text that is conceived now and presented as the "Amorim proposal". In that document, there has never been a reference to the same or equal treatment of the four core issues. The same applies to the first version and to the revised version of the five Ambassadors' proposal. We have always indicated flexibility in the sense that we have never asked for the immediate negotiation of the four core issues at the same time. Obviously this would cause, as our colleague from New Zealand has just recalled, a serious strain to all delegations. We may have different priorities, obviously, and for Brazil, as well as New Zealand, as a member of the New Agenda Coalition, nuclear disarmament is a key priority issue. But we know that the conditions are riper for the start of negotiations on a treaty on fissile material.

With regard to the scope of this treaty, obviously Brazil is totally in favour of the Shannon mandate, and we do want to see it in the negotiation of this treaty, a negotiation on verification and stockpiles. But the question is that we have to show political flexibility, and after 10 years of no work, no negotiations, in this forum, we have taken the political decision to support the L.1 document, because we think that this is the right way to proceed. That does not prevent us - and we have indicated it many times - that does not prevent us from having not only substantive discussions, but to find a way to find consensus on negotiations on other issues on our agenda, on the other of the four issues for us.

But invoking now that we have to have a clear definition on negotiations of the four issues, or that we have to start negotiations at once and, let us say, in parallel with the four core issues, is really a way perhaps not to engage in any negotiations whatsoever. And this is a source of concern to my delegation.

So I wanted to make this point of clarification, because I think that it is important that we here at the CD, after so many years of inaction, firmly show political commitment.

The PRESIDENT (spoke in French): I thank the representative of Brazil for his kind words addressed to the Chair. Does any other delegation wish to take the floor at this stage? I give the floor to the distinguished representative of Pakistan.

Ms. JANJUA (Pakistan): I would just like to make two points, one with regard to our comments regarding the inclusion of stocks and verification. What we said - and I shall just repeat it - Pakistan's clear concerns about the global security implications about the text are evident from the fact that we insist on the inclusion of stocks and verification in paragraph 2 of L.1. So that is what we are suggesting. And we believe that that is possible because there has been agreement on the Shannon mandate, and under the Shannon mandate, there was a clear

(Ms. Janjua, Pakistan)

understanding on verification and an understanding on stocks as well, and therefore, we do not see how it was not considered at that time when the Shannon mandate was adopted as prejudging the process and is now being considered as one. That is the first point.

The second point I wanted to make was with regard to our raising the four core issues. The intention to raise the four core issues was not, as the distinguished Ambassador of Brazil said, to reflect reluctance to start work, but just to indicate that these are also priorities for us. While it does not mean that work cannot start on all four issues, we understand that it is difficult for smaller delegations to undertake such work. But we are a small delegation as well, and we feel that we can start work on all four issues. We will be able to come to some agreements in some areas. Work may progress faster in some areas, while it might proceed slowly in others. Therefore, it does not mean that it locks anyone in to all four issues, slowing down the process, but allowing the process perhaps - there may be speed in one area, and therefore would allow work, as I said, to continue fast in one area.

That is the only point I wanted to make, and it is not misunderstood that our reference to the four areas in any way means that we intend to impede the work. We in fact want to list our priorities and why we feel that the work can start in these four areas.

The PRESIDENT: Thank you for your clarification. Is there any other delegation that wants to take the floor now?

(spoke in French)

It seems not. Today's is the last plenary meeting of the second part of the 2007 session, and, as announced at the previous plenary meeting, on 26 June 2007, we still have one task to accomplish. Under the organizational framework for our work for this year, we must assess the progress accomplished during weeks 11 to 16 (the second part of the session, from 14 May to 29 June 2007) and schedule our activities for weeks 18 to 21. Therefore I am going to present the Presidential report on the second part of the 2007 session. This follows report CD/1820, which was presented to you for the first part. I will also ask the secretariat to issue this report, with its three annexes, as an official document of the Conference. I will now read out the report in English.

(spoke in English)

“Presidential report to the Conference on Disarmament on part II of the 2007 session.

“By the end of part I of the 2007 session a presidential draft decision CD/2007/L.1 (see annex II of this report) was on the table. The Presidential assessment of part I of the 2007 session is contained in document CD/1820.

“During the inter-sessional period between part I and II, and bearing in mind the possibility of convening a special session of the Conference according to the rules of

(The President)

procedure, the incumbent President, Ambassador Sarala Fernando of Sri Lanka, conducted consultations based on CD/2007/L.1, with a view to bringing the conference closer to an agreement on taking up substantive work.

“At the beginning of part II, on 15 May 2007, the incumbent President announced that the Presidency would continue consultations with regard to ascertaining the readiness of member States to move forward towards a decision on document CD/2007/L.1.

“In the plenary meeting of 5 June 2007, the incumbent President, Ambassador Elisabet Borsini Bonnier of Sweden, assessed that it would be worthwhile to make a serious attempt to address the issues involved in CD/2007/L.1 through a complementary presidential statement. To that end, a number of informal open-ended consultations by the President were held.

“Based on these open-ended informal consultations with members of the Conference, a ‘Complementary Presidential Statement Reflecting an Understanding of the Conference on the Implementation of CD/2007/L.1’, contained in document CD/2007/CRP.5 (see annex III to this report), was submitted to the Conference on 14 June 2007. In response to requests for clarification on the interrelationship between the Complementary Presidential Statement (CD/2007/CRP.5) and document CD/2007/L.1, a Draft Decision by the Conference (see annex I to this report) was also proposed.

“In his message to the Conference on Disarmament of 14 June 2007, the Secretary-General of the United Nations urged the CD to take forward the vital work of the Conference in a spirit of compromise and accommodation. Adoption of the Presidential Draft Decision, supplemented if necessary in such a way as to overcome any reservations, would, in his view, have a positive impact on the international security atmosphere.

“On 21 June 2007, the President tried to establish whether there were any delegations which, at that point in time, were not in a position to go along with a consensus to begin substantive work on the basis of the three documents taken together (CD/2007/L.1, CD/2007/CRP.5 and the Draft Decision by the Conference). The President concluded that the situation was clear: Some capitals needed more time, which should be given. The documents remained on the table.

“The seven Co-ordinators on agenda items 1 to 7, as appointed by the P-6 and as listed in paragraph 1 of CD/1820, did not preside over further meetings during part II of the 2007 session. Yet, throughout part II, they remained ready to preside over work under the authority of the Conference or the P-6 and continued to fulfil their mandate. The seven Co-ordinators continue to stand by in order to work under the authority of the Conference or the P-6, if so decided.

“The above has given ground for the assessment that:

“(a) a momentum has been created to move the Conference on Disarmament out of its longstanding stalemate, based on the three annexed documents;

(The President)

“(b) a wide range of delegations support the proposal based on the draft mandates contained in CD/2007/L.1 in combination with the other two documents; some delegations, though they have some concerns about certain elements in the proposal, would not oppose consensus on it; others need more time for their capitals to decide whether they could go along with a consensus along these lines;

“(c) there still is valuable time available for the implementation of CD/2007/L.1, if agreed upon, during part III of the current session and that no effort should be spared to adopt a programme of work by consensus.”

And finally -

“In view of the above, the incumbent President, Ambassador Jürg Streuli of Switzerland, will undertake further consultations during the inter-sessional period between part II and III, based on the three documents contained in annex I, II and III of this report, with a view to reaching an agreement by the Conference early in the first week of Part III of the 2007 session.

“Annexes

“I. Draft Decision by the Conference

“II. CD/2007/L.1

“III. CD/2007/CRP.5”

- which are integral parts of this declaration.

As was the case for the report on part 1, I kindly ask the secretariat to issue this Presidential report on part 2, including the three annexes, as an official document of the Conference. So it is well noted.

Is there any other delegation that wishes to take the floor now? That is not the case.

So, before we leave this room for the summer break, there is still one more detail I would like to recall concerning document CD/2007/L.1.

My predecessors have made it very clear that CD/2007/L.1, taken together with the schedule of activities, will constitute a programme of work for the 2007 session, and as you are all well aware, we will conclude our work during part 2 of our session today. You may also recall that the coordinators, according to paragraphs 1-4 of L.1, would have to report to the Conference on Disarmament “before the conclusion of the second part of the current session”. The same applies to the kind of coordinators mentioned in the complementary Presidential statement which is contained in CD/2007/L.1.

(The President)

For reasons of practicality, I have asked the secretariat to arrange a reissue of CD/2007/L.1. The four words “of the second part” will simply be deleted in the second sentence of paragraphs 1, 2, 3 and 4, as well as in the complementary Presidential statement which is contained in L.1. Therefore, the second sentence in the paragraphs concerned will now read as follows: “The Coordinator shall present a report to the Conference on Disarmament on the progress of work before the conclusion of the current session.” I will repeat this phrase: “The Coordinator shall present a report to the Conference on Disarmament on the progress of work before the conclusion of the current session.”

We are now at the end of part 2 of the 2007 session. This part has moved the Conference significantly forward, but not yet decisively. At this point, I would only like to wish all of you an excellent summer break, and I am convinced I will see you back in this room in four weeks, full of energy and ready to overcome the remaining obstacles.

If there is no other delegation that would like to take the floor - Pakistan, you have the floor.

Ms. JANJUA (Pakistan): Mr. President, we notice that you have made amendments to L.1, so it just goes to prove that the document is not sacrosanct and can be discussed and amended.

The PRESIDENT: What I did was reissuing for practical reasons. If we had kept the wording of the document as it is, it would have been total nonsense, and so it is not an amended text but a reissuing for practical reasons.

The meeting is closed.

The meeting rose at 11.10 a.m.