

# CONFERENCE ON DISARMAMENT

CD/PV.1115  
26 August 2008

ENGLISH

---

## FINAL RECORD OF THE ONE THOUSAND ONE HUNDRED AND FIFTEENTH PLENARY MEETING

Held at the Palais des Nations, Geneva,  
on Tuesday, 26 August 2008, at 10.15 a.m.

President: Mr. German MUNDARAÍN HERNÁNDEZ (Venezuela)

The PRESIDENT (spoke in Spanish): I declare open the 1115th plenary meeting of the Conference on Disarmament. I think I will be reflecting the feeling of the Conference on Disarmament if I express a warm welcome to participants in this year's United Nations disarmament fellowships programme who are observing the proceedings of today's plenary meeting. I am sure they will benefit from this experience and also from the lectures on the work of the Conference. Welcome, and I wish you all success.

Before giving the floor to speakers for today's meeting, I would like to take this opportunity on behalf of the Conference and on my own behalf to bid farewell to our distinguished colleague, Ambassador Chang Dong-hee from the Republic of Korea, whose term in Geneva is about to come to an end. On behalf of the Conference and on my own behalf, I would like to convey to the Ambassador our deep appreciation for his many valuable contributions to our endeavours during his tenure, as well as our sincere wishes for success and satisfaction in his new assignment. I would also like to take advantage of the presence of Ambassador Eric Danon, the new Permanent Representative of the French Republic who is with us, to express our welcome to him and to wish him every success.

I shall now read the presidential report to the Conference on Disarmament on Part III of the 2008 session: "The presidential assessments of Part I and Part II of the 2008 session are contained in documents CD/1841 and CD/1845 respectively. This report covers the inter-sessional period between Parts II and III of the 2008 session as well as the first five weeks of Part III. During the inter-sessional period between Parts II and III, the incumbent President, Ambassador Christina Rocca of the United States, conducted consultations with a view to bringing the Conference closer to a consensus on document CD/1840. At the beginning of Part III, the incumbent President announced that she would continue her consultations with a view to bringing the Conference closer to an agreement on taking up substantive work. On 29 July, Ambassador Christina Rocca of the United States proposed, on behalf of the 2008 Presidents, to begin one additional informal session on each of the seven agenda items, to be led by the agenda item coordinators, for the purpose of refreshing the Conference's understanding of the issues and to advance the prospect of consensus on CD/1840. Subsequently, Mr. Alejandro Rogers, representing Ambassador Carlos Portales of Chile, held one informal meeting on 31 July 2008 on agenda item 1, entitled 'Cessation of the nuclear arms race' and agenda item 2, 'Prevention of nuclear war, including all related matters', with a general focus on nuclear disarmament; Ambassador Sumio Tarui of Japan held one informal meeting on 31 July 2008 on agenda item 1, 'Cessation of the nuclear arms race' and agenda item 2, 'Prevention of nuclear war, including all related matters', with a general focus on the prohibition of the production of fissile material for nuclear weapons and other nuclear explosive devices; Ambassador Marius Grinius of Canada held one informal meeting on 5 August 2008 on agenda item 3, entitled 'Prevention of an arms race in outer space'; Ambassador Babacar Carlos Mbaye of Senegal held one informal meeting on 7 August 2008 on agenda item 4, entitled 'Effective international agreements to assure non-nuclear-weapon States against the use or threat of use of nuclear weapons'; Mr. Ivan Gospodinov, representing Ambassador Petko Draganov of Bulgaria, held one informal meeting on 7 August 2008 on agenda item 5, entitled 'New types of

(The President)

weapons of mass destruction and new systems of such weapons; radiological weapons'; Ambassador Dayan Jayatilleka of Sri Lanka held one informal meeting on 12 August 2008 on agenda item 6, entitled 'Comprehensive programme of disarmament', and Ambassador Wesaka Puja of Indonesia held one informal meeting on 12 August on agenda item 7, entitled 'Transparency in armaments'. On 13 August 2008, the coordinators reported orally to the 2008 Presidents on this latest round of informal meetings.

The presidential proposal contained in document CD/1840 continued to generate support among a substantial number of delegations but did not achieve consensus. Some delegations, though they had some concerns about certain elements in the proposal, said that they would not oppose consensus on it and other delegations stated they had concerns that the proposal would not satisfy their expectations. Nonetheless, significant progress was achieved on further elaborating the agenda items and advancing the prospect for reaching agreement on a programme of work.

During the presidency of Venezuela, intensive consultations continued on document CD/1840. Furthermore, also under its presidency the Conference proceeded with the consideration of the report of the 2008 session to the United Nations General Assembly."

I should now like to turn to the list of speakers for today's meeting. For today's meeting, our first speaker will be the Republic of Korea. I give the floor to Ambassador Chang Dong-hee.

Mr. CHANG (Republic of Korea): First of all, I would like to express my sincere thanks to you, Mr. President, for the kind words extended to me on the occasion of my departure. As this is the first time for me to take the floor under your presidency, I would like to congratulate you on your assumption of the presidency of the 2008 Conference on Disarmament. I would also like to express my heartfelt appreciation to Ambassador Rocca, the outgoing President, and to all the other 2008 Presidents for their hard work in trying to create a common approach to re-energize the CD in the face of more than 10 years of stalemate. I can say confidently that all your efforts will bring meaningful rewards at the end of the third session when we produce a well-balanced report, which will serve as a solid basis for a successful beginning of next year's work.

We had a very useful and fruitful discussion on CD/1840 at the last plenary meeting. Although we witnessed once again that some delegations still have some reservations about some of the issues related to the FMCT and other agenda items, I still believe we can discuss those issues in a serious manner once we embark on negotiations. The fact that there is no precondition in CD/1840 implies that the scope of negotiations and discussions is broad enough to leave the door open for delegations to pursue their priorities and raise any issues deemed important to them during the process. CD/1840 contains well-crafted elements from which we can move forward to fulfil the mandate of the CD as the sole multilateral disarmament negotiation forum. What counts most at this moment is our genuine will to cope with the challenges before us.

(Mr. Chang, Republic of Korea)

CD/1840 is not a surprising product which burst on the scene unexpectedly. Rather, it is the outcome of the tireless efforts of the presidency to gather extensive opinions and ideas from all delegations engaged in the discussions, based upon the so-called P6 mechanism which was initiated in 2006. The initiative of the P6 platform has, without a doubt, made a significant contribution to increasing the consistency and intensity of the discussions in the CD, building momentum to move the CD forward out of its long-standing stalemate. As a member of the 2006 P6 who initiated the new framework, I am pleased to note that the P6 mechanism has enjoyed wide support from member States and has been succeeded by the 2007 and 2008 presidencies.

Although the position of the Republic of Korea on the four core agenda items of the CD has been expressed several times in this room, I would like once again briefly to reiterate our position.

First, the Republic of Korea believes that FMCT is the issue that is the ripest for negotiation in the CD. An FMCT can be a building block for nuclear disarmament and nuclear non-proliferation given the delayed entry into force of the CTBT. Moreover, FMCT negotiations would reinforce mutual trust and reaffirm our commitment to multilateral disarmament.

Second, on nuclear disarmament, the structured debates have revealed that transparency, irreversibility and verifiability should be the guiding principles of nuclear disarmament. While pursuing a pragmatic, realistic and step-by-step approach, we need to discuss a range of issues, such as nuclear doctrine and policy, operational status, reduction and verification. The Republic of Korea supports the concept of negative security assurances as a useful means of reducing the sense of insecurity of non-nuclear-weapon States. I believe that the nuclear-weapon States should provide credible security assurances, especially to non-nuclear-weapon States that faithfully meet their NPT and safeguards obligations.

Third, the Republic of Korea, as one of the countries which is actively pursuing a peaceful space programme, views space security, including the prevention of an arms race in outer space, as an important issue of great relevance for the CD. In this regard, we welcome the draft PPWT which was submitted by the Russian Federation and China this year as meaningful input for the substantive discussions in the CD on the agenda item PAROS. We also believe that transparency and confidence-building measures are highly important elements in building multilateral cooperation on the peaceful use of outer space, and those two approaches of PPWT and TCBM can complement each other in attaining the goal of the peaceful use of outer space.

Fourth, my delegation believes that all four core issues are too important to be abandoned. However, as was pointed out by Ambassador Don MacKay of New Zealand at the last plenary, it is neither realistic nor possible to begin negotiations on the four core issues simultaneously.

Many people in and outside the CD are questioning the effectiveness and the capability of the CD in coping with the emerging security threats to the international community. The

(Mr. Chang, Republic of Korea)

numerous attempts to resolve the impasse have yielded few prospects for success and caused frustration among those who have expressed strong hopes and a determination to revitalize the CD. Some people who are pessimistic about the future of the CD often find the root causes of the current stalemate inside the Conference itself.

A prominent civil servant, Lord Hankey, said in his book, Diplomacy by Conference, that “the most important elements of diplomacy by conference are elasticity of procedure, small numbers, informality, mutual acquaintance and, if possible, personal friendship among the principals, a proper perspective between secrecy in deliberations and publicity in results, reliable secretaries and interpreters. The more delicate the subject, the more essential are those conditions”. His words explain precisely why I believe in the prominent and promising role of the CD in the disarmament field and why I advocate its value as being too dear to be thrown away like an old hat. The CD, which is composed of a relatively small number of member States, compared with other disarmament machinery, has all the characteristics pointed out by Lord Hankey, except “elasticity of procedure”, which does not apply to the consensus-based rule of procedure here in the CD. However, I strongly believe that if we could add a little more flexibility to our discussions, it would have a more significant impact on the viability of future instruments and build deeper trust among the member States than elastic procedures.

In a few days I will be leaving Geneva, but I assure you that my successor and my colleagues will continue to support you and will take part constructively in the discussions in this august Council chamber. Thanks to telecommunication technology, I will be able to watch and listen to the discussions in this room on a real-time basis. In my new post, I will look forward to hearing any good news from this room and its success in facilitating the renaissance of disarmament and non-proliferation. I sincerely hope that that day will come sooner rather than later.

Lastly, I would like to thank all the colleagues here, the staff of the Secretariat and the interpreters, who have made my stay in Geneva a memorable one, and wish them all success in the important tasks ahead.

The PRESIDENT (spoke in Spanish): Thank you very much, Ambassador Chang Dong-hee. Thank you for your support and thank you for your kind words addressed to the presidency.

Continuing with the list of speakers, the next speaker on my list is a State non-member of the Conference. I propose to give that State the floor. I give the floor to Ambassador Giorgi Gorgiladze of Georgia.

Mr. GORGILADZE (Georgia): I would like to take this opportunity to update the distinguished Conference on Disarmament on the current situation in Georgia, as it was the subject of discussion during the meeting last week.

Speaking in legal terms, Georgia has been subjected to full-scale military aggression by the Russian Federation in violation of the principles and rules of the Charter of the United Nations, including the prohibition of the use of force among States and respect for the sovereignty and

(Mr. Gorgiladze, Georgia)

territorial integrity of Georgia. It was rather disgraceful when the Russian Federation used the so-called violation of the rights of Ossetians in Georgia as a pretext for its unlawful acts. I will not engage in the debate regarding the justifications employed by the Russian Federation as grounds for its act of aggression, but merely note that in general terms the international community does not approve of any recourse to the use of force for the so-called “protection of citizens/nationals abroad”, as it contradicts the principles of the Charter of the United Nations and lacks any legitimacy without Security Council authorization. Ironically, the Russian Federation has never pursued any international mechanism as the proper arena for discussion of its concerns, even if one could argue that there is legitimate reasoning behind Russia’s argument. Russia’s justification suspiciously stands out after the massive passportization conducted in Abkhazia, Georgia, and South Ossetia, Georgia, and represents a violation of the principles of sovereignty and good neighbourliness. It further calls into question the true purpose and motives of such intervention, especially without any prior appeal to the international community in the matter.

As for the massive scale of deaths among civilians in the Tskhinvali Region of Georgia, as argued by the Russian Federation as another legal ground for the justification of intervention, this fact has not been confirmed either by international human rights organizations such as Human Rights Watch or by the Russian law enforcement authorities. It is unfortunate that there were civilian casualties in the course of the conduct of hostilities and we do mourn for those civilians, as the loss of any civilian life in a situation of armed conflict is a tragic event.

It is most unfortunate that the civilian population throughout Georgia became a direct victim of the aggressive acts of the Russian Federation. In particular, the Russian armed forces have acted in breach of the major principles governing means and methods of warfare under international humanitarian law. These violations have continued even after the ceasefire agreement that was brokered by the President of France, Mr. Sarkozy, acting in the capacity of European Union President, was signed by the Presidents from both sides: Georgia and the Russian Federation, on 15-16 August 2008. On 23 August, only after one week of military occupation of part of the territory of Georgia, the Russian authorities announced their pull-out from the territories of Georgia proper. However, it has been done only partly. As of today, Russian forces occupy the territories of Georgia, going beyond the conflict zone of the Tskhinvali Region of Georgia, namely the city of Poti, 300 kilometres from that region. Apart from the fact that Russia’s behaviour represents a manifest violation of the ceasefire agreement, the situation has further deteriorated as a result of acts of looting, pillage and the destruction of property, the detention of the civilian population and their inhuman treatment, summary executions and hostage-taking by the Russian armed forces as well as in the territories falling under their control.

When speaking of the violation of the means and methods of warfare, it seems that the principle of humanity that guided Fyodor Martens during the drafting of the treaties on international humanitarian law has been forgotten by the current Russian authorities. In the course of the last two weeks, civilian objects (cities, hospitals, academic facilities, churches) throughout Georgia have been subjected to military attacks in violation of the principle of distinction. While leaving parts of the occupied territory of Georgia, the Russian armed forces left mined railroads, civilian infrastructure and public offices that per se do not qualify as

(Mr. Gorgiladze, Georgia)

military objects under the relevant rules of humanitarian law. The acts were rather directed at increasing the humanitarian crisis, developing economic restraints and terrorizing the ordinary civilian population.

I particularly would like to draw the attention of the Conference to the use of cluster munitions and other types of means of warfare having indiscriminate effects on the civilian population by the Russian armed forces. In particular, the Russian armed forces have extensively used [and left] two “Iskander” 9M72 missile systems (reporting name SS-26 Stone) short-range tactical ballistic missiles, “Tochka-U” missile systems, “Grad” and “Uraqau” multiple-launch rocket systems and various modified versions of cluster munitions (including RBK-250).

A large amount of unexploded ordnance and anti-personnel mines has been left, often on purpose, on roads, meadows and farms, resulting in civilian casualties on a daily basis. The existing situation has grave consequences for hundreds of thousands of internally displaced persons who have been willing to return to their places of permanent residence.

Apart from the civilian objects and civilian population, the Russian armed forces have targeted Georgia’s environment, bombarding with incendiary munitions the mountainous regions of Borjomi and the settlement of Tsemi. Broad areas of timberland have been set on fire. Several hundred hectares of unique flora, including the protected plant species of the National Park, were burned to the ground in violation of Protocol III to the CCW.

Today, as I speak, we are still waiting for the Russian Government to adhere to the ceasefire agreement, act in good faith and leave the territories of Georgia occupied by its armed forces. In that respect, we appeal to all members of the international community to support the internationalization of the problem-solution and confidence-building process, with the active participation of all relevant international organizations and mechanisms.

The timeline and information regarding the civilian objects subject to attacks and bombardment have been enclosed with this statement, and photos of cluster munitions are available from the secretariat.

The PRESIDENT (spoke in Spanish): Thank you, Ambassador Gorgiladze, for your statement and information. I give the floor to Ambassador Masood Khan of Pakistan.

Mr. KHAN (Pakistan): We welcome the young disarmament fellows who are observing our proceedings today to the CD chamber.

I am making this statement in anticipation of the consultations on the draft report of the Conference to the United Nations General Assembly.

We know that you, Mr. President, your delegation and the secretariat have been working hard on the first draft. We thank you for the effort you have made. Consultations and negotiations on the report will require careful handling. We are confident that under your guidance and leadership we will be able to work towards the adoption of a balanced report by consensus. The Conference has sufficient guidance and expertise for report-writing. We also

(Mr. Khan, Pakistan)

have the advantage of good precedents, because the CD has been presenting its reports year after year. We will read the first draft carefully, and present our views, comments, and amendments, wherever required, at the next formal plenary. During that session, we will also comment on the presidential report of the Conference issued by you today. At this stage, I would restrict myself to the general parameters and principles which have been guiding our discussions on the report.

In accordance with rule 45 of the rules of procedure, the report should be factual and reflect the negotiations and work of the Conference. This year no negotiations have taken place, but the CD has been working in both formal and informal settings and proposals have been made about the programme of work. The report should reflect diverse viewpoints, including substantive reservations expressed during plenary meetings, and capture convergences and divergences. Evaluations, if agreed, could be made once and effectively. Repetition, selective quotation and negative characterizations need to be avoided. The report should not be interpretative. It should not give value judgements that would entail substantive negotiations due to varying interpretations of the content. It should not be used as a tool for discussion on the programme of work or to place lopsided emphasis on one theme or issue, or to seek legitimacy for interim, ad hoc measures taken for practical and functional reasons. For all these issues, we need independent space for conscious, collective decisions. We must bear in mind that every year the Conference adopts its agenda and makes fresh efforts to reach consensus on a programme of work. The report will be a negotiated document. We have full confidence in your wisdom and skills in holding these negotiations in an open and transparent manner. Wherever we have difficulties in reaching a consensus, we can draw upon past precedents.

Substantial activities have taken place in the CD during this year. We commend the six Presidents for their drive, resolve and hard work to breathe new life into the CD. In 2009, replication and emulation of the new work ethic, the new impulse, and high standards of professionalism demonstrated by them and indeed the Conference will be a success in itself. Next year, early in the session, we should resolve differences over key issues and commence negotiations.

Lastly, I would like to take this opportunity to bid farewell to Ambassador Chang Dong-hee. First, congratulations are in order because of his new ambassadorial assignment, though he is temporarily moving out of the multilateral arena. We would remember him for his balanced, wise and prudent diplomatic posture. He has always presented and defended his brief with conviction and compelling reasoning. Time and again he has been a catalyst for agreement and consensus. We wish him well and we wish him success. The warmth of my tribute to the Ambassador should not be construed as an endorsement of his statement in regard to CD/1840.

We also welcome Ambassador Eric Danon, who has joined us today.

The PRESIDENT (spoke in Spanish): Thank you, Ambassador Khan, for your views, your contribution and for your encouraging words addressed to the presidency. The delegation of the Russian Federation has asked for the floor. I give the floor to Ambassador Valery Loschinin.



Mr. LOSCHININ (Russian Federation) (spoke in Russian): First of all, I would like to avail myself of this opportunity to once again, and for far from the first time, extend my best wishes to our friend, the Ambassador of Korea, Mr. Chang Dong-hee, for his further diplomatic endeavours and to welcome the new Ambassador of France. I would like to reaffirm that we are open to joint work and hope that that work will yield us good results.

With respect to the topic of the situation in South Ossetia, which has been raised once again, I would like to comment on a few things. Colleagues must be aware of the true picture unfolding in South Ossetia and Abkhazia, for around it there are, it must be admitted, torrents of lies and disinformation flowing from the mouths of the leadership of Georgia, President Saakashvili and widely disseminated by numerous mass media.

Attempts are being made to portray the Georgian-South Ossetian and Georgian-Abkhazian conflict as a conflict between Georgia and Russia. What is being ignored here are history, the facts and the whole chain of events that took place after the first President of independent Georgia, Zviad Gamsakhurdia, in 1992, after the collapse of the USSR, proclaimed "Georgia for Georgians" as his policy objective and subsequently started aggressive military actions against the South Ossetians and Abkhazians. Those actions were, of course, aimed at destroying these peoples. I have to point out that in modern times Georgia has only been an independent State for 20 years: from 1918 to 1921 and then from 1991 to the present. And it has to be said that every time Georgia has acquired independent status, it has immediately used every possible opportunity to crush and destroy the small peoples of its own country. During these 20 years, it has attacked the Abkhazians and Ossetians nine times. The culmination of this kind of policy was the aggression unleashed by Georgia against the people of South Ossetia during the night of 7-8 August 2008.

Some western media, political scientists, even some western governments and NATO are trying to present the aggressor as the victim, to whitewash and save the failed regime in Tbilisi. They are taking steps to rearm Georgia even though everyone has already been able to see what arming and rearming the aggressor leads to. It is clear that the leadership of Georgia is purchasing arms - and not only is it buying them, they are being supplied as if for charitable purposes - not for defence, far from it, but for the continuation of its attempts to resolve its problems through forcible methods - the problems that it itself is creating. This approach derives from the recent statement by NATO Foreign Ministers in Brussels. Instead of condemning the aggressor, NATO took the defence of this criminal regime. They tried to lay all the sins at Moscow's door, threatening to break off cooperation with Russia. President Dmitry Medvedev has spoken out quite clearly on this subject. Yesterday, for example, he said, and I quote: "We have been consistently developing our relations with NATO for a long time. We would like those relations to be fully-fledged and relations of partnership. But we do not want illusions of partnership: when they surround us on all sides with bases and draw more and more countries into the North Atlantic bloc and tell us, 'Don't worry, everything is alright'. Of course we don't like this, especially when faced with restrictive acts like those that have taken place recently. We did not provoke those acts and we did not want them. But speaking seriously, it is the States members of the North Atlantic Alliance, not the Russian Federation, that are primarily interested

(Mr. Loschinin, Russian Federation)

in this cooperation, the cooperation between Russia and NATO. And if they in NATO in essence break off this cooperation, nothing terrible would come of it for us. We are ready to take any decisions, up to and including terminating relations completely. Although that would, of course, be the most difficult turn of events. I just hope that our partners will think about this”.

The continuing attempts to block the adoption of a Security Council resolution in support of the six principles elaborated by Presidents Medvedev and Sarkozy are the next step in this sequence of an unobjective, biased approach to the situation.

Georgia’s aggression against the peaceful citizens of South Ossetia and the attack on Russian peacekeepers, which cost many lives - all this showed that Russia’s historical role as a guarantor of security in the Caucasus is now objectively increasing. The Russian military operation to compel the Saakashvili regime to peace was an appropriate and legitimate response to obvious aggression. The people of South Ossetia and Abkhazia see Russia as a protector and a guarantor of their safe development, and that is why yesterday, 25 August 2008, the State Duma and the Federation Council, the lower and upper chambers of the Russian parliament, responding to the requests by the peoples of South Ossetia and Abkhazia, unanimously - and I stress unanimously, even though a variety of parties of differing persuasions and trends are represented there - unanimously adopted an appeal to the President of the Russian Federation and the parliaments of other countries to recognize the independence of the Republic of South Ossetia and the Republic of Abkhazia. The real threat of genocide of the peoples of these republics by Georgia makes that decision topical, timely and legitimate. Now this question is being reviewed by the executive authority, the President of the Russian Federation.

At the same time it is of fundamental importance to distinguish between Russia’s relations with the current Georgian regime and with the Georgian people. Politicians come and go, but peoples stay. We are convinced that soon, and there are already signals pointing in that direction, the Georgian people will, with its inherent wisdom, make its own accurate assessment of the criminal actions of the ruling regime under Saakashvili, who personally bears full responsibility for the tragedy and must answer in full to the Ossetians, the Abkhazians, his own people and the international community.

Regarding the criticisms there have been of Russia for excessive and indiscriminate use of force, the answer I can give to that is as follows: “excessive” use of force is the use against children, women and old people in South Ossetia of “Grad” multiple-launch rocket systems (which, as is well known, do not hit individual targets - something of which we have already spoken - but entire areas), the use of heavy artillery against peaceful populations, the use of mortars, aerial bombs and tanks. By its actions Russia forced Georgia to stop its aggression and return its warriors to barracks. Although in this respect Tbilisi is still far from fulfilling its obligations under the six principles.

Regarding Georgia’s far-fetched accusations of indiscriminate use of weapons by Russian military personnel against Georgian civilians and of breaches of the Inhumane Weapons Convention, I would like to say the following. There exists for the professional discussion of

(Mr. Loschinin, Russian Federation)

these issues a specialized forum of the Inhumane Weapons Convention. There we will talk separately, there we will provide the figures and facts concerning what really happened. And what do those facts show? The total number of fatalities among the peaceful population of South Ossetia as a result of the barbarous acts of the Georgian military exceeds 2,000. These are the latest figures and they emphasize and show that this was a planned action to annihilate a peaceful population. I repeat that properly prepared facts will be provided to the international community. That should prove who really used inhumane weapons, who attacked peaceful cities and villages. That is ethnic cleansing, a crime against humanity, a war crime of the regime in Tbilisi. We must call a spade a spade. It was the leadership of Georgia that unleashed aggression, it was the leadership of Georgia that carried out ethnic cleansing and pursued a policy of genocide. Russia basically saved the people of South Ossetia from genocide, and thereby prevented a still worse turn of events in Transcaucasia.

The PRESIDENT (spoke in Spanish): Thank you, Ambassador Loschinin. There are no further speakers on my list. Does any other delegation wish to take the floor? The representative of Georgia has the floor.

Mr. KAPANADZE (Georgia): We are not going to make a reply to the cynical statement made by the Russian Federation. Georgia has expressed its position concerning the current situation in my country. It is a reality. What was said by the Ambassador of Georgia is all true.

The PRESIDENT (spoke in Spanish): Thank you for your statement. We have no further speakers on our list. Let me repeat, does any other delegation have an interest in speaking? Apparently not.

On other items, as is noted in the organizational framework for the Venezuelan presidency, I have the pleasure to introduce the draft report of the 2008 session of the Conference to the General Assembly of the United Nations at its sixty-third session. In accordance with rule 44 of the rules of procedure, I have prepared the draft report with the assistance of the secretariat. Also, as provided in rule 45, the draft report is factual and reflects the work of the Conference during its 2008 session. The draft report takes into account the work of the Conference up to 20 August 2008, which was the day of its finalization and submission for processing. The secretariat will fill in the blank spaces in the draft report in due course. Also, I would like to remind you that all documents submitted before the adoption of the report will be included. The draft report, which is contained in document CD/WP.550, will be distributed in English in this room to all delegations following the adjournment of this meeting. It will be available in all official languages also in the mailboxes on the first floor. This concludes our business for today. The next plenary meeting of the Conference will be held on Tuesday, 2 September at 10 a.m. At that time, we shall proceed with the first reading of the draft report in an informal setting. It is recommended that delegations remain seated to receive the draft report as distributed.

The meeting rose at noon.