

CONFERENCE ON DISARMAMENT (CD)

Established: 1979

Membership: 65 States—Algeria, Argentina, Australia, Austria, Bangladesh, Belarus, Belgium, Brazil, Bulgaria, Cameroon, Canada, Chile, China, Colombia, Cuba, Democratic People’s Republic of Korea, Democratic Republic of the Congo, Ecuador, Egypt, Ethiopia, Finland, France, Germany, Hungary, India, Indonesia, Iran, Iraq, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Japan, Kazakhstan, Kenya, Malaysia, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Myanmar, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nigeria, Norway, Pakistan, Peru, Poland, Republic of Korea, Romania, Russian Federation, Senegal, Slovak Republic, South Africa, Spain, Sri Lanka, Sweden, Switzerland, Syrian Arab Republic, Tunisia, Turkey, Ukraine, United Kingdom, United States, Venezuela, Viet Nam, and Zimbabwe. (Responding to a request from Serbia and Montenegro [the former Yugoslavia], the Conference decided to remove a nameplate of Yugoslavia as Member State. Instead, all the republics of the former Yugoslavia are invited to join as observers.)

Observers: 37 States (2008 session)

Background: Formed in 1979 as the single multilateral disarmament negotiating forum of the international community after agreement was reached among Member States during the first special session of the UN General Assembly (UNGA) devoted to disarmament (1978). The CD is the successor to the Ten-Nation Committee on Disarmament (TNDC), Geneva, 1960; the Eighteen-Nation Committee on Disarmament (ENDC), Geneva, 1962-68; and the Conference of the Committee on Disarmament (CCD), Geneva, 1969-78.

As originally constituted, the CD had 40 members; however, following the unification of Germany and the breakup of the former Yugoslavia, only 38 countries participated in the work of the Conference until 1995. On 17 June 1995, the CD unanimously decided to admit 23 additional members.

The CD has a special relationship with the [United Nations](#). It adopts its own rules of procedure and its own agenda, taking into account the recommendations made by the UNGA and the proposals presented by its members. It reports to the General Assembly annually or more frequently, as appropriate. The budget of the CD is included in that of the United Nations, and the CD meets on UN premises and is

served by UN personnel. The Conference conducts its work by consensus. The CD has a permanent agenda that was agreed upon in 1978 at the first special session of the UNGA devoted to disarmament.

The CD and its predecessors have negotiated multilateral arms control, nonproliferation, and disarmament agreements such as the [Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons \(NPT\)](#), [Environmental Modification and Seabed treaties](#), the [Biological and Toxic Weapons Convention \(BTWC\)](#), the [Chemical Weapons Convention \(CWC\)](#), and the [Comprehensive Nuclear-Test-Ban Treaty \(CTBT\)](#).

Agenda: The agenda of the CD includes:

- cessation of the nuclear arms race and nuclear disarmament;
- prevention of nuclear war, including all related matters;
- prevention of an arms race in outer space (PAROS);
- effective international arrangements to assure non-nuclear weapon States against the use or threat of use of nuclear weapons;
- new types of weapons of mass destruction and new systems of such weapons; radiological weapons;
- a comprehensive program of disarmament;
- prohibition of the production of fissile material for nuclear weapons or other nuclear explosive devices;
- transparency in armaments; and
- consideration and adoption of the annual report and any other report, as appropriate, to the UNGA.

Developments:

Since the conclusion of the negotiation of the CTBT in August 1996, the CD remained deadlocked until May 2009. With the exception of 1998, it was not able to reach consensus on its program of work and thus to commence substantive deliberations. The principal problems included difficulties in the current relations between key players, disagreement among them on the prioritization of main issues on the CD’s agenda, and attempts of some countries to link progress in one area to parallel progress in other areas. The key items under consideration include: a fissile material cut-off treaty (FMCT), nuclear disar-

mament, prevention of an arms race in outer space (PAROS), and negative security assurances.

2009: The first part of the Conference took place from 19 January to 27 March. The second part started 18 May and will end 3 July. The third part is scheduled for 3 August to 18 September. The rotating presidency of the Conference will be held by Viet Nam, Zimbabwe, Algeria, Argentina, Australia, and Austria.

2009 First Part:

The CD met for its first plenary on 20 January and adopted its agenda, [CD/WP.552](#), which was identical to that of the previous year. During this part, numerous parties expressed support for moving forward based on the 2008 proposed program of work ([CD/1840](#)), but Pakistan, Egypt, and Malaysia voiced their opposition. The discussions focused mostly around the prevention of an arms race in outer space, negative security assurances, and a fissile material treaty.

On 3 February, following the precedent of 2008, the CD President Le Hoai Trang of Viet Nam announced the appointment of seven coordinators to facilitate informal discussions on each substantive agenda item. Pakistan and Iran noted their reservations, but did not oppose the appointment.

2009 Second Part:

On 19 May, during the first meeting of the second part, CD President Idriss Jazāiry submitted a new proposed program of work. In contrast to the [2007](#) and [2008](#) proposals, [CD/1863](#) mandates the establishment of working groups on the four core issues and special coordinators for the other agenda items. The proposed program of work calls for negotiation of a fissile materials treaty on the basis of the [1995 Shannon Mandate](#), for recommendations for dealing with negative security assurances, and for an “exchange of views and information on practical steps for progressive and systematic efforts to reduce nuclear weapons with the ultimate goal of their elimination, including on approaches toward potential future work of multilateral character.”

UN Secretary-General Ban Ki-moon addressed the CD in support of the adoption of the proposed program of work, which he called a “document that can achieve consensus and that addresses all substantive and procedural issues.” He also urged a “new multilateralism,” emphasizing that any bilateral efforts “must feed into a broader multilateral framework,” and called for “bold action” to accelerate disarmament.

Both the Swiss and the Algerian foreign ministers also addressed the CD in support of [CD/1863](#).

On 22 May, while the CD President noted that consensus had not yet been reached, numerous parties, including Pakistan, announced their support for [CD/1863](#). However, Israel argued that it had not received a response for a request for a meeting with the Algerian CD President.

On 26 and 28 May, numerous delegations took the floor in support of the proposed program of work. The Indian mission announced that it was still waiting for instructions from the capital. Many delegations condemned or expressed concern over the North Korean 25 May nuclear test.

On 29 May, the CD president characterized the proposed program of work as “a compromise which provides a delicate balance.” He contended that it “in no way establishes a hierarchy in terms of priority,” but rather provided a basis of compromise to launch negotiations. Afterwards the CD adopted [CD/1863](#) as its program of work. Before the adoption of the document, however, the DPRK stated that it would continue to strengthen “national deterrence” and Morocco noted its discontent with a number of issues, but both delegations ultimately said they would not block consensus. Iran’s delegation announced it had just received instructions from the capital and Israel’s delegation was not present in the room. After the adoption of the program, India noted that it expected negotiations to focus on the future production of fissile materials, while Pakistan argued that stocks would have to be addressed for Pakistan to implement the treaty. Numerous delegations, including Egypt, Indonesia, the Russian Federation, Syria, the United Kingdom, and the United States, welcomed the adoption of the program.

2008:

The first part of the 2008 session took place from 21 January to 28 March, the second part began 12 May and ended 27 June, and the third part started on 28 July and concluded on 12 September. Tunisia, Turkey, Ukraine, the United Kingdom, the United States, and Venezuela held the rotating presidencies for 2008.

2008 First Part:

The first part began with a call from [UN Secretary General Ban Ki-moon](#) for members to “move forward in a spirit of compromise.” This marked the first time in recent years that a UNSG personally opened the CD session, and Mr. Ban expressed his disappointment with the Conference’s failure to seize opportu-

ities for progress in 2007. Several states, including Russia, Germany, and Australia, expressed their support for using the previous year's [L.1](#) program of work as a starting point for 2008.

On 29 January, Conference President Samir Labidi of Tunisia outlined a seven-point plan of action based upon the CD mandate and appointed a coordinator for informal discussion on each item. Ambassador Martabit of Chile was tasked to focus on the prevention of nuclear war; Ambassador Tarui of Japan on a fissile material treaty; Ambassador Grinius of Canada on PAROS; Ambassador Ly of Senegal on negative security assurances; Ambassador Draganov of Bulgaria on new types and systems of WMD and radiological weapons; Ambassador Jayatilleka of Sri Lanka on disarmament; and Ambassador Puja of Indonesia on transparency in armaments.

On 12 February, China and the Russian Federation presented a [draft treaty](#) on the Prevention of the Placement of Weapons in Outer Space, the Threat or Use of Force against Outer Space Objects (PPWT). The proposal included a mandate for further research, and several states embraced the effort to energize discussion on outer space. However, the United States gave no indication that it would be willing to reverse its position and begin negotiations on such a treaty.

During informal discussion on 19 February, Swedish Ambassador Hans Dahlgren delivered a [statement](#) on behalf of several nations calling for the de-alerting of nuclear weapons systems.

During an informal session on 13 March, rotating President Ahmet Üzümcü of Turkey circulated [CD/1840](#), a draft decision from the six presidents based upon the 2007 [L.1 agenda](#) and the [CRP.5](#) and [CRP.6](#) presidential statements. Mr. Victor Vasiliev of the Russian Federation stated that while the plan was not fully acceptable, it represented a compromise that his country would not reject, but he urged greater consultation between coordinators and members in the second part of the session.

The CD continued to witness an increase in the number of high-level visitors urging cooperation and progress. In addition to the UNSG, the Tunisian, Russian, and Chinese Ministers of Foreign Affairs, and the administrator of the U.S. National Nuclear Security Administration addressed the conference.

2008 Second Part:

Many delegations spoke in favor of [CD/1840](#), most notably a number of Latin American countries in the G21, although the Moroccan delegation criticized it

for offering no new ideas and placing an unbalanced emphasis on negotiating an FMCT. Chilean Ambassador Carlos Portales also questioned the relevance of the CD's consensus-based decision-making process in a post-Cold War world, and Canada encouraged more transparent, informal discussion among members.

Iranian Ambassador Ali Reza Moaiyeri called for a "balanced and comprehensive" program of work, as well as an FMCT that would be comprehensive, verifiable, and covers existing stocks.

A number of delegations noted that while the CD is frequently referred to as the sole forum for multilateral disarmament negotiations, conventions banning anti-personnel mines and cluster munitions had been successfully negotiated elsewhere. South African Ambassador Claudine Mtshali argued that the institution and machinery of the CD should not be blamed for the deadlock, and that diplomats have a responsibility to take active roles in making recommendations to their capitals in order to "influence or shape the exercise of political will."

On 25 June, Mr. Javier Solana, EU High Representative for the Common Foreign and Security Policy, [addressed](#) the final plenary of the second session. He highlighted the importance of the CD as the place for Nuclear Weapon States and Non-Nuclear Weapon States to forge a credible plan for the way forward. He also announced that later in the year, the [EU](#) would introduce a code of conduct for transparency and confidence-building in outer space. In addition, Mr. Solana called on all relevant States to sign and ratify the [CTBT](#) without delay.

2008 Third Part:

Pakistani Ambassador Massood Khan agreed with the numerous delegations who had urged that members not allow the perfect to be the enemy of the good. However, he laid out specific reasons why his delegation felt that [CD/1840](#) was flawed, calling it "a lop-sided compromise among broadly likeminded countries." Mr. Khan explained that Pakistan would endorse [CD/1840](#) only if it were revised to address the following issues:

- A commitment to negotiate a "non-discriminatory, multilateral and internationally and effectively verifiable" fissile materials treaty.
- Creation of space for addressing the question of existing and future stocks of fissile material.

CONFERENCE ON DISARMAMENT

- Balance among all four core issues—nuclear disarmament, FMT, PAROS, and NSAs.
- Using ad hoc committees or other subsidiary bodies as mechanisms for negotiation, in accordance with the CD's Rules of Procedure.
- A differentiation between the role of the coordinators to facilitate informal discussions and the functions of formal CD subsidiary bodies to conduct negotiations in the context of the programme of work.

On 26 August, the American delegation circulated [comments](#) critical of the Sino-Russian draft treaty banning space weapons. In the final plenary of the 2008 session on 9 September, the CD was able to adopt an annual report for the UN General Assembly. Representatives from Vietnam, Argentina, and Zimbabwe, three of the six presidents for 2009, addressed the final plenary, pledging to conduct consultations during the intersessional period with a view to starting the 2009 Conference as productively as possible.

2007:

The first part of the 2007 meeting took place from 22 January to 30 March. The CD held the second part from 14 May until 29 June. The third part began on 30 July and concluded on 14 September. South Africa, Spain, Sri Lanka, Sweden, Switzerland, and Syria (the S6) held the presidencies.

2007 First Part:

The activities of the first part commenced with the South African Presidency of Claudine Mtshali. On 24 January, the conference adopted its agenda, and the S6 established an [Organizational Framework](#) and built on the 2006 "Friends of the Presidents" by appointing coordinators to each of the agenda items. The items on the agenda included: cessation of the nuclear arms race and nuclear disarmament, prevention of nuclear war, including all related matters, prevention of an arms race in outer space, effective international agreements to assure non-nuclear-weapon states against the use or threat of use of nuclear weapons, new types of weapons of mass destruction and new systems of such weapons, including radiological weapons; a comprehensive program of disarmament; transparency in armaments, and consideration and adoption of the annual report and any other report, as appropriate, to the General Assembly of the United Nations. Some member countries expressed the concern that the term "coordinator" implies activity too similar to a negotiation mandate, but most expressed optimism and enthusiasm for progress during the 2007 session.

On 6 February, Syria called for a new international convention against the use or threat of use of a nuclear weapon. Egypt once again called for a NWFZ in the Middle East. At the same meeting, Russia shifted its position indicating that it was ready to negotiate an FMCT without any preconditions.

In a speech before the CD on 22 February, Dr. Kim Howells, Minister of State, Foreign & Commonwealth Office of the [United Kingdom](#), defended the recently circulated UK [whitepaper](#) on renewing its trident submarines. A decision not to renew would have been the first example of a NWS disarming. Howell argued that maintaining a nuclear deterrent was still necessary, and the United Kingdom needed to ensure that it would still have a nuclear capability in 20 years.

On 23 March, the S6 proposed a draft program of work ([CD/2007/L.1](#)), appointing coordinators to oversee substantive discussions on disarmament, PAROS, NSAs, and "negotiation without precondition on a non-discriminatory and multilateral treaty banning the production of fissile material for nuclear weapons and or other nuclear explosive devices." The United States, United Kingdom, and Russia all indicated their acceptance of the proposal. China, India, Pakistan, and several other nations had to wait to receive guidance from their capitals. Egypt and Algeria also expressed reservations. Members delayed the vote twice as parties insisted they needed more time. By the last day of the first session, consensus on the S6 proposal had still not been achieved. The conference opted for more time and a possible special session before the second session, at which point in time a vote on the proposal would occur.

2007 Second Part:

The conference did not in fact hold a special session prior to its next official meeting. The CD commenced its second session on 15 May. Delegations continued to deliberate the president's proposed plan of work. After the first two plenary meetings, the committee remained stuck on the issues. China, Pakistan, India, and Egypt all expressed concern about the plan. China continued its campaign for a PAROS negotiating mandate and expressed concern that conducting work under "coordinators" rather than in ad hoc committees would "not ensure effective and substantive work on the relevant items." Some states suggested that the S6 proposal be opened for amendments as a way to move forward.

When Ambassador Elisabet Borsini Bonnier of Sweden assumed the presidency of the CD on 31 May, she delivered a clear message to the conference, re-

questing patience, cooperation, and urging members to avoid blaming each other or fostering pessimism. She requested a break in the conference activities so that she could deliberate and prepare a response to the continued impasse. A few days later, Bonnier announced her intention to create a presidential statement ([CRP.5](#)) to accompany the P6 proposal as a measure to clarify and alleviate concerns. She went forward with her idea while warning that if “the heart of the problem lies in serious political or military reluctance to embark on the kind of work outlined in the [L.I](#), then no Presidential Statement, however cleverly crafted, will take us out of our present deadlock.”

When the presidential statement and attached draft decision were presented to the conference, China, Pakistan, and Iran indicated that they were not prepared to move forward with the package. China requested more time to consider the issue, while Iran and Pakistan expressed their substantive and procedural concerns. They continued to stress their desire for negotiations to begin on all four issues simultaneously and negotiations on an FMCT in accordance with the [Shannon Mandate](#). Despite numerous consultations and negotiations, these concerns were not resolved, and the second session ended in stalemate.

2007 Third Part

The CD’s third session convened on 30 July 2007. The conference did not take a vote on the [L.I](#) proposal or the associated presidential statements. Despite continuing consultations and attempts to resolve concerns, the parties were not able to achieve the consensus necessary to begin negotiations. Discussions during the last days of the conference instead focused on chemical and biological weapons issues, and preparing and adopting the annual report.

In his farewell comments to the conference, Canadian Ambassador Paul Meyer frankly expressed his frustration and concern that there was a “dysfunctional consensus rule that sacrifices the commitments of the many to the preferences of the few” and rendered the conference incapable of achieving its substantive goals. He said: “If despite the best efforts of many in this hall, we are unable to agree on a way to resume work, we should look to other processes for carrying this work forward.” Ambassador Meyer pointed to progress on cluster munitions and the Ottawa process on landmines as examples of extra-CD approaches that could be successful if the necessary political will was harnessed. Indeed, the fact that the CD came so close to breaking its decade-long stalemate and yet failed caused many analysts to question the future of

the world’s sole forum for multilateral disarmament negotiation.

2006:

The first part of the 2006 session began on 23 January and concluded on 31 March. The second part ran from 15 May to 30 June. The third part took place between 31 July and 15 September 2006. Throughout 2006, Poland, the Republic of Korea, Romania, the Russian Federation, Senegal, and Slovakia held the rotating presidency of the conference. The presidents of the 2006 conference (P6) cooperated closely in order to assure continuity during their successive presidencies.

2006 First Part:

As a means of creating a framework for a substantive session, presiding Polish Ambassador Rapacki encouraged delegates and NGOs at the first meeting to submit working papers, proposals, and ideas. While some delegations suggested that the conference should look at alternative proposals on the program of work, many other States expressed continued support for the [2003 Five Ambassadors agenda](#).

Ambassador Valery Loshchinin of the Russian Federation submitted a [proposal](#) on fissile materials which referenced President Putin’s initiative of 25 January 2006 on the “creation of a prototype of a global infrastructure which will assure all interested countries equal access to the benefits of the peaceful use of nuclear power.” This infrastructure would establish international centers for uranium enrichment and reprocessing of spent nuclear fuel “under strict compliance with all norms of [the] nuclear non-proliferation regime” and functioning “a non-discriminatory basis and under the IAEA control.”

The timetable was announced on 9 February. It included the core issues (FMCT, PAROS, NSA, nuclear disarmament), as well as new WMD and radiological weapons, a comprehensive program of disarmament, and transparency in armaments.

China and the Russian Federation circulated an updated and revised version of the “Compilation of Comments and Suggestions to the CD PAROS Working Paper [CD/1679](#)” which was welcomed by various sides.

Participants discussed the necessity of establishing an ad hoc committee on nuclear disarmament. While the G21 continued to support the establishment of this

committee, France indicated that the committee would be redundant as soon as the negotiations on the FMCT started.

The meeting on 2 March had a special focus on nuclear disarmament. In this context, specific attention was given to the issue of transparency.

On 14 March, Ambassador Park of the Republic of Korea introduced a *non-paper*: a "[Compilation of proposals and observations on Agenda Items 1 and 2](#)", based on the focused debate on nuclear disarmament under his presidency. Russia welcomed the non-paper as "a bold step" that would hopefully set an example to be followed during sessions on other agenda items. The Netherlands noted that while it "may not reflect everything every delegation has said, [...] it surely is a very useful tool to recall and to understand the gist of our debate." Other delegations noted that they wished the non-paper would follow the two tracks of assessment of nuclear reductions and proposals for future nuclear disarmament measures. Malaysia stated that nuclear disarmament was not being addressed directly and extensively. Pakistan regretted the selectiveness of the compilation, holding that it therefore "can only be a non-paper that has no status at all."

2006 Second Part:

The second session of the Conference on Disarmament, presided over by Ambassador Doru Costea of Romania, opened on 16 May. The first plenary meeting focused on debate over a Fissile Material Cut-Off Treaty (FMCT). Australia, Canada, Italy, Japan, and Switzerland submitted working papers in this regard. On 18 May, the United States introduced a [draft FMCT](#) along with a draft mandate for its negotiations.

China and the Russian Federation submitted proposals on prevention of the weaponization of outer space. A number of member states called for the establishment of an Ad Hoc Committee on PAROS. DPRK referred to their 19 May statement, wherein they said they would rejoin the NPT if the United States demonstrated the political will to abide by and execute its responsibilities under the Joint Statement of the Six-Party talks. Other important themes discussed at the session included new weapons of mass destruction and radiological weapons, and nuclear terrorism. Myanmar declared that nuclear disarmament was its priority in the Conference and called for the swift establishment of an ad hoc committee on nuclear disarmament.

At the plenary meeting on 21 June, the secretary-general of the United Nations—Kofi Annan—addressed the CD. In a strong statement, he cautioned that the world was "sleepwalking" down a path on which increasing numbers of states find themselves obliged to acquire nuclear weapons. He asserted that the CD had the "collective power to wake the world up" to the dangers of nuclear weapons and ensure that the issue of disarmament would be featured prominently in the international agenda. He referred to the two urgent crises facing the NPT – confidence and compliance – and called for "devaluing the currency of nuclear weapons." Annan emphasized the urgent need to resolve the issues of the DPRK and Iran's nuclear programs. He welcomed the CD's agreement to work on an agreed schedule, noting these positive developments as indications that the CD was ready to make significant and productive contributions. He concluded by urging member states to put their "differences and well-rehearsed arguments" behind them, and rise to the challenge of defining security policies that would lead to a safer, more peaceful world.

2006 Third Part:

The third session of the Conference on Disarmament opened on 3 August 2006. The first plenary meeting, held that same day, was a focused debate on Negative Security Assurances (NSA). Here, the debate continued over the proper place to hold the debate, within the CD or outside the CD as part of NPT negotiations.

A comprehensive program for disarmament was the subject of the 10 August plenary meeting. A draft of the Arms Trade Treaty (ATT) that would be presented at the first committee was presented and discussed among the members of the conference.

At the plenary meeting held on 17 August, the representative from Japan spoke on NSAs and argued that positive security assurances might work better, and asked the members of the conference to consider the effectiveness of a globally legally binding instrument rather than regional agreements tied to NWFZs.

Transparency in Armaments (TIA) was the subject of a focused debate beginning on 23 August. Germany, Russia, and Italy expressed their desire to move ahead with a program of work under the [A5](#) Proposal. In this and future meetings, Israel and Syria engaged in a heated debate over the situation in the Middle East. Syria expressed outrage at the use of cluster munitions and phosphorous weapons by Israel in its attacks on Lebanon in response to the kidnapping of two Israeli soldiers by Hezbollah.

CONFERENCE ON DISARMAMENT

At the 24 August meeting, Mr. Tariq Rauf, head of the IAEA's Verification and Security Policy Coordination, presented on verification and the FMCT. He argued that an FMCT would strengthen Article VI of the NPT and that a strong verification mechanism would be the only way to ensure compliance with an FMCT. He contended that such a mechanism should apply to the entire fuel cycle and be comprehensive to provide the highest level of assurance. Mr. Rauf presented on the costs and benefits of different verification options. He estimated that a verification program would cost 50-150 million Euros.

In a meeting held on 6 September, the United Kingdom, France, and the United States made it clear that they did not support the Central Asian Nuclear Weapons-Free Zone in its current form and expressed frustration that their concerns were not being addressed. They indicated that they would not support the treaty in its current condition or sign any accompanying protocols or NSA agreements required for the weapons-free zone to enter into force.

The final meeting did not produce a draft report for the General Assembly; instead, the CD went on to additional informal meetings to finalize the draft report. The establishment of a set schedule for debate, the organizational structure using "friends of the Presidents," increased coordination and cooperation among the six presidents (P6), and broad consensus and increased activity on the Arms Trade Treaty (ATT) and FMCT were presented as positive developments that might serve as sources of momentum to move the CD forward in 2007.

2005:

The first part of the session began on 27 January and concluded on 1 April 2005. The second part occurred from 2 June to 15 July. The third took place from 8 August to 23 September 2005.

2005 First Part:

The 2005 session of the Conference of Disarmament emphasized the importance of overcoming the deadlock that had plagued the CD during the previous decade. In an opening message on 27 January, UN Secretary General Kofi Annan stressed that "disarmament was critical for conflict prevention, peacebuilding and the realization of the Millennium Development Goals."

At the end of the opening meeting, the conference accepted the request of an additional 33 states to participate in the conference as observers. On 8 Febru-

ary, the CD adopted its agenda for the 2005 session based on the agenda agreed to in the past. The agenda included the following items: cessation of the nuclear arms race and nuclear disarmament; prevention of nuclear war, including all related matters; prevention of an arms race in outer space; effective international arrangements to insure non-nuclear-weapon states against the use or threat of use of nuclear weapons, new types of weapons of mass destruction, new systems of such weapons, and radiological weapons; comprehensive programs of disarmament; transparency in armaments; and consideration of the annual report and any other report, as appropriate, to the General Assembly of the United Nations.

At this meeting, conference president Ambassador Chris Sanders of the Netherlands, announced an absence of consensus on the establishment of any subsidiary bodies or mandates during the first two weeks of the conference, indicating a continued lack of consensus on the [A5 proposed agenda](#) (CD/1693/Rev1).

The [A5 proposal](#), drafted by five ambassadors to the Conference on Disarmament at the 932nd plenary meeting on 26 June 2003, outlined a program of work for the meetings. The proposal suggested the establishment of four Ad Hoc Committees, each tasked with negotiating an agreement on the topics of negative security assurances, nuclear disarmament, FMCT, and PAROS. The Ad Hoc Committees would then present a report of their progress for the session to the general conference. In addition, the [A5 proposal](#) calls for three special coordinators, each tasked with gathering the views of conference members on how best to approach questions relating to new types of WMD, a comprehensive program of disarmament, and transparency in armaments.

In the last week of his presidency of the CD, Ambassador Sanders presented a non-paper entitled "[Food for thought on a CD Program of Work](#)," which extended the recommendation of the [A5](#) proposal, suggesting Ad Hoc Committees for four agenda topics: nuclear disarmament, FMCT, PAROS, and negative security assurances. Despite the non-paper, the [A5](#) proposal still failed to gather a consensus.

During the first part of the conference, statements from multiple states were issued concerning a number of topics. The first weeks of open debate and discussion were characterized by discussions on the CD's past deadlock and proposals to overcome the impasse. Beginning in February, the main focus of the conference shifted to members' efforts to remove and destroy their anti-personnel landmines. The con-

CONFERENCE ON DISARMAMENT

ference responded with discussion about the Nairobi Action Plan and its successes, encouraging the United States, a non-party to the plan, to adopt its tenets. Many member states voiced their support for the Nairobi Action Plan.

Another topic of discussion at the CD was the FMCT. Members recognized that the CD's failure to reach a consensus on the FMCT, particularly on the issue of verification, undermined not only the effectiveness of the CD, but also the security of the world.

The ambassador of Japan also suggested that the rotating presidency system of the Conference on Disarmament be abandoned in favor of something that would provide more stability.

2005 Second Part:

The second part of the 2005 Conference on Disarmament began by noting the "abysmal failure" of the [2005 NPT Review Conference](#). According to Ambassador Joseph Ayalogu of Nigeria, the conference's current president, the Review Conference "widened the gap" between the divergent positions of the members of the CD. The most contentious issues for the CD continued to be negotiations over the FMCT, negative security assurances, and PAROS.

At the second plenary meeting of the second session on 9 June, Russia and China presented their non-paper entitled "[Definition Issues regarding Legal Instruments on the Prevention and Weaponization of Outer Space](#)." This non-paper was one of several submitted by two countries on the PAROS issue. Both countries announced their intention to create an open-ended group to discuss all non-papers on PAROS presented during the conference.

At the 17 June plenary meeting, Ambassador Wegger Strømme of Norway assumed presidency of the CD. He proposed that each of the four plenary meetings under his presidency adhere to a theme: nuclear disarmament, fissile material cut-off, outer space, and security assurances. The proposal received broad support from member states.

The plenary on 23 June was dedicated to the discussion of nuclear disarmament. Twenty-eight countries offered statements regarding disarmament, most noting that nuclear disarmament and nonproliferation were a mutually reinforcing process. Members agreed that the failure of the NPT Review Conference placed a larger burden on the CD to resolve its impasse.

The plenary on 28 June centered on discussion of the FMCT. While most delegates stressed the importance of FMCT negotiations occurring as soon as possible, others outlined the need to come to a consensus first on a universally applicable treaty prohibiting the production of fissile material without preconditions. An immediate moratorium on material production was also suggested, as was consideration of whether the treaty would cap existing stocks or only halt future production of fissile materials.

On 30 June, the plenary discussed PAROS exclusively. Twenty-one members delivered statements, many noting that the existing legal framework was inadequate for preventing an arms race in outer space. However, it was also noted that there was no international consensus on any further treaties, and a treaty limiting weaponization of outer space would face great difficulty in verification.

The final thematic plenary was held on 7 July and focused on negative security assurances. Members considered the possibility of a legally binding instrument for negative security assurances (NSAs), and some proposed the idea of recreating an Ad Hoc Committee to address the issue. Most members agreed that a legal framework for NSAs would need to be accomplished through the NPT.

At the final plenary of the second session on 14 July, Ambassador Masood Khan of Pakistan assumed the presidency. At the meeting, China and Russia announced that they would hold an open-ended meeting on PAROS on 16 August 2005.

2005 Third Part:

The third session opened on 11 August with statements on arms control and disarmament through multilateral efforts, the NPT Review Conference and six-party talks, as well as national security interests and international terrorism. Several states recommended ways to overcome the conference's impasse.

At the 18 August plenary meeting, France submitted a [paper](#) on "out-of-the-box" issues that could help break the deadlock by focusing on new issues as they relate to the CD agenda and Program of Work. The paper was based on a brainstorming session of several Member States at the first informal plenary meeting. It argued that certain issues should be pursued in addition to the traditional CD agenda to provide a fresh outlook. The most important issue raised was prevention of terrorist acquisition of WMD; other issues included compliance, small arms and light

weapons, and export controls. States also mentioned more specific topics such as the protection of critical infrastructure, fuel-cycle technologies, radiological weapons, man-portable air-defense systems, and CD reform. The paper concluded that legally binding instruments should be pursued as a matter of priority. At the same time, a number of states expressed the belief that guidelines, declarations of principles, and other political legally binding instruments would help move the work of the CD forward again.

On 25 August, the outgoing president of the CD, Ambassador Masood Khan of Pakistan, closed with a [speech](#) deploring the lack of progress on the CD Program of Work. Ambassador Khan emphasized the need for political will to break the deadlock.

On 1 September, the incoming president, Ambassador Manuel Rodriguez of Peru, recommended that the work of the CD be evaluated in the context of the UN reform process as well as with regard to different national perceptions of security. On 15 September, he gave a debriefing of his consultations on the Program of Work. Ambassador Cuadros informed the conference of the four areas of agreement shared by all delegations: support for the CD negotiating mandate, desire to break the current paralysis, support for substantive working papers on areas related to the program of work, and the desire to continue working by consensus. The [draft report](#) of the CD to the GA was introduced but not discussed.

The final session of the CD concluded on 22 September without a program of work, for the ninth year in a row. Prior to the meeting, the "[Food for Thought](#)" non-paper was presented on 12 September by the Netherlands, representing a further amendment to the Five Ambassador [A5](#) proposal.

Informal discussions were held during the session on the CD president's [draft decision](#) on a proposal for a program of work. All three proposals suggest the establishment of the same four ad hoc committees: FMCT, PAROS, NSAs and nuclear disarmament.

The president's paper merges the stronger language on NSAs in the [A5 proposal](#) with the weaker language on NSAs of the "Food for Thought" non-paper, while retaining the non-paper's specification of no pre-conditions for negotiations on an FMCT. Like the non-paper, the president's paper has the same language on nuclear disarmament as the [A5 proposal](#), and nearly the same language on PAROS, with the notable exception of removal of the important phrase "including the possibility of negotiating [a] relevant international legal instrument."

2004:

2004 First Part

The first two weeks of the 2004 session of the Conference on Disarmament were dedicated to opening statements and general debate. On 27 January, the CD adopted by consensus the agenda (document CD/WP.533) for its 2004 session. The agenda included issues pertaining to the cessation of the nuclear arms race and nuclear disarmament; prevention of nuclear war; prevention of an arms race in outer space; effective international arrangements to assure non-nuclear-weapon States against the use or threat of use of nuclear weapons; new types of weapons of mass destruction and new systems of such weapons; radiological weapons; a comprehensive program of disarmament; transparency in armaments; and consideration and adoption of the annual report and any other report to the General Assembly. Statements and debates were expected to continue throughout February and into March during the first part of the CD's 2004 session.

In the final days of the first session, several important topics on disarmament were addressed. Statements were heard from Sri Lanka, Spain, Algeria, Romania, the United States and many others concerning the current status of disarmament worldwide. Sri Lanka noted its support for the establishment of an ad hoc committee in the Conference to negotiate a multilateral treaty banning the production of fissile material for nuclear weapons. Spain, in the aftermath of the 11 March terrorist bombings in Madrid, encouraged member states to move beyond the 8-year long impasse in an effort to prevent the proliferation of weapons of mass destruction, especially given their potential use by terrorist groups. The Algerian delegation reaffirmed that disarmament should be the Conference's major priority so that "the planet could be definitively spared this version of the apocalypse." While the U.S. unveiled a new policy on landmines, it also noted that it could not agree to a suggested nuclear weapons convention or a timetable on disarmament. The president of the CD closed the meeting by emphasizing that the priority for the Conference is to adopt a definitive programme of work so that it could pick up its substantive work, which had been interrupted for so long.

2004 Second Part:

The second session of the 2004 Conference on Disarmament began 13 May. Based on a proposal from Conference President Pablo Macedo of Mexico, the CD began structured informal plenaries on substantive issues. Participants stated that the informal ple-

nary sessions, which allowed discussion of issues behind closed doors, encouraged transparency and assisted in the effectiveness of the meeting. Members noted that they see the informal plenaries as an opportunity to identify common denominators that would help to forge a consensus.

A discussion of the First Anniversary Meeting of the Proliferation Security Initiative was also an important topic in the first weeks of the session. The aims of the meeting included emphasizing the Proliferation Security Initiative as a global initiative, further development of international support for its aims and objectives, and promotion of broad international cooperation and participation in the initiative's activities. The Arab Group also emphasized its regional commitment to nuclear disarmament, highlighting the importance of a regional commitment to disarmament in the Middle East.

Outer-space safety remained a high-priority concern for member states. However, the CD was far from a consensus. Members discussed the possibility of considering "other avenues" of peace in space in the short term, including a moratorium on the testing and development of space-based weapons.

The conference also discussed the recently adopted [G-8 Action Plan on Nonproliferation](#). The plan included the expansion of the Proliferation Security Initiative, which "demonstrates in a concrete way how dozens of countries can agree to work together toward a common security." The [G-8 Action Plan](#) also called for the expansion of the Global Partnership and a one-year moratorium on "new transfers of uranium enrichment and reprocessing technology to additional states."

The closing remarks of the session emphasized the polarized nature of the members of the conference. An array of speakers listed upcoming challenges to the group, among them terrorism, FMCT negotiations, and radiological weapons.

2004 Third Part:

The third session of the 2004 Conference on Disarmament began with the [U.S. announcement](#) in the first official plenary that it had completed its policy review of the FMCT. U.S. Ambassador Jackie Sanders stated that ratification of the FMCT is important, although it will most likely face serious difficulties before its verification. Member states expressed their satisfaction with the long-awaited U.S. review of the FMCT, stating that the time was ripe for negotiation.

Ambassador Sanders also noted the importance of an international ban on the sale and export of "persistent land mines." Some member states responded with concern that though the United States had made an "important contribution" to the problem, the U.S. proposal might undermine the more comprehensive ban required by the Ottawa Convention by allowing countries to opt for the less stringent option.

Beginning on 26 August, the conference made new contributions to the discussion of banning weapons in outer space, which sparked a week of discussions almost entirely devoted to PAROS. Russia and China distributed a *non-paper* that discussed verification of implementation and a review of existing international law related to weaponization of outer space. Among topics specifically addressed were the need for a moratorium on placement of weapons in outer space and the further consolidation of international opinion on a legal commitment to prevent the proliferation of weapons in space. Many countries supported the suggestion of an Ad Hoc Committee to address the problem.

On 7 September, the third session of the 2004 conference reached its conclusion. The final report of the conference noted that, although there was a goal of consensus and the creation of multiple informal proposals, the group had not agreed on a program of work, nor had it established any mechanisms on any specific agenda items. While the informal plenary meetings were constructive, the conference members felt they were not sufficient efforts to overcome the impasse of the CD.

The conference did adopt a decision designed to enhance the participation of civil society in its efforts. The decision called for one informal plenary meeting per annual session allocated to nongovernmental organizations (NGOs). This meeting would be allocated, the decision stipulates, after the conference has adopted its program of work.

President of the conference, Ambassador Mya Than of Myanmar, *noted* that despite all efforts, the conference had still not achieved a program of work, although progress had been made in certain areas. UN Secretary-General Kofi Annan issued a statement saying that disarmament was of great importance and that recent events inspired a new demand for multilateral action. Annan stressed that political will was a key factor in overcoming the impasse of the conference and that he hoped it could achieve consensus at the 2005 CD.

2003:

The dates of the 2003 sessions of the Conference on Disarmament were 21 January through 28 March, 12 May through 26 June, and 28 July through September 10.

The CD opened its annual session on 21 January 2003 with a [message](#) from Secretary-General Kofi Annan. He urged an end to the impasse the CD has experienced in the last four years, during which the CD was consistently unable to reach consensus on a program of work. According to the Secretary-General, this deadlock could be “a reflection of broader problems in multilateral diplomacy.” The Secretary-General stressed the importance of the CD’s ability in 2003 to face profound challenges in the form of WMD and their delivery systems, increased military expenditures, and the prospect of an arms race in outer space. Of particular concern to the Secretary-General was the ability of the CD to lead important negotiations, including a ban on the production of fissile material for weapons purposes.

2003 First Part:

The first part of the annual session began with statements by the conference’s then-president, Rakesh Sood of India. Sood noted that “consultations since the adjournment of the 2002 session had shown a growing consensus that the problem facing the Conference was a political problem and that attention to the Conference’s procedures and methods of work did not appear to be an approach that was going to work.” He called on Member States to consider what steps would be necessary for the Conference to reach its potential as an effective forum on disarmament issues. Special emphasis was placed on new threats to international peace and security via terrorism and WMD, the need for debate on radiological weapons, and a renewed sense of political will and determination among Member States.

Throughout the first part of the 2003 session, the CD heard statements from the following countries: Japan, Cuba, Senegal, the United States, Austria, Iraq, the Netherlands, Italy, Egypt, China, Kenya, Turkey, Ireland, India, Bulgaria, Belgium, Switzerland, Romania, the United Kingdom, Slovenia, Lithuania, the Syrian Arab Republic, Canada, France, and Mexico.

One of the key debates during the first part of the CD session was the situation in Iraq. The United States received substantial criticism from various members for acting unilaterally in its foreign policy approach toward Iraq and its mission to force the country to eliminate WMD. Another issue of critical importance was the withdrawal of the Government of the Demo-

cratic People’s Republic of Korea from the nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty. Additional issues that were addressed during the meeting were support for efforts to adopt a verification protocol to the Biological and Toxin Weapons Convention ([BTWC](#)), Small Arms and Light Weapons (SALW), and U.S. policy towards the nuclear program of the DPRK. Various other informal meetings during the first part of the session addressed issues such as the Fissile Material Cutoff Treaty (FMCT), prevention of an arms race in outer space, disarmament efforts in the Middle East, and the Conference’s continuing difficulties in reaching agreement on a program of work. In addition, the issue of women’s participation in the disarmament community was addressed.

Incoming president Mary Whelan of Ireland began her responsibilities during the first part of the CD session by addressing the Conference’s inability to reach agreement on its work program. She stated that she was dedicated to contributing to the resolution of the CD’s deadlock. She noted that the Conference’s relevance would be seriously questioned if it remained inactive on multilateral disarmament issues while strongly encouraging the Group of Five Ambassadors (Algeria, Belgium, Chile, Colombia, Sweden), who submitted a [proposal](#) for a program of work, to continue their effort for a possible agreement on the proposal.

The CD president also encouraged Member States to consider the issue of participation of civil society in the work of the CD. They discussed possible ways for NGOs to participate in the CD (e.g., to make statements in the plenary meeting, to distribute documents outside the Conference room). However, they did not reach any agreement on this issue.

Towards the end of the first part of the session, intense debate erupted in the CD over the situation in Iraq as the United States embarked upon “Operation Iraqi Freedom” beginning March 20, 2003.

Further discussion on the FMCT, the Organization for Security and Cooperation in Europe ([OSCE](#)) Small Arms Document, [the United Nations Program of Action on Small Arms and Light Weapons](#) and [the Convention on the Prohibition of the Use, Stockpiling, Production, and Transfer of Anti-Personnel Mines and on Their Destruction](#) continued during the last meeting of the first part of the session. Representatives from Romania, Switzerland, Lithuania, the United Kingdom, Slovenia, and Japan discussed most of these issues and reported on each country’s individual progress.

The first part of the 2003 Conference on Disarmament concluded with debates between the United States, the United Kingdom and Iraq about the actions of the United States. The United States maintained that Iraq had failed to comply with the UN Security Council and the weapons inspectors and therefore posed a threat to the Middle East region in terms of its WMD capabilities. Iraq held the position that its government had cooperated with the weapons inspectors and had given them every possibility to complete their mission prior to U.S. intervention.

2003 Second Part:

Incoming president of the conference Mario E. Maiolini of Italy stressed the “importance of the forum as the only comprehensive negotiating body on disarmament at the disposal of the international community.” Other representatives emphasized the need to remember the issue of security, particularly against the threat of nuclear weapons. Non-nuclear countries expressed concern over the number of nuclear warheads still being kept by nuclear weapon states.

The majority of States expressed their support for or welcomed the “Five Ambassadors” (A5) proposal. However, some countries did not pronounce their opinions, though they did not openly oppose the initiative.

There was clear disagreement concerning the mandate on possible efforts to prevent an arms race in outer space (PAROS). Emphasizing that their proposal was an “evolving” text, the Five Ambassadors encouraged States who could not accept the language of the proposal to submit suggestions or ideas so that they could amend the text.

On 26 June, 2003, the Conference on Disarmament concluded the second part of its 2003 session. Representatives from Sweden, Colombia, Canada, Romania, South Africa and Japan expressed concern and frustration over the long impasse the Conference had experienced. Romania noted that “political will, balance, compromise and consensus were the key elements for moving forward in the Conference’s work.” Colombia made reference to the importance of the CD and the need for work on the limitation of availability of small arms.

Belgium and Algeria emphasized the need for consensus adoption of their “Five Ambassadors” proposal as a program of work.

In his closing remarks, president Maiolini emphasized the fact that “the achievement of a programme of work remained the main goal of the moment, and the best chance for a solution was to pursue the min-

imum in order to keep the Conference alive. Just what that minimum was had been emerging in recent months, and the Conference should continue to explore the possibility of consensus in the relevant areas.”

2003 Third Part:

On 26 June, Ambassador Lint of Belgium, on behalf of Five Ambassadors, suggested an amendment to the text of their proposal on PAROS. On 7 August, China, Russia and Ukraine stated that they accepted the PAROS mandate as suggested on 26 June and were ready to join the consensus on the amended Five Ambassadors proposal.

On 5 September, the Five Ambassadors formally submitted the amendment of their proposal to the CD ([CD/1693/Rev.1](#)). The Netherlands, Nigeria, and South Africa expressed their support for the amended text, while many others have not specified their position.

The third part of the Conference concluded on 9 September with the adoption of the annual reports. In her [closing remark](#), President of the Conference Kuniko Inoguchi, stated that during the inter-sessional period she would continue her informal consultations with Member States on a program of work.

She also announced that Kazakhstan, which was to take over the Presidency, declined to accept the Presidency for the 2004 session of the CD. It was therefore decided that the CD presidents for the 2004 session would be Kenya, Malaysia, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, and Myanmar.

2002:

The dates for the 2002 session of the CD were: January 21 to March 28, May 13 to June 28, and July 29 to September 13.

The CD concluded its 2002 session on 12 September 2002 after adopting its annual report to the UNGA. For the fourth consecutive year, the CD failed to reach a consensus on a program of work and to engage in substantive discussions. Disagreement persisted between the key players on prioritization of issues on the CD’s agenda. However, some developments, including a new cross-group proposal on a program of work, demonstrated greater dynamism at the Conference and gave rise to cautious optimism about the prospects for its next annual session.

2002 First Part: The CD opened its 2002 annual session on 22 January 2002 under the presidency of Mohamed Tawfik, Deputy Permanent Representative of Egypt to the United Nations in Geneva. It con-

cluded the first part of its 2002 session without any agreement on the program of work. The Member States disagreed on such agenda items as nuclear disarmament and PAROS.

The annual session of the Conference started in a rapidly changing security environment and with widespread concern among the Member States about its potential consequences for the work of the CD. The reactions to the events of 11 September and its aftermath demonstrated increased solidarity among most of the Member States in their desire to foster disarmament and to overcome the stalemate. However, many States also voiced concerns about the erosion of multilateral disarmament and arms control regimes and the renewed interest in unilateralist policies among some CD members.

The CD's stalemate was addressed by a number of high-ranking officials such as Ministers of Foreign Affairs from Sweden, Canada, Kazakhstan, and Pakistan; the Defense Minister of Romania, the Under-Secretary of State of the United States, the Secretary of State of the Ministry for Foreign Affairs of Finland, and the Deputy Foreign Minister of Iran. The Conference also heard statements from delegations.

As a majority of the speakers emphasized, the recent political situation provided the CD with a "window of opportunity" to finally get back to business. However, despite the intensive consultations conducted by the successive presidents (Mohamed Tawfik of Egypt, Fisseha Yimer of Ethiopia, and Markku Reimaa of Finland), consensus on the work program was not reached. Moreover, towards the end of the first part of the 2002 session, it seemed that the proposal on the program of work contained in document CD/1624 (the so-called "Amorim proposal"), which had been widely regarded as a "basis for further intensified consultations," drew more criticism from the countries that have always had reservations about it. These States criticized as a step backward from CD/1624 the efforts made by the president of the CD, Ambassador Reimaa of Finland, to launch the work of four Ad Hoc Committees, for the duration of the 2002 CD session, on nuclear disarmament, an FMCT, PAROS, and negative security assurances.

The first part of the 2002 session was marked by an important procedural decision to appoint Special Coordinators on the review of the agenda of the Conference, expansion of its membership, and improved and effective functioning. After a round of consultations among groups, the posts of the Special Coordinators were filled as follows: Ambassador Eui-Yong Chung of the Republic of Korea was appointed Special Coordinator on the review of the agenda; Am-

bassador Dimiter Tzanchev of Bulgaria was appointed Special Coordinator on expansion of membership of the Conference; and Ambassador Prasad Kariyawasam of Sri Lanka was appointed Special Coordinator on improved and effective functioning of the CD. Although the appointment of Special Coordinators early in the session was regarded as an encouraging sign, many delegations stressed that these procedural developments should not lead to self-complacency and distract the CD from reaching a compromise on its work program and subsequent commencement of substantive work. The CD concurred with a decision by the Secretary-General of the United Nations to appoint Mr. Sergei Ordzhonikidze, the Director General of the United Nations Office at Geneva, as the Secretary-General of the CD and his Personal Representative to the Conference. The CD also paid tribute and bid farewell to his predecessor Mr. Vladimir Petrovsky, who was retiring after nine years with the Conference.

Towards the end of the first part of the 2002 session, it became evident that positions of many delegations were influenced by anticipation of the results of the first session of the Preparatory Committee to the 2005 NPT Review Conference, held in New York on 8-12 April 2002. The period between the first and the second parts of the annual session was regarded by many delegations, including the Finnish presidency of the CD, as a time to seek greater consensus on the work program and alternative ways of engaging the Conference in substantive work.

2002 Second Part: On 13 May, the CD started the second part of its 2002 session. The president of the conference, Ambassador Reimaa of Finland, continued consultations on his draft program of work, which he first presented to the CD at the end of the first part of the 2002 session. The draft envisaged the establishment, for the duration of one year, of four Ad Hoc Committees on nuclear disarmament, an FMCT, PAROS, and negative security assurances, without formalizing their mandates, but making general reference to "the existing proposals and CD/1624 when initiating the work of the Conference on Disarmament."

Towards the end of his presidency, Ambassador Reimaa distributed a revised version of his proposal. A reference to the "agreed mandates," i.e., for an FMCT and negative security assurances, and two "existing proposals" (on mandates for nuclear disarmament and PAROS) were added, while a reference to the Amorim proposal (CD/1624) was dropped. Ad Hoc Committees were replaced by "subsidiary bodies," and reference to the duration of this work pro-

gram arrangement (one year) was also dropped. The revised proposal was considered at an informal plenary meeting and received support from a majority of delegations. China and Pakistan expressed reservations, while the Russian Federation voiced concerns over the ambiguity of the mandates of the proposed subsidiary bodies. At the conclusion of the meeting, the president submitted the final version of his proposal ([CD/1670](#)).

Special Coordinators (SC) on “reform issues” continued their consultations. The SC on expansion of membership and the SC on improved and effective functioning of the CD held very lively and business-like open-ended consultations. The most discussed issues included a possible limitation to the rule of consensus; modalities for participation of civil society and intergovernmental organizations (IAEA, OPCW, and CTBTO) in the proceedings of the Conference; and modification of the regional grouping system.

On 23 May 2002, South Africa submitted a working paper entitled “The Possible Scope and Requirements of the Fissile Material Treaty (FMT)” ([CD/1671](#)). In particular, the paper attempted to deal with the controversial issue of existing stocks of nuclear material, as well as to provide a practical and politically feasible solution to this problem.

The Netherlands sponsored an open-ended, informal meeting on an FMCT, which took place on 7 June 2002.

At the presidential consultations on 29 May 2002, China submitted an informal proposal on a program of work. According to it, China would agree to the Amorim proposal if the following words were added to the language of the final paragraph dealing with the mandate of the Ad Hoc Committee on PAROS: “with a view of reaching an international legally binding instrument.”

At the 907th plenary meeting of the CD on 27 June 2002, China, the Russian Federation, and five other nations submitted a [joint working paper](#) on the possible elements of a treaty on PAROS. The paper contained a basic obligation not to place weapons in outer space. From the Chinese perspective, it represented a compromise, because it did not ban using outer space for all the weapons-related purposes as the previous Chinese proposals did.

Also at the 907th meeting, the new president of the CD, Germany, made a proposal to reconsider item five of the CD’s agenda (“New types of weapons of mass destruction; radiological weapons”) in light of

the new threats, and distributed among the delegations a working paper on this subject.

2002 Third Part: The third part of the 2002 annual session was marked by an important cross-group initiative on a program of work by the five former presidents of the CD (Ambassador Dembri of Algeria, Ambassador Reyes of Colombia, Ambassador Vega of Chile, Ambassador Lint of Belgium, and Ambassador Salander of Sweden). The proposal was informally distributed among the delegates prior to the start of the third part of the annual session. At the 908th plenary meeting of the CD on 31 July 2002, the authors of the proposal outlined it to the Conference. The authors of the proposal sought to receive feedback from the CD members, and based on it, to decide whether to formally introduce the proposal.

The initial proposal envisaged establishing four Ad Hoc Committees (on negative security assurances, an FMCT, nuclear disarmament, and PAROS) and appointing three Special Coordinators for the duration of the rest of the 2002 session and the whole 2003 annual session. This would have necessitated amending the CD’s rules of procedure, which require renewing mandates of subsidiary bodies at the beginning of each annual session. In terms of the mandates of the proposed subsidiary bodies, the proposal drew upon the earlier efforts to find a compromise formula in order to resolve a deadlock in the CD, including the Amorim proposal ([CD/1624](#)). In comparison to previous proposals, the new initiative contained several amendments. For instance, it required stocks of fissile material to be included in the scope of the future FMCT negotiations. In this regard, the new initiative differed from the so-called “[Shannon mandate](#),” which was widely regarded as the basis for the future FMCT negotiations.

Following a month-long consultation process, the new cross-group proposal on a program of work was formally presented to the CD at the 912th plenary meeting on 29 August 2002. The revised version opted for a presidential declaration instead of a preamble, and it no longer required modification of the CD rules of procedure in regard to the necessity to renew the mandates of subsidiary bodies at the beginning of each annual session. It called for the establishment of an Ad Hoc Committee on negative security assurances with a mandate to negotiate effective international arrangements, which “could take the form of an international legally binding instrument” and an Ad Hoc Committee to deal with nuclear disarmament. It further recommended an Ad Hoc Committee to negotiate an FMCT, whose mandate was modified so that the reference to stocks con-

tained in the wording of the initial version submitted in July was eliminated. Finally, there would be an Ad Hoc Committee to deal with PAROS, which should “identify and examine... any specific topics or proposals, which could include confidence building or transparency measures, general principles, treaty commitments and the elaboration of a regime capable of preventing an arms race in outer space.”

Ambassador Dembri of Algeria *noted* that the establishment of three Ad Hoc Committees (namely, on negative security assurances, FMCT, and nuclear disarmament), as well as the appointment of three Special Coordinators enjoyed more or less universal support among the delegations, or at least this support was evolving in a favorable direction, while the issue of PAROS remained a point of contention. Ambassador Dembri noted again the wide gap between China’s approach to a program of work, which he termed “maximalist”, and the U.S. approach, which he called a “minimalist” one.

The reactions of the CD members to the new modified proposal were generally favorable. However, China and the United States again demonstrated disagreement between their approaches to the work of the CD. China tabled a proposal stating its willingness to agree to the 2000 Amorim proposal on the program of work if the PAROS Ad Hoc Committee were established with a view to reaching a legally binding agreement (CD/1682). The United States stated that the offer made by China remained unacceptable to it. The United States stressed that any proposal on PAROS would be acceptable to it only if it did not prejudice where the discussions would lead.

Some of the members of the Western Group also criticized the Chinese position on PAROS. At the same time Russia and a number of G21 states expressed their support for the Chinese position. A number of countries also praised the joint Russian-Chinese working paper on PAROS.

On 15 August, the CD held informal consultations on the issue of radiological weapons, as proposed earlier by Germany. Views diverged on whether consideration of radiological weapons should take into account the already existing experience of the CD, which had considered this item in 1980-1992, or to start anew. Many states expressed a view that the CD’s efforts in this area should not duplicate the work of the International Atomic Energy Agency (*IAEA*) related to protection of radioactive materials. Some countries raised the issues of scope of the potential convention and definitions of radioactive sources. Some states questioned the necessity of a convention on radiological weapons, arguing that such weapons do not exist

and are unlikely to appear in the future because they lack military utility. These issues were extremely controversial and had prevented the CD from reaching a consensus on this item in the past. The conference agreed to inform the IAEA of the debate.

Among other developments, the CD heard statements from the Special Coordinators on procedural issues. The Coordinators as in the previous year reported no consensus among the members of the CD on the reform of the CD agenda, the expansion of its membership, and improved and effective functioning of the Conference. In its Annual Report to the General Assembly, the CD adopted a recommendation to reappoint the Special Coordinators on procedural issues during the 2003 annual session.

At its final plenary meeting, the CD adopted its annual report to the 57th session of the United Nations General Assembly. In this report, *inter alia*, the CD requested that the current president and the incoming president conduct appropriate consultations during the intersessional period and, if possible, make recommendations, taking into account all existing proposals and views presented and discussions held in the 2002 session. While agreeing that priority should be given to substantive work, the CD recommended that Special Coordinators on procedural issues be appointed, if deemed necessary, during its 2003 session.

2001:

Dates for the 2001 CD session were: January 22 to March 30, May 14 to June 29, and July 30 to September 14.

2001 First Part: The new president of the CD, Ambassador Christopher Westdal of Canada, attempted to secure the members’ consensus on a program of work based on the Amorim proposal (CD/1624), which received support from most countries. However, it became apparent that the key players were not yet ready to make concessions given the difficult political climate and with the national missile defense issue at center stage. The statements by the Russian Foreign Minister Igor Ivanov and Pakistan’s Foreign Secretary Inam ul Haque at the opening Plenary of the 2001 Session, in addition to statements by China and the United States, once again reinforced the sense that reaching agreement on PAROS and an FMCT in particular, and on the program of work in general, was impossible.

Given the stalemate over the key issues of the program of work, some countries proposed that the Conference could do something in the meantime. Myanmar put forward a “Plan B” proposal, saying that

pending an agreement on the program of work, the CD should convene plenary meetings devoted to substantive items on its agreed agenda. Delegations would be encouraged to submit their proposals on substantive items in order to make optimum use of the plenary meetings while efforts to reach agreement on the program of work continue. This proposal enjoyed the support of some delegations.

Other delegations cautioned the Conference against such a solution, which might reduce the relevance of the CD as a negotiating body. New Zealand and South Africa suggested strengthening the Amorim proposal to adequately reflect the NPT undertakings with respect to the issues of nuclear disarmament and an FMCT. This approach, supported by Canada and several other countries, was designed to prevent “thematic discussions” that risked providing convenient cover for those who did not want to engage in real negotiations and to maintain the pressure on key players to fulfill pledges made at the 2000 NPT Review Conference.

2001 Second Part: In the beginning of the second part of the 2001 session, on 17 May 2001, the Conference managed to adopt a decision to appoint three Special Coordinators: one to review the CD’s agenda (Ambassador Günther Seibert of Germany), a second to review its membership (Ambassador Petko Dragano of Bulgaria), and a third to review its working methods (Ambassador Prasad Kariyawasam of Sri Lanka). That was the first decision taken by the Conference in almost three years.

Russia tabled an official proposal on PAROS and nuclear disarmament. The proposal provided for the establishment of two Ad Hoc Committees (AHC) on the two issues. The nuclear disarmament AHC would “deal with” the topic and “take into consideration all relevant views and proposals,” and also “address questions related to its mandate,” while the PAROS AHC would negotiate with a view to reaching agreement on a regime (an internationally legally binding instrument) capable of preventing an arms race in outer space. The proposal marked the first time that Russia had supported the establishment of an AHC on nuclear disarmament in the CD. China supported the proposal. China said the “Treaty on the Prevention of the Weaponization of Outer Space” should contain four basic provisions: 1) “not to test, deploy, or use in outer space any weapons, weapons systems or their components;” 2) “not to test, deploy or use on land, at sea or atmosphere any weapons, weapon systems or their components that can be used for war-fighting in outer space;” 3) “not to use any objects launched into orbit to directly participate in

combatant activities;” and 4) “not to assist or encourage other countries, regions, international organizations or entities to participate in activities prohibited by this legal instrument.”

In the meantime, some delegations were reportedly holding informal consultations on the possibility of preparing for FMCT negotiations outside the CD framework to expedite the work on this issue. The FMCT negotiations would be transferred back to the CD as soon as it agreed on a work program. During the May 2001 meeting dedicated to this matter, many divergent views were expressed, while some countries, namely China and Pakistan, opted not to attend. However, a great number of delegations supported the initiative, and participated in a Japan-Australia-organized seminar entitled “Geneva Workshop on a treaty to ban the production of fissile material for nuclear weapons or other nuclear explosive devices.”

2001 Third Part: Upon the commencement of the third part of the 2001 session, the three Special Coordinators on the CD’s agenda, functioning, and membership reported no agreement on these three items.

After the 2001 session, the CD was still unable to break the deadlock over its program of work, although the majority of the delegations still recognized the “Amorim proposal” (CD/1624) as the basis for continuing consultations to reach agreement on this. The CD recommended that Special Coordinators on procedural issues be reappointed the following year. Given US efforts to develop and deploy NMD, PAROS became the main bone of contention in the CD, with China and Russia in particular pressing hard for negotiations. At the same time, the long-awaited negotiations on an FMCT still had their active and strong supporters, who looked at ways to make progress outside the CD. Reportedly, a number of delegations were planning cutbacks in their CD delegations, including possible withdrawals of disarmament ambassadors, until more promising times.

2000:

The dates for the 2000 session of the CD were: 17 January to 24 March, 22 May to 7 July, and 7 August to 22 September.

The CD entered its 2000 session after having failed to agree on its program of work in 1999 or to engage in substantive work for three consecutive years. This situation caused a sense of deep frustration among the CD members who questioned the very existence of the Conference due to its inability to address pressing matters of disarmament and nonproliferation. Several delegations even raised the issue of establishing an alternative body to deal with these matters. In

March, Germany, on behalf of 22 countries, proposed that the CD should first address the issues on which agreement had already been reached while continuing to discuss outstanding items to find compromise solutions. This position came into conflict with that of certain countries, namely China, which insisted on the comprehensive and balanced nature of the program of work. Germany also argued that the program of work should address the real problems of international security.

The CD presidents, through informal presidential consultations and meetings of the regional groups, tried to lead the Conference out of the deadlock by crafting various compromise drafts of the program of work. In the beginning of the 2000 session, the outgoing president, Ambassador Harald Kreid of Austria, declared the Dembri Proposal set forth during the 1999 session as the “point of departure” for reaching an agreement on the program of work. The following presidential proposals reflected the ideas and spirit of the Dembri Proposal while containing “more acceptable language” for the Member States. Ambassador Kreid’s proposal contained three possible options for the program of work. Option 1 provided for appointment of SC on PAROS and nuclear disarmament as well as the re-establishment of the subsidiary bodies and the SC with their mandates on all other substantial items, including an FMCT. Option 2 excluded the FMCT from that list but contained a non-negotiated statement by the president with regard to this item. Option 3—a minimum option—contained appointment of SC on PAROS and nuclear disarmament with submission by the president of his proposal as an official CD document concerning the re-establishment of the subsidiary bodies and re-appointment of SC with their mandates on all other substantial items. The proposal by the president, Ambassador Martynov of Belarus, contained priority and contingency actions. The former provided for the continuation of presidential consultations on setting up subsidiary bodies on outstanding issues, while the latter considered holding informal focused plenary meetings on all issues of substance on a rotation basis until the program of work was adopted. The proposal by the president, Ambassador Jean Lint of Belgium (CD/1620), included establishment of an Ad Hoc Committee to negotiate an FMCT, an Ad Hoc Working Group to deal with nuclear disarmament “through an exchange of information and views on practical steps for progressive and systematic efforts to attain this objective,” and an Ad Hoc Working Group “to examine and identify specific topics or proposals that might be a basis for subsequent in-depth consideration” of the issue of PAROS.

The proposal by Celso Amorim of Brazil in August followed closely Lint’s proposal and provided for establishment of four Ad Hoc Committees to deal with fissile material, PAROS, nuclear disarmament, and negative security assurances. However, this proposal failed to alleviate China’s concerns about a balanced approach to the issues. In China’s view, Amorim’s proposed mandates for Ad Hoc Committees were differently weighted — they proposed a negotiation mandate for an FMCT, and only a discussion mandate for PAROS. By the end of the 2000 Session (22 September), neither of the proposals enjoyed consensus, and the CD’s prospects for starting substantive work early in 2001 were very slim.

In 2000, there continued to be a lack of consensus regarding PAROS and nuclear disarmament. Moreover, conditions outside the Conference (namely, setbacks concerning the failure of the CTBT to enter into force and US plans to deploy NMD) worsened the prospect of attaining consensus on these items. Some countries proposed that an Ad Hoc Committee to start negotiations on a phased program of nuclear disarmament and eventual elimination of nuclear weapons should be established as soon as possible. Other Member States called on the CD to establish an Ad Hoc Committee to negotiate an international legally binding mechanism preventing the weaponization of outer space by prohibiting testing, deploying, and using weapons and weapon systems there. None of the aforementioned proposals reached consensus in the Conference. The problem became even more acute when the issue of an FMCT joined the group of unresolved issues following the change in position of China. China linked negotiation on an FMCT with negotiation on PAROS and nuclear disarmament, thus blocking any possible progress to re-establish the Ad Hoc Committee on the negotiation of an FMCT in particular and adoption of the program of work in general. On the other side, certain countries regarded issues of nuclear disarmament and PAROS as less important than the the FMCT and thus refused to include them in the package. The United States stuck to the position that nuclear disarmament and PAROS were not ripe for treaty negotiations in the CD because there was no consensus on proposals for such negotiations. However, such a consensus had been reached with respect to an FMCT, as reflected in the “Principles and Objectives” document of the 1995 NPT Review Conference. Following the successful outcome of the 2000 NPT Review Conference, states expected a start of substantive work on these issues. However, great differences with respect to approaching an FMCT and PAROS, mainly voiced by China, the United States, and Russia, continued to

prevent the CD from adopting its program of work and getting down to substantive work. The US-China debate on the issue of NMD and the relationship between an FMCT and PAROS sometimes resembled polemics in the Cold War-style and became sharper in tone than ever before. The United States went as far as accusing China of attempting to block negotiations on the FMCT by holding them hostage to PAROS. By the end of the 2000 session, all attempts to agree on the program of work or at least the program of work for 2001 were unsuccessful.

The stalemate in the CD triggered a discussion on the rules of procedure of the Conference. Some Member States called for “procedural reform” of the CD. Certain delegations proposed that the rule of consensus should be abolished, at least with respect to decisions on procedural matters such as the program of work or appointment of SC and establishment of subsidiary bodies. Some delegations also voiced a desire to change the procedure that necessitated the re-establishment of subsidiary bodies each session. However, many delegations were reluctant to do anything requiring a reform of the CD’s rules of procedure, particularly regarding the consensus rule. In view of the miserable state of affairs in the Conference at the turn of the new millennium, the CD raised the question of attracting more high-level attention to its work in the capitals of Members States. The outgoing Deputy Secretary-General of the CD Abdelkader Bensmail argued, however, that that deadlock was not due to the CD’s rules of procedure, working methods, or its group system. Rather, he maintained, the political will and unfavorable political climate between the major players were the chief causes of the Conference’s difficulties.

Closing its 2000 session for the fourth consecutive year without having begun any negotiations or established subsidiary bodies, the CD adopted its annual report to the UNGA on 21 September 2000. The report noted that the CD had conducted intensive consultations and considered both formal and informal proposals without having agreed on the program of work and without having established any mechanism for any of its agenda items. Costa Rica expressed its desire to join the CD as a permanent member.

1999:

It was hoped that negotiations on a treaty to ban the production of fissile material for explosives (FMCT) would begin during the 1999 session of the CD. However, due to both internal and external factors, the Conference was unable to adopt a program of work for the year, thus preventing the re-establishment of an Ad Hoc Committee to resume the

work begun in August of 1998. Despite successive efforts of CD presidents, CD members could not reach consensus on how to treat two agenda items — nuclear disarmament and PAROS — within the work program. Many of the non-aligned states pressed for an Ad Hoc Committee on nuclear disarmament, stating that the troika consultations of the preceding year were not a permanent solution. However, the NWS were reluctant to agree to anything more involved than the troika arrangement. China led the effort to re-establish an Ad Hoc Committee on PAROS. However, the United States was unwilling to address the issue multilaterally.

The “Dembri Proposal,” named after Ambassador Mohamed-Salah Dembri (Algeria) who held the presidency during the second session of the 1999 Conference, called for both an Ad Hoc Working Group “with a view to preventing the weaponization of outer space” and an Ad Hoc Working Group “to exchange information and views on endeavors towards nuclear disarmament.” However, the CD was unable to achieve consensus on either of these issues. During the third part of the Conference, the CD admitted five new members: Ecuador, Ireland, Kazakhstan, Malaysia, and Tunisia. These countries — representing diverse geo-political regions as well as distinct groups within the CD structure — were admitted after member countries dropped their lingering reservations.

1998:

On 26 March 1998, the CD adopted its program of work, contained in document CD/1501. Based on this program, the CD decided to establish an Ad Hoc Committee on negative security assurances. To address nuclear disarmament issues, the CD established a mechanism of consultations held under the auspices of the presidential “troika” consisting of the past, present, and incoming presidents. The CD also appointed six SC to address PAROS, a comprehensive program of disarmament, transparency in armaments, a review of its agenda, the expansion of its membership, and its improved and effective functioning. On 11 August, the CD established an Ad Hoc Committee to negotiate an FMCT to ban the production of fissile material for weapons purposes.

Nuclear disarmament was the most pervasive point of contention in the CD. Due to widespread differences of opinion on how to proceed, it was not possible to reach an agreement on the establishment of a mechanism to negotiate nuclear disarmament issues. The non-aligned states continued to stress the utmost importance of nuclear disarmament, while a number of other delegations, including some from the Western group, supported the idea of establishing a consulta-

tive mechanism to facilitate cooperation, information sharing, and accountability in nuclear disarmament matters. A considerable number of delegations considered the presidential “troika” consultations useful in addressing the issue. In his final report to the CD, the outgoing president recommended that the Conference resume the troika consultations in its next session in 1999.

According to the decision, contained in document CD/1501, the CD agreed to establish an Ad Hoc Committee under agenda item 4 entitled “Effective international arrangements to assure non-nuclear weapon States against the use or threat of use of nuclear weapons.” The Committee was established to negotiate an international legally binding instrument that would assure NNWS protection against the use or threat of use of nuclear weapons. The Committee’s discussions primarily focused on the nature and scope of currently existing positive and negative security assurances, as expressed in nuclear weapon States’ declarations and the protocols to the nuclear-weapon-free-zone treaties. It also addressed certain definitions that required clarification, in particular, such as “aggression,” “attack,” “invasion,” “dependent territories,” “associations and alliances,” and “security commitments.” However, the Committee was unable to reach any consensus on how to deal with these issues. The Chairman’s final report (CD/1554) on the work of the Committee noted that there was no consensus reached on these issues, provided a list of all the relevant documents, and compiled in its annex a summary of all the views and national positions. The report also included a recommendation that the work of the Committee be resumed in 1999.

Pre-1998

In 1994, the CD appointed a Special Coordinator, Ambassador Gerald Shannon (Canada), to seek the views of its members on the most appropriate arrangement to negotiate a nondiscriminatory, multilateral, internationally verifiable treaty banning the production of fissile material for nuclear weapons or other nuclear explosive devices (FMCT). After 14 months of consultations, the CD agreed, on 23 March 1995, on a [mandate](#) for FMCT negotiations based on UNGA resolution 48/75L (of 16 December 1993). The 1995 NPT Review and Extension Conference called for the “immediate commencement and early conclusion of negotiations” on an FMCT, as have subsequent NPT PrepComs. During the 1995, 1996, and 1997 sessions of the CD, while consultations continued no agreement was reached on establishing an Ad Hoc Committee on this item. On 11 August 1998, the CD adopted a decision contained in docu-

ment CD/1547 on the establishment of an Ad Hoc Committee on the ban on production of fissile material under agenda item 1, on the basis of the 1995 Shannon report and the mandate contained therein ([CD/1299](#)). Following the adoption of that decision, the president read out his statement in which he stressed that the decision was made “without prejudice to any further decisions on the establishment of further subsidiary bodies under agenda item 1,” and ensured the pursuance of intensive consultations to seek further ways to deal with the agenda item on nuclear disarmament.

In view of the limited time available for the work of the Committee before the closing of the 1998 session of the CD, it did not achieve any substantive progress and failed to resolve long-standing conflicts pertaining to the issue of nuclear stockpiles and their relation to nonproliferation and/or nuclear disarmament. The Chairman’s final report on the work of the “Agenda item 1 Committee on banning fissile material production,” (CD/1555) provided a list of CD documents relating to this issue.

Despite the fact that there was widespread support for dealing with the issue of PAROS, no consensus was achieved on how to proceed. The SC introduced a draft mandate for negotiating measures on PAROS, and suggested that its text serve as the basis for the renewed 1999 consultations on this issue, with an aim of reestablishing an Ad Hoc Committee on agenda item 3.

The Conference was unable to reach consensus on the establishment of an Ad Hoc Committee to negotiate a ban on the transfer of anti-personnel land mines.

In his final report on the outcome of discussions under agenda item 7 on transparency in armaments (TIA), the Special Coordinator concluded that there seemed to be widespread support in the CD for the establishment of an Ad Hoc Committee on this issue to negotiate an international instrument. According to the report, his consultations primarily dealt with the merits of TIA; the ways of dealing with TIA within the CD, and the scope of possible activity on the issue.

According to the Special Coordinator’s final report on improved and effective functioning of the CD, the consultations focused on three main issues: 1) the question of maintaining the continuity of the work of the CD from one session to the next, 2) the question of a permanent establishment of “standing committees” to deal with substantive and technical issues, and 3) the possibility for the president to appoint

“friends of the president” to facilitate discussion and communication among delegations on certain issues. There was also a proposal to formalize the mechanism of open-ended consultations. Despite the Special Coordinator’s support for various proposals on these issues, there was no agreement on any of them.

While no agreement was reached on how to proceed with the review of the agenda, the Special Coordinator noted that some delegations advocated keeping the current agenda with nuclear disarmament as an item of high priority. Other delegations suggested placing all issues under the three main headings of “nuclear disarmament,” “conventional disarmament,” and “other items.” In his final report, the Special Coordinator included a recommendation for pursuing this issue further in 1999.

Despite being very close to reaching a consensus on the adoption of the proposal made by the Special Coordinator to admit five new members representing five regions (Ecuador from Latin America, Ireland from Western Europe, Kazakhstan from Eastern Europe, Malaysia from Asia, and Tunisia from Africa), the final decision was blocked by Iran and postponed until 1999.

The CD closed its 1998 session by adopting its final report to the United Nations General Assembly on 9 September. Despite the fact that most of the May 1998 CD plenary meetings were dominated by discussions on the Indian and Pakistani nuclear tests, the annual report did not address this issue.

Point of Contact:

Secretary-General of the Conference and Personal Representative of the UN Secretary-General to the CD: Sergei Ordzhonikidze (Russia)
Deputy Secretary-General: Tim Caughley (New Zealand)

Address:

8-14 Avenue de la Paix
Palais des Nations, CH-1211
Geneva 10, SWITZERLAND
Tel: (41 22) 917 2100
FAX: (41 22) 917 0034