



# Economic and Social Council

Distr.: Limited  
13 June 2024

Original: English

---

## Committee for Programme and Coordination

Sixty-fourth session

New York, 13 May–14 June 2024

### Draft report

*Rapporteur:* Mr. Noel M. Novicio (Philippines)

#### Addendum

### Programme questions: proposed programme budget for 2025

(Item 3 (a))

#### Programme 3 Disarmament

1. At its 5th meeting, on 15 May 2024, the Committee considered programme 3, Disarmament, of the proposed programme plan for 2025 and programme performance in 2023 ([A/79/6 \(Sect.4\)](#)).

#### Discussion

2. Delegations expressed appreciation and support for the work of the Office for Disarmament Affairs and its multilateral efforts aimed at achieving the goal of general and complete disarmament under strict and effective international control. Delegations emphasized the importance of the work of the Office, in particular in the context of the uncertain and deteriorating security environment, and expressed appreciation for the programme plan provided. A delegation reiterated its support for the work of the Office, reaffirmed its unwavering commitment to disarmament, and noted with concern the lack of consensus on the programme.

3. Appreciation was expressed for the efforts made by the Office to support the implementation of decisions of the Security Council and the General Assembly. A delegation emphasized that the support provided by the Office should be impartial, depoliticized and carried out in strict accordance with the mandates given by Member States. Attention was drawn to paragraph 4.3 of the report, which contained references to *Securing Our Common Future: An Agenda for Disarmament*. In that regard, the view was expressed that references to the Agenda should be avoided as it had not received approval from all Member States. Another delegation said that while it generally supported the work of the Office, its support did not extend to the entire



mandate, as it did not agree with some Assembly resolutions. The same delegation said that it strongly supported some elements of the Agenda, but did not support other elements. The delegation emphasized that the Agenda was the initiative of the Secretary-General and had not been drawn up by Member States.

4. A delegation expressed its support for the further strengthening of the role of the Office and said that Member States expected the Office to play an increased role in many areas. As an example, the delegation noted that the Office provided administrative services to the Biological Weapons Convention Implementation Support Unit and that the States parties to the Biological Weapons Convention would soon agree on further expanding the Implementation Support Unit to serve the two new mechanisms to be established under the Convention.

5. A delegation emphasized the need to accelerate progress towards a world free of nuclear weapons, and reaffirmed that nuclear weapons posed an existential threat to humanity and that a nuclear war could never be won and must never be fought. The delegation expressed the view that the only guarantee against the use and threat of use of nuclear weapons was total elimination, and reiterated its deep concern over the slow pace of nuclear disarmament. The same delegation stressed the need to uphold disarmament obligations and expressed serious concern at the continuous and progressive erosion of international norms, rules and obligations in the field of disarmament, arms control and non-proliferation.

6. A delegation stated that it did not share the view that political developments relating to international peace and security were conducive to the facilitation of negotiations on new arms limitation and disarmament agreements. The delegation cited the deteriorating international environment as one of the reasons for the launch of an initiative to address the security challenges faced and to provide a practical dialogue to facilitate further progress on disarmament. The delegation emphasized the importance of language in the programme plan that reflected nuclear non-proliferation as an issue that was as important as the elimination of existing nuclear weapons, and noted that the objectives of the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons included non-proliferation and the facilitation of the peaceful uses of nuclear energy, as well as disarmament. Another delegation expressed the view that the existing multilateral arms control and disarmament machinery had played a pivotal role in stabilizing international security and order. The delegation stressed the importance of the Conference on Disarmament as the sole multilateral disarmament negotiating body and the need for the international community to oppose selectivity and utilitarianism. The same delegation emphasized the legitimacy of the peaceful use of science and technology and encouraged the Office to take steps to ensure the effective implementation of General Assembly resolutions [76/234](#) and [77/96](#) on promoting international cooperation on peaceful uses in the context of international security.

7. A delegation commended the references to gender mainstreaming in the Office's operational activities, deliverables and results. The delegation expressed the view that addressing the issue of gender in disarmament, non-proliferation and arms control continued to face resistance, and stated that all weapons, from nuclear weapons to drones, had a gender dimension, which had been invisible until recently. Another delegation concurred with paragraph 4.7 on mainstreaming a gender perspective.

8. A delegation referred to the mandates listed in paragraph 4.10, noted the inclusion of General Assembly resolution [68/33](#) on women, disarmament, non-proliferation and arms control, but observed the absence of any resolutions on the matter adopted after the sixty-eighth session, such as General Assembly resolution [77/55](#). The delegation suggested that the list of mandates should be updated accordingly. Another delegation expressed the view that the Office could not interact

with civil society on disarmament issues at its own discretion and that such interactions must be authorized by the Member States. The delegation said that a similar approach should be applied regarding gender issues.

9. A delegation called for equitable geographic representation in the Office.

10. With respect to subprogramme 1, Multilateral negotiations and deliberations on disarmament and arms limitation, a delegation referred to paragraphs 4.15 and 4.16 and observed that the Conference on Disarmament had not started substantive work in over two decades and noted the lack of agreement on its programme of work. The delegation further referenced Result 2 and expressed the view that the thematic discussions referred to in paragraph 4.21 were contrary to the mandate of the Conference.

11. Another delegation questioned the emergence of new terminology in the programme plan that had never been discussed or used in relevant disarmament forums. The delegation made reference to the term “treaty-making conferences” in paragraph 4.15 (b) and sought clarification on the type of mechanisms being referred to. The delegation highlighted the inadmissibility of such wording and emphasized the need to adhere to agreed-upon language. Another delegation expressed the view that there was duplication and overlap in programmatic priorities established by the General Assembly under subprogramme 1 and highlighted the strain on the capacity of small delegations due to two open-ended working groups in the area of the prevention of an arms race in outer space. The same delegation referred to table 4.3 and suggested that a reference to the second mechanism on international cooperation and assistance as part of the planned performance measures should have been included. Delegations also referred to table 4.4 and expressed the view that the planned performance measures for 2024 and 2025 should have been more realistic. A delegation stated that the reference to “inclusion of agreed language” under the 2024 planned performance measure in table 4.5 did not reflect the dynamics of the negotiations and expressed the view that such projections should not be included.

12. With respect to subprogramme 2, Weapons of mass destruction, a delegation expressed serious concern regarding the reference, in paragraph 4.28 (h), to the Secretariat’s support for the efforts of the Organisation for the Prohibition of Chemical Weapons (OPCW) to ensure accountability for the use of chemical weapons. The delegation emphasized that such actions should not go beyond the mandate of OPCW and stressed that ensuring accountability for the use of chemical weapons was the prerogative of the Security Council. The delegation stated that governing bodies of the United Nations had not assigned that task to OPCW and stressed that Security Council resolution [2118 \(2013\)](#) did not contain directives to the Organisation in that regard.

13. A delegation expressed support, in principle, for the establishment of a nuclear-weapon-free zone in the Middle East, with the caveat that it could only be achieved with the full support of all States in the region.

14. A delegation expressed its commitment to the long-term goal of a world without nuclear weapons, in line with its obligations under the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons. The delegation said that the most effective way to achieve that would be through gradual multilateral disarmament negotiated through the Treaty and looked forward to working with all States on nuclear disarmament during the eleventh review cycle of the Treaty and beyond. While the delegation acknowledged the need for the Treaty on the Prohibition of Nuclear Weapons to be a part of the work of the Office, the delegation stressed that it would not sign or ratify the Treaty, or send observers to the Meeting of States Parties. The delegation expressed the view that the Treaty did not address the key issues that must be overcome to offer the potential for lasting global disarmament, consider solutions to the challenges posed by a

deteriorating security environment, or address the technical challenges of verifying nuclear disarmament without proliferating knowledge pertaining to nuclear weapons.

15. With respect to subprogramme 3, Conventional arms, a delegation said that Member States would benefit if the Office was enabled to provide greater analytical insights in some areas, such as reporting on military expenditure and analysing trends of military expenditure and arms transfers. A delegation commended the efforts of the Office to assist Member States with the implementation of the Global Framework for Through-life Conventional Ammunition Management. The delegation suggested that the process would benefit from renewed momentum going into 2025 and expressed its support for efforts to link stakeholder engagement on small arms and light weapons with broader development processes.

16. Referring to figure 4.I, a delegation sought clarification on whether the dedicated fellowship training programme had commenced and requested an update on its current status and progress.

17. With respect to subprogramme 4, Information and outreach, a delegation sought clarification on the inclusion of Result 1 in the programme plan. The delegation expressed the view that developments in the field of information and telecommunications in the context of international security, and advancing responsible State behaviour in the use of information and communications technologies were achieved through negotiations between Governments on cybersecurity, and were not related to information and outreach. The same delegation stated that the strategy for information and outreach of the Office could have been more comprehensive, through the use of flexibility, capacity and dynamics, and use social networks and media to reach young people and raise awareness among them about the importance of disarmament.

18. A delegation stated that it attached great importance to the empowerment of young people in disarmament and non-proliferation discussions and welcomed the inclusion of a paragraph on lessons learned and planned change (para. 4.63).

19. With respect to subprogramme 5, Regional disarmament, a delegation referred to Result 1 and sought clarification on the inclusion of the application of Security Council resolution [1540 \(2004\)](#) in the regional context. In that regard, the delegation expressed the view that the regional approach was not adequate and that the global level was more appropriate. With respect to table 4.22, another delegation sought clarification on the variance between the planned and actual deliverables for 2023 with respect to the implementation of General Assembly resolution [65/69](#) on women, disarmament, non-proliferation and arms control.

### **Conclusions and recommendations**

20. **The Committee recommended that the plenary or the relevant Main Committee or Main Committees of the General Assembly, in line with Assembly resolution [78/244](#), consider the programme plan for programme 3, Disarmament, of the proposed programme budget for 2025 under the agenda item entitled “Programme planning” at the seventy-ninth session of the Assembly.**