



# General Assembly

Sixty-eighth session

## First Committee

**12<sup>th</sup>** meeting

Monday, 21 October 2013, 10 a.m.  
New York

Official Records

*Chair:* Mr. Dabbashi ..... (Libya)

*The meeting was called to order at 10.10 a.m.*

### Agenda items 89 to 107 (continued)

#### Thematic discussion on item subjects and introduction and consideration of all draft resolutions submitted under all disarmament and related international security agenda items

**The Chair** (*spoke in Arabic*): On behalf of the Committee, I should like warmly to welcome Mr. Kim Won-soo, Assistant Secretary-General, Special Adviser to the Secretary-General on Change Implementation, who will have an exchange with the Committee today on the report of the Secretary-General entitled “Research, training and library services” (A/68/485).

As members will recall, Mr. Kim briefed the Committee on that matter on three previous occasions — on 1 November 2012 (see A/C.1/67/PV.17), 30 January 2013 and 26 July 2013. Today’s exchange, as the previous ones, underlines the importance of this issue to the work of the First Committee, especially with regard to the role of the United Nations Institute for Disarmament Research.

I now give the floor to Mr. Kim.

**Mr. Kim Won-soo:** As Ambassador Dabbashi just said, this is my fourth interaction with the First Committee on the United Nations Institute for Disarmament Research (UNIDIR) and the bigger issue of integrating knowledge-related functions. I always appreciate an opportunity to interact with the First Committee. In fact, this Committee is the only

intergovernmental body that asks me to appear so frequently. I have learned a lot from this exercise.

We are trying to show the gist of our thinking, although I am sure that all representatives must have read our proposal, which was submitted in September. Currently we are experiencing some technical glitches, which shows how challenging it is to be paper-smart and to organize our meetings using more technical means. Our colleagues are working on solving those technical glitches so that we can show paper slides. In the meantime, I will try to emphasize the gist of our proposal.

First, I should like to emphasize that, having heard the comments, concerns and interest that have been expressed by the First Committee so overwhelmingly—I think with almost absolute consensus, which is a very welcome development for us in the Secretariat — we have come up with a consolidation plan that does not propose any change as far as UNIDIR is concerned. That means that the governance structure of UNIDIR with its governing Board of Trustees, which is also the Secretary-General’s Advisory Board on Disarmament Matters, will maintain 100 per cent authority, oversight and control over what UNIDIR is doing. The institutional setup of UNIDIR and its mandate will not change.

We are proposing to organize other knowledge-related functions, notably training and library services. Our proposal suggests two different levels of integration in the training and library services, which are more mature for integration, while

This record contains the text of speeches delivered in English and of the interpretation of speeches delivered in the other languages. Corrections should be submitted to the original languages only. They should be incorporated in a copy of the record and sent under the signature of a member of the delegation concerned to the Chief of the Verbatim Reporting Service, room U-506. Corrections will be issued after the end of the session in a consolidated corrigendum.

13-52297 (E)



Accessible document

Please recycle



maintaining the research functions that have been done by four research institutions, including UNIDIR. We will keep the institutional firewall between those institutions intact and no change will be proposed.

Instead, we are now proposing to better organize the knowledge and library services. Those two services will provide a one-sided service to the research institutions, because we need to better organize our knowledge management. That means that knowledge has to be produced by the research institutions. The knowledge produced by them will be fed into training and libraries to be used by the training machine. It will also be stored and disseminated by the library system. In turn, those integrated training and library services will provide a better service to the research institutions. All the research institutions, including UNIDIR, will stand to gain many benefits from that improved knowledge-management system of the whole Secretariat, which will allow us to move towards meeting the growing demands from Member States and other stakeholders in this age of information.

I will shortly show how that knowledge-management integration will work for the benefit of UNIDIR. We hope this proposal will allow everybody to gain by creating synergies between the two functions.

We propose to Member States that, through our interaction with the First and Fifth Committees this Fall, we will ask the General Assembly to provide guidance on the overall direction of the exercise. Based on that decision, we will come up with a more detailed plan on how to integrate training and library services next Fall. We will then get the consideration and decisions of Member States on that plan and, based on that, we will first integrate training and libraries. In the meantime, we will improve the coordination mechanism between the research institutions so that, by the end of 2015, two years from now, a transition plan for those three functional areas of knowledge service will be completed. I will now quickly go through the technical part.

The first slide shows how the consultation has moved up to the present and also how it will go until December 2013. It captures what I did first with consultation with Member States, mostly with the First Committee and then with the Economic and Social Council resolution of July. A report was then submitted, and now I am here with the First Committee. I will meet with the Fifth

Committee in November so that Member States can consider it in December in its entirety.

The next slide shows where we are with the seven institutions. We have seven institutions that are totally different, not related and unconnected, working in their own worlds while all of them are performing one, two or three knowledge-related functions. On the library side, we will integrate the two largest libraries we have, the Dag Hammarskjöld Library in New York and the Library at the United Nations Office at Geneva.

In the training service area, we will integrate the training functions that have been done by the United Nations Institute for Training and Research (UNITAR) for representatives and the Staff College training function for staff. We will integrate the two largest training functions first.

In the research area, four research institutions will exist with institutional firewalls between them so that nothing in the institutional setup or its oversight, control or budget will be changed. The purple arrows show how we intend to organize those seven knowledge-related institutions in a better fashion. The knowledge produced by four research institutions will be fed into training for use in the learning and training of representatives and staff, and also fed to the library for better storage and dissemination. That better-organized training, which is the use of knowledge and storage of the dissemination of knowledge, will provide a better service to the research institutions. We are trying to create a virtuous cycle of knowledge management.

The three concentric circles on this slide show what our approach will be to improve coordination within the research network. The four existing institutions will serve as the core of the research network we have at the Secretariat. That core will improve their relationships and modus operandi with other United Nations research entities, most probably the United Nations University network. That network also has a global reach, but we are now proposing to include it in the core of the research network because they have a dual governance structure, not only the United Nations but also UNESCO. The third concentric circle shows that, with the improved network, we will improve our networking with other networks outside the United Nations system.

As to training and learning, as I said, the training for staff and training for representatives will be integrated in Torino, Italy. The Director of Training, to be based in

Torino, will report to the Assistant Secretary-General in Geneva, who will be reconfigured from the UNITAR structure. The second concentric circle shows that this integrated training service of the Secretariat will have a better working relationship with the existing training capacity in the Secretariat, and then eventually with those outside the United Nations system.

With regard to library services, the two largest libraries will be integrated under a unified structure — although the two libraries will maintain their brand names, as they have other functions that they have to continue to perform in their locations. We will then integrate the other libraries that exist in all our duty stations, most notably in all regional commissions, and, eventually, integrate all the United Nations system libraries of every specialized agency.

Through this exercise, we are trying to strengthen links in the research network, including UNIDIR, to strengthen their relationship with intergovernmental bodies. The prime example we are telling other research institutions to follow is what UNIDIR is doing with the First Committee and the Conference on Disarmament.

Unlike UNIDIR, the links other research institutions have with Member States are weak, as are their links with the substantive departments. In the case of UNIDIR the link is with the Office for Disarmament Affairs, but in other research institutions their links with substantive departments are weak as well. We are trying to strengthen those two key relationships. Eventually, that will lead to a higher level of research capacity in all research institutions participating in the network. Then the integrated training service and integrated library service will help those research institutions to better manage the knowledge they produce. They also stand to gain from the many other synergies to be created. It is hoped that this will also help them to raise more money from donors, as they will see that the United Nations has improved its capacity for research, training and knowledge storage and dissemination.

I briefly alluded to the timeline. In December, we hope to receive broad consideration and guidance from Member States on the overall direction for the training and library area, where we need to propose an institutional set of changes.

We will not ask for any decision from Member States on the research area, as we will be discussing with the research institutions what will be in their best interests to improve coordination mechanisms among

themselves and how they can link to other parts of the knowledge services without any institutional change. Based on that guidance, we will work with all seven institutions for the next two years to determine the best transition plan so that the first phase of our integration can be completed within two years.

I will stop there and will be very happy to answer any questions.

**The Chair** (*spoke in Arabic*): I thank Mr. Kim for the invaluable information he has given us.

In keeping with the established practice of the Committee, I shall now suspend the meeting to afford delegations an opportunity to hold an interactive discussion with Mr. Kim through an informal question-and-answer session.

*The meeting was suspended at 10.25 a.m. and resumed at 11.25 a.m.*

**The Chair** (*spoke in Arabic*): Before we hear from the remaining speakers under cluster 1, “Nuclear weapons”, the Committee will first have the panel exchange on cluster 7, “Disarmament machinery”, in order to release any panellist who may need to travel back to his or her duty station today.

I therefore now have the pleasure of welcoming to the members of the panel on cluster 7, namely, Her Excellency Ambassador Patricia O’Brien of Ireland, President of the Conference on Disarmament; His Excellency Ambassador Christopher Grima of Malta, Chair of the United Nations Disarmament Commission; Mr. Desmond Bowen of the United Kingdom, Chair of the Secretary-General’s Advisory Board on Disarmament Matters; and Ms. Theresa Hitchens, Director of the United Nations Institute for Disarmament Research.

After giving the floor to the panellists, we will switch to an informal mode so as to give delegations an opportunity to make comments and ask questions.

I now give the floor to Ambassador O’Brien.

**Ms. O’Brien** (Ireland), President, Conference on Disarmament: I should like to express my appreciation to you, Mr. Chair, to the Bureau and to the High Representative for Disarmament Affairs, Ms. Angela Kane, for the invitation to take part in this panel to speak about the work of the Conference on Disarmament at the 2013 session as outlined in its report. May I also, in my national capacity, briefly mention that it is an honour for Ireland to hold the

presidency of the Conference on Disarmament, a body whose contribution to international peace and security through the negotiation of multilateral disarmament instruments is without parallel.

Ireland assumed the presidency of the Conference on 19 August as the sixth President in 2013. I should like to express Ireland's appreciation to each of its predecessors in 2013, Hungary, India, Indonesia, Iran and Iraq. In the arrangement known as the "P-6" the cooperation between all six Presidents throughout the 2013 session was excellent. One of the primary tasks entrusted to Ireland as the sixth President of the Conference's annual session was that of preparing the Conference's annual report to the General Assembly (A/68/27). I should like to express my appreciation for the collaborative and cooperative approach of all members of the Conference, which allowed for the adoption of the report by consensus in an expeditious manner.

As colleagues will have seen in the report, the Secretary-General of the United Nations conveyed a message to the Conference at its first plenary meeting of 2013 in which he recalls the centrality of the Conference to both disarmament negotiation and to strengthening the rule of law in global disarmament. He also called upon States to ensure that the Conference lived up to its responsibility and to revive substantive negotiations without delay.

One of the primary responsibilities of a President of the Conference under rule 29 of the rules of procedure is to draw up, with the assistance of the Secretary-General of the Conference, a programme of work for the Conference for its consideration. Last year in the resolution on the annual report of the Conference (resolution 67/72), the Assembly called upon the Conference to further intensify consultations and explore possibilities for overcoming its ongoing deadlock of well over a decade by adopting and implementing a balanced and comprehensive programme of work at the earliest possible date during the 2013 session.

As the report of the Conference clearly shows, 2013 saw particularly intensive efforts by successive Presidents to agree a programme of work that would enable the Conference to get back to the task envisaged for it at the first special session of the General Assembly devoted to disarmament, namely, the negotiation of multilateral disarmament agreements. Those efforts included the drafting of three programmes

of work on which, regrettably, consensus could not be achieved. Those are reflected in the report. Other efforts by Presidents included intensive and extensive consultations and the hosting of a seminar.

As the report notes, despite those efforts, the Conference did not succeed in agreeing a programme of work and commencing its substantive work at its 2013 session. On 16 August, the Conference decided to establish an informal working group to draft a programme of work that would be robust in substance and progressive over time in implementation. That decision was adopted thanks to the great efforts of Ambassador Mohammad Sabir Ismail of Iraq, and was inspired by the remarks of His Excellency Mr. Kassym-Jomart Tokayev, Secretary-General of the Conference and Personal Representative of the Secretary-General of the United Nations. Ambassador Luis Gallegos Chiriboga of Ecuador and Ambassador Peter Richard Woolcott of Australia were appointed as co-Chair and Vice-co-Chair of the group, which met on three occasions during the Irish presidency. Ambassador Gallegos Chiriboga orally reported to the Conference on 10 September.

As President, I am deeply conscious of the tasks entrusted to me by the Conference's rules of procedure, which include the preparation of the draft report of the Conference and the presentation of the resolution on the report to the General Assembly. Those tasks also include the responsibility that is entrusted to each President of drawing up a programme of work for the Conference. As has been the case in previous years, at the conclusion of the Conference's annual session, the Conference requested that the current President and incoming President consult during the intersessional period. I look forward to consulting delegations during the coming months to seek their views on possible elements of a programme of work for the Conference. In doing so, I shall be working closely with Israel as incoming President. I also look forward to working closely with Ambassadors Gallegos Chiriboga and Woolcott should they decide that they wish to convene informal consultations on the issue of the Conference's programme of work in the coming period.

In addition to the intensive efforts to achieve consensus on a programme of work, the Conference also had discussions on the core issues of its agenda, as well as on the important topic of the revitalization of the Conference. Those discussions provided delegations



with an opportunity to set out their national positions on these items.

The task of finalizing the annual report of the Conference this year was undertaken by my delegation and, with the cooperation and constructive inputs of all colleagues in Geneva, was agreed in an expeditious manner. I consider that it presents a fair, accurate and balanced picture of the activities of the Conference in 2013.

While it is for the representatives of States to negotiate multilateral instruments, that task is significantly aided by expertise from our partners that do not represent States but share our common goal of advancing disarmament. In that regard, I should like to express appreciation for the contribution that the research analysis and activities of the United Nations Institute for Disarmament Research make. Throughout the 2013 session of the Conference, delegations welcomed the engagement between civil society and the Conference as well.

I should also like to place on record my delegation's appreciation for the work of the small but dedicated team that constitutes the Conference's secretariat. It is perhaps only when a delegation assumes the presidency of the Conference that the extent of its contribution to our work becomes apparent.

In his address to the Conference on 18 June, Secretary-General Tokayev set out two further proposals to the Conference in addition to the informal working group, that is, the establishment of a subsidiary body to examine and make proposals on the improvement of the working methods of the Conference, and the designation of a special coordinator to examine and make recommendations on the expansion of the Conference and the role of civil society. It is the hope of my own delegation that the Conference might consider those ideas in 2014. The advice, ideas and suggestions from Secretary-General Tokayev during his tenure demonstrated his sustained engagement with the Conference. I wish to express appreciation for his leadership and wish him well in his new responsibilities.

As we look forward to the 2014 session of the Conference, I consider that there are grounds for optimism. However, in order for that optimism to be translated into positive results, each member of the Conference will need to explore all avenues, and perhaps indeed even think outside of the box, in order to formulate the programme of work that would allow

the Conference to resume its substantive work. That substantive work is the negotiation of multilateral disarmament agreements. As the draft resolution on the report of the Conference notes, there are a number of urgent and important issues for negotiation to achieve disarmament goals on the Conference's agenda. The contribution of the Conference to strengthening the rule of law in disarmament is unassailable, but it cannot be allowed to continue to rest on its laurels. The impressive track record of the Conference urgently needs to be further bolstered.

**The Chair** (*spoke in Arabic*): I thank Ambassador O'Brien for her statement.

I now give the floor to Ambassador Grima.

**Mr. Grima** (Malta), Chair, United Nations Disarmament Commission: I should like to begin by thanking you, Sir, and the High Representative for Disarmament Affairs, Ms. Angela Kane, for inviting me to participate in this panel discussion in my capacity as Chair of the United Nations Disarmament Commission for 2013. It is an honour for me to address the Committee today on the work of the 2013 substantive session and to share with it a few personal reflections from the perspective of the Chair.

The substantive session of the Disarmament Commission met in April for the second year of its three-year cycle. The Commission continued to consider in Working Groups I and II the two agenda items approved in 2012, namely, "Recommendations for achieving the objective of nuclear disarmament and non-proliferation of nuclear weapons" and "Practical confidence-building measures in the field of conventional weapons". Both Working Groups had a constructive discussion. In general terms, I believe that the Commission can be moderately satisfied with what it managed to achieve during the session. For the first time since 2006, the Commission has agreed to send forward to the third, and final, year of the cycle three Chair's working papers, which should represent the starting point for further work next year.

As the report (A/68/42) of the Commission clearly indicates, the working papers remain the responsibility of the Working Group Chairs and in no way prejudice or prejudge the positions of delegations. In that regard, I should like to take this opportunity to thank the Chairs of both Working Groups, Ambassador Naif Bin Bandar AlSudairy from Saudi Arabia and Mr. Knut Langeland

of Norway, as well as all the members of the Bureau, for their outstanding work over the three weeks.

Clearly, much work lies ahead if the Commission is to agree to recommendations before the end of its next substantive session. I do, however, believe that the Commission has done what it was expected to do in the second year of its three-year cycle, which is to set the stage for the third, and final, year. That brings me to what the Commission is doing in a broader sense and some personal reflections on how it could perhaps do it better.

The Disarmament Commission was established to deliberate at the intergovernmental level and make recommendations. The Commission has a dual role, that is, to deliberate and to adopt recommendations. Unquestionably, the adoption of recommendations remains at the very heart of the Commission's mandate. I would, however, suggest that its deliberative function also serves an important purpose, and we should not be so quick to dismiss the deliberative value of the Commission.

The Disarmament Commission provides a unique forum for frank and open debate on some of the most pressing issues on the disarmament agenda. The Commission continues to provide a useful vehicle through which delegations can better understand each other's position, in the process building trust and confidence among themselves. As I noted in my closing remarks, given its universal character through the open and often informal setting in which it operates, the Commission can usefully serve as a laboratory of ideas, a sounding board for initiatives and a clearing house for proposals that can be taken forward and developed in other disarmament forums. In defence of the Disarmament Commission, therefore, even when it is unable to adopt specific recommendations, as regrettable as that may be, I believe that through its deliberative function it can play a constructive role in moving forward the disarmament agenda.

Given the increasingly complex international environment in which we operate, I believe that, without adjustments to the manner in which it conducts its business, the Disarmament Commission will be hard-pressed to deliver on the other part of its mandate in the form of agreed recommendations. Better ways need to be found by which to record and lock in limited progress. As I have already remarked at the Commission itself, I believe that the Commission's inability to

agree to recommendations stems partly from the lack of a common objective, which is why I believe the Commission would benefit greatly from a more focused and targeted agenda. A proposal by Norway for the First Committee to task the Disarmament Commission to examine clearly defined topics merits closer examination.

Before concluding, allow me to briefly introduce, on behalf of all members of the Bureau, draft resolution A/C.1/68/L.5, entitled "Report of the Disarmament Commission". As members will know, the draft resolution updates the resolution adopted at the sixty-seventh session (resolution 67/71) and recommends, in paragraph 7, the continuation of the consideration of the substantive items at the Commission's 2014 substantive session. The dates for the 2014 session set forth in paragraph 8 reflect the decision of the Committee on Conferences. As with similar resolutions in previous years, I look forward to the adoption of the draft resolution by consensus.

**The Chair** (*spoke in Arabic*): I thank Ambassador Grima for his statement.

I now give the floor to Mr. Bowen.

**Mr. Bowen:** I am grateful for the opportunity to speak as the Chair of the Secretary-General's Advisory Board, which, as members know, is also constituted as the Board of Trustees of the United Nations Institute for Disarmament Research (UNIDIR). I thank the Chair and the High Representative for Disarmament Affairs for the invitation to be here today.

This year, the Advisory Board on Disarmament Matters has been renewed in the sense that there were 10 new members out of the 15. That process of renewal is very much to be welcomed, as is the change in the regional balance that resulted. It has, however, meant a fairly steep learning curve for Board members and a reaffirmation of the independence, expertise and, above all, non-governmental quality of the Board. That is an important aspect of what the Advisory Board brings to this arena.

The Committee will of course have seen the report submitted to the General Assembly by the Secretary-General on 26 July. The subjects that were assigned to the Board by the Secretary-General were relations among the nuclear-weapon-free zones in advancing regional and global security, and, secondly, disarmament and security implications of emerging technologies. I will

come back to that in a little more detail in a moment, but I would also say that we met as the Board of Trustees of UNIDIR both to take stock of the work programme of the Institute itself and to grapple with the reform proposals on which we the Board were briefed for the first time in March, and consulted in writing in July.

We have also, as the Board of Trustees, instituted a process for the recruitment of a new Director for the end of 2014, when the term of the current Director comes to an end. We have also recommended, in a traditional way, the continuation of the subvention from the United Nations regular budget for UNIDIR, a level of subvention that the Board considers to be inadequate and we have therefore continued to make recommendations that it should be increased. Members will know that the funding from the United Nations regular budget amounts to less than 10 per cent of the total of UNIDIR's spending.

I will now talk briefly about the highlights of the two substantive topics, nuclear-weapon-free zones and emerging technologies, and then will say something about the role we have as Board of Trustees.

On nuclear-weapon-free zones, there was clearly more work to be done to learn lessons to apply best practice. The idea was put forward that there ought to be a platform for more interaction between the zones and those who support them, not just on a governmental basis but also with civil society and the think-tanks involved. Thought was given to the need for new zones and more activity to promote the North-East Asia Zone with perhaps more activity at the regional level. There were also issues about the nuclear-weapon States and the need for them to sign up to the protocols associated with the zones. Let us not also forget the idea that was recalled in the Advisory Board that there were other nuclear possessors that ought also to be thinking about their formal relationship with the nuclear-weapon-free zones.

A particular issue that arose was the lack of progress on a Middle East zone free of weapons of mass destruction. There was a sense that there was an opportunity perhaps for the Secretary-General to take a role in a preparatory meeting to try to maintain momentum. Certainly, that notion of the Middle East and the agreement that came out of the Review Conference of the Parties to the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons was asserted.

Let me move on to emerging technologies and the topic of disarmament and the security implications of emerging technologies. We found that a very challenging, complicated topic, and were struck by the inadequate understanding that we, and I think others, have of the bearing of technology on security and the opportunities that there may be for disarmament or arms-control action.

In all of that, we were very conscious that there was a very strong civil thread to new technology as well as a military thread. There were vast benefits to be had, but there were also dangers. Some of those dangers we spoke about related to the legal, humanitarian and political aspects of weapons systems that had the possibility of becoming increasingly autonomous. A categorization we found useful related to humans being in the loop — in control — a supervisory and last-resort opportunity to engage, and then a future where humans might be out of the loop, in other words, that there might be machines operating as weapons systems that could be operated effectively by machine algorithms.

There was a vast tissue of issues to be confronted. The feeling the Board had was that the most important direction to take was to do more work and more study and to make progress on the basis of further study, and then to think about what opportunities there would be to take forward any ideas of arms control or disarmament. We had in mind perhaps that the Convention on Prohibitions or Restrictions on the Use of Certain Conventional Weapons Which May Be Deemed to Be Excessively Injurious or To Have Indiscriminate Effects might be a suitable forum, but clearly that was not the only opportunity. This was an area where there was scope for the United Nations to be taking action to, as it were, seize this subject and work with it rather than catching up after the event, as has been the case, let us say, with cluster weapons.

Let me now move to the role of the Advisory Board as the Board of Trustees of UNIDIR. This, in a way, was the subject that preoccupied us most. We have seen the reform proposal that saw the light of day in the Secretary-General's report of 26 September (A/68/485), and of course the Committee had a briefing this very morning from Assistant Secretary-General Kim Won-soo. Those are recommendations for action on which member States will have to take decisions.

As I said, the Board has been consulted once — on a draft paper provided in July — and it was also briefed

in March and in June, and only last week there was a further briefing with some, though not all, members of the Board. The Board is clear that reform of the Secretariat and its operations is a good thing in delivering transformation through greater efficiency and effectiveness. But our benchmark as the Board of Trustees in considering this matter has been to judge whether UNIDIR outputs would be enhanced as a result of the proposed reform. We know that at present UNIDIR struggles to make ends meet; but, notwithstanding that struggle, it delivers high-quality products and services for the disarmament community and Member States. I was very glad to hear tributes paid to UNIDIR from the floor earlier today during the informal part of the meeting. UNIDIR certainly needs better administrative and financial support to facilitate and enable its output, but the Board has not been persuaded that the proposal now on the table will result in a better UNIDIR. Indeed, the Board fears that there are considerable risks that have not been fully examined or exposed.

As is well known, UNIDIR is a product of the first special session of the General Assembly devoted to disarmament. Its statute approved by the General Assembly provides for its autonomy of operation and the independence of its research. Its value and strength derive directly from those two principles. The proposal that is being considered says that those principles will be preserved, and we applaud that. I heard this morning Mr. Kim Won-soo say that there would be no change to those principles and their application.

We must recognize, at the same time as those assurances are given, that this is a project of consolidation and transformation under a new Assistant Secretary-General, involving the establishment also of a research coordination network, of which UNIDIR will be a part. The view of the Board is that there is a contradiction in that regard, which has not been resolved. It is difficult to avoid the conclusion that the result, intended or otherwise — and maybe not in the immediate term, but in the longer term — would be to cause fundamental change to UNIDIR's mission. That is an area where there should be no scope for ambiguity.

I should like now to turn to voluntary funding. Since the Institute will continue to be required to raise funds from Member States and other entities, confusion about its special status would be very damaging in this regard, as would any diversion of potential funds to the \$640,000 funding of transitional costs and the ongoing funding of a research hub. There is a real

danger of UNIDIR being perceived as embedded in the Secretariat, with an Assistant Secretary-General overhead to carry, and no distinct or unique identity as an independent research institute with access to the United Nations disarmament machinery.

For UNIDIR, the operational relationship inside the United Nations family which matters is with those responsible for peace and security. It is not the functional ties of research that count but the operational connection with the Conference on Disarmament, the Office of Disarmament Affairs and the Member States intensely involved in the disarmament machinery, and with the broader life-and-death issues of global peace and security. The Board believes that UNIDIR's future belongs with that community and not in the proposed research/training library services consolidation, which does nothing for UNIDIR's operationally essential and substantive cooperation. I would recall that Mr. Kim applauded the way in which UNIDIR interacted with the Conference on Disarmament and with member States.

In all our deliberations as the Board of Trustees, we have sought to enhance UNIDIR's ability to perform as a United Nations centre of excellence with a very highly valued output. In this brief presentation, I have tried to set out the significant risks we believe that we have identified in the reform proposal.

**The Chair** (*spoke in Arabic*): I thank Mr. Bowen for his statement.

I now give the floor to Ms. Hitchens.

**Ms. Hitchens:** May I congratulate you, Mr. Chair, on your election to your post. I should also like to thank the High Representative for Disarmament Affairs for the invitation to speak today.

Once again, I am glad to have the opportunity to address the Committee and provide a brief update on the activities and status of the United Nations Institute for Disarmament Research (UNIDIR) during the past year. As many know, UNIDIR was created in the wake of the first special session of the General Assembly devoted to disarmament as an autonomous institute under a General Assembly mandate. Under our statute, the Institute is designed to undertake independent research, analysis and educational activities with the aim to promote informed participation by Member States in efforts towards disarmament, arms control, peace and security.



This past year, the Institute has been blessed with opportunities — as the temperature in the disarmament and arms-control arena has warmed up a bit — but also beset by serious challenges. Despite those challenges, UNIDIR has continued to uphold its long-standing record of providing relevant, informative and useful research and analysis to Member States — and we have greatly appreciated their support and encouragement regarding the benefits of our activities to Member States and to the disarmament community at large.

One of the key themes of the Institute's work has been building and expanding our substantive cooperation on issues of peace and security with fellow members of the United Nations family, the academic and scientific world and civil society. For example, we have been working with colleagues at the Organization for the Prohibition of Chemical Weapons to establish a framework for future cooperation. We held our first joint meeting in February in The Hague to explore the shift in the focus of the Chemical Weapons Convention towards non-proliferation and the maintenance of a chemical-weapons-free world. I would be remiss not to pause a moment to congratulate our colleagues in The Hague on their Nobel Prize award, a much-deserved honour.

Furthermore, UNIDIR has been working closely with the Implementation Support Unit to find creative ways to bolster implementation and confidence in the Biological and Toxin Weapons Convention, with a focus on the concept of peer review as well as transparency and confidence-building.

Over the past year, the Institute has also been participating in the efforts of the global partnership process on the non-proliferation of weapons of mass destruction, at the request of the global partnership member States. One area of concentration for us within the global partnership process is to explore opportunities to support the Security Council Committee established pursuant to resolution 1540 (2001).

Another one of UNIDIR's flagship projects, which will continue into next year, involves working directly in support of the 26-member Inter-Agency Working Group on Disarmament, Demobilization and Reintegration to develop an evidence-based, strategic design approach to United Nations programming for reintegration, which promises to improve results in the field. That is an excellent example of UNIDIR acting

as a force multiplier for substantive agencies working in peace and security.

With the more optimistic atmosphere surrounding nuclear disarmament and non-proliferation that has emerged over the past 12 months, UNIDIR has increasingly partnered directly with Member States to build momentum for action. For example, the Institute has been at the forefront in assisting Member States efforts to seek levers to dislodge the Conference on Disarmament from its state of suspended animation, to support creative interaction in the open-ended working group on nuclear disarmament, to explore, in a holistic manner, the humanitarian approach to nuclear disarmament and to provide analysis to help underpin future negotiations on fissile materials.

In addition, UNIDIR continues to put emphasis on efforts to control the proliferation of conventional weapons, in particular small arms and light weapons, which contribute to instability and conflict throughout the world. UNIDIR began work in 2008 to support the elaboration, and later the negotiation, of the Arms Trade Treaty. In the wake of the Treaty's successful conclusion in April, our work will continue, in cooperation with our partners in civil society and in support of the implementation efforts of our friends and colleagues at the Office for Disarmament Affairs.

Another keystone project under way is the development of a software tool designed to assist Member States with the implementation of their commitments to control small arms and light weapons via the International Small Arms Control Standards. Indeed, if any members would like to see a demonstration of that tool, they should attend our lunchtime event this afternoon in Room A. Working closely with the United Nations Coordinating Action on Small Arms, the Institute has completed testing of this prototype tool this year and the tool will be available to all Member States at the beginning of next year.

It should be clear that one of the strengths of UNIDIR's model of operations is its ability to interact directly with its clientele in the international security community in a manner that serves as a force multiplier. UNIDIR has traditionally been a lean and mean organization, relying on a small number of specialized institutional staff responsible for the Institute's vision, management and day-to-day operations, as well as a variable pool of high-calibre researchers and analysts who undertake our substantive work. While the

Institute is subject to United Nations administrative and financial rules and regulations, as an autonomous organization it also has a certain amount of freedom from bureaucratic burdens that allows it to be nimble in its operations.

As most members know, UNIDIR's many activities are funded strictly by voluntary contributions. I therefore would first like to express my gratitude to all Member States that have funded UNIDIR's operations during this time of financial constraint. We are equally grateful to those delegations that have over the past year expressed their strong and continuing support for the autonomous and independent status of the Institute and for the work we have been, and are, undertaking. We are heartened to know that the Institute's independent voice is so highly valued by the international peace and security community and we remain committed to addressing the needs of all Member States in their disarmament and arms-control activities as best we can.

That said, the financial environment continues to take its toll on the Institute and its functioning. This year saw the loss of yet another institutional staff member, whom we have not had the funding to replace, thus reducing our capacity to carry out our project portfolio, activities and outreach. In particular, this has resulted in the cessation of our quarterly journal, *Disarmament Forum*, which was the only regular United Nations journal dedicated to disarmament issues published in both English and French.

A key part of the financial difficulties faced by the Institute has been the shift in Government funding patterns away from institutional support to highly restricted funding for specific projects. Over the past year, about 82 per cent of funds coming to the Institute have been earmarked for project work, often with stipulations that limit the amount that can be spent on overhead or institutional staff functions. That has created a disconnect between the desire of Member States for UNIDIR to take on new projects and activities and the institution's capacity to develop, manage, evaluate and disseminate the results from those projects and activities. While UNIDIR receives a very small subvention from the regular budget, the subvention for many years has covered only one staff member, despite many resolutions by Member States and the Board of Trustees that it be increased.

The lack of non-earmarked funding is creating several operational concerns. Many members will

have heard me express regret at our lack of capacity to carry out rapid-response research and educational activities, as we have no pool of funds to accommodate non-project-related activities. The lack of institutional and macro-programmatic resources inevitably means that some issues dear to the hearts of some Member States regrettably get less attention on the Institute's agenda than they should. I am open at any time to discussions with any Member State on creative, realistic solutions to this problem.

In addition, as the United Nations itself has sought over the past year to effect much-needed reform on many levels, the perhaps unforeseen consequence has been that the administrative burden on small, voluntarily funded organizations involved has weighed heavily. Our assiduous investment in the change-management process appears, regrettably from where I sit, to show little prospect of financial return or increased levels of support in the near future to either Member States or to the Institute. Unfortunately, that exercise has instead meant that we have had less time to devote to substantive project development and fundraising, creating a difficult-to-resolve conundrum in that a smaller project portfolio means less income, which in turn means less capacity to undertake much-needed substantive work. Indeed, this past year saw the smallest number of specific project activities by the Institute in my five-year tenure, in large part because of the over-stretched human resources. Obviously that problem, if left uncorrected, will certainly come to undermine the efficiency of the Institute.

Nonetheless, UNIDIR remains determined to do its part to forward the cause of disarmament, non-proliferation, peace and security. Again, I thank all members for their past and continued financial support. I urge all Member States to consider funding the Institute, at however small a level. Every cent counts, and we promise to continue to make the best use of those cents that we can in support of the international community's needs.

Lastly, I should like to place on record a personal tribute to the work of the Secretary-General's Advisory Board on Disarmament Matters and UNIDIR's Board of Trustees for their concerted efforts to support UNIDIR over the past difficult 12 months, and their support to myself personally as Director. Their dedication and commitment reflects without a doubt a wider recognition that an independent and autonomous UNIDIR continues to have a vital role to play in

supporting and, indeed, stimulating the achievement of the disarmament objectives that are at the core of the Charter of the United Nations.

**The Chair** (*spoke in Arabic*): I thank Ms. Hitchens for her statement.

I shall now suspend the meeting to give us an opportunity to have an interactive discussion with our panellists in an informal setting.

*The meeting was suspended at 12.10 p.m. and resumed at 12.30 p.m.*

**The Chair** (*spoke in Arabic*): The Committee will now hear from the remaining speakers on the nuclear-weapons cluster.

**Mr. Istrate** (Romania): As this is the first time that I take floor, I should like to congratulate you, Sir, and the Bureau on your elections and assure you of my delegation's full cooperation in successfully fulfilling the task you have set out for this session of the First Committee.

I take the floor in my capacity as successor to Ambassador Cornel Feruță of Romania, Chair of the second session of the Preparatory Committee for the 2015 Review Conference of the Parties to the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons, which was held in Geneva from 22 April to 3 May, and as Chair-designate of Main Committee II of the 2015 Review Conference.

Ambassador Feruță is no longer in a position to continue the task he was entrusted with last year, and I should like to take this opportunity to acknowledge the great effort he has put into ensuring the necessary conditions for a successful meeting, as well as in attempting to reflect the thrust of the debates in the Chair's factual summary. I should also like to express my gratitude to the States parties members of the Eastern European Group for endorsing my nomination to replace him. I hope to count on the support of all States parties in this important endeavour.

Let me, at the outset, express the conviction that the second Preparatory Committee session contributed significantly to taking forward the process to the third Preparatory Committee session and the Review Conference. It generally went according to expectations, in spite of a climate before and during the session that was considered to be challenging, even with a certain negative potential. We must indeed not

lose sight of the fact that the review process of the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons (NPT) does not take place in a political vacuum. The international community continues to face old as well as new challenges in the areas of nuclear disarmament, non-proliferation and the peaceful uses of nuclear energy. All that has put a stamp on the NPT review cycles, and this time around will not be any different.

The work of the second session of the Preparatory Committee rested largely on the solid foundation reflected in the conclusions and recommendations for follow-on actions — the so-called Action Plan — adopted by consensus at the 2010 NPT Review Conference. The Chair's summary aimed to cover in a balanced and comprehensive manner all three pillars of the NPT. The main drive was to keep the balance among the pillars and the relevance of all issues to all NPT States parties.

Yet the second session of the Preparatory Committee signalled that the expectations of many States parties were still high on the nuclear-disarmament pillar. Concerns were raised about the continued reliance on nuclear weapons in security doctrines, high alert levels, the lack of transparency and reporting standards, the lack of time frames for nuclear disarmament and the continued modernization of nuclear weapons, delivery systems and related infrastructure. The issue of non-strategic nuclear weapons was also mentioned, with stress on a reduction or elimination rather than transparency. As was agreed, the achievements in implementing disarmament measures from the 2010 Action Plan will have to be presented at the third session of the Preparatory Committee, next year. That is both a deadline to deliver and an opportunity to assess progress.

Specific cases related to compliance were addressed during the session in Geneva. The aim of the Chair was not to identify definitive solutions to all the delicate issues on the agenda, but rather to create a context that would allow States to tackle all these issues in a non-divisive way. As we go through the current NPT review cycle, one can expect that compliance with the NPT, as well as the related implementation of the International Atomic Energy Agency safeguards, will continue to be central to the process.

The debate regarding the humanitarian consequences of any use of nuclear weapons recalled the deep concern with respect to the "unacceptable harm" that would

result from a detonation of nuclear weapons, including the wider and long-term impact on socioeconomic development. Seventy-eight States joined the statement on the humanitarian consequences during the second session of the Preparatory Committee.

The Chair expected — since the pre-session contacts — that the issue of the conference on the establishment of a Middle East zone free of nuclear weapons and all other weapons of mass destruction was going to be one of the most problematic points, due to the complexity of the subject and the frustration shared by many States at the postponing of the December 2012 meeting in Helsinki. But a widely recognized view during the second session of the Preparatory Committee was that as long as we make sure we do not go backwards, hiccups and delays could always be overcome. We must make sure that we all continue to press on and stay the course.

I should like to point out in particular the enhanced interaction among States parties and civil society in a new format that was pioneered during the last session. The role of non-governmental organizations and think-tanks in raising awareness on topics such as nuclear disarmament and non-proliferation, as well as their ability to shape the public agenda, are very important for furthering our shared goals of strengthening the NPT regime, and their engagement should be further encouraged and supported.

By way of conclusion, I should say that the second session of the Preparatory Committee was an important stage to acknowledge that the goal of a world free of nuclear weapons was widely recognized, the consensus for non-proliferation was building in the international community and the demand for peaceful applications of nuclear energy was outstanding, alongside the practical steps to enhance nuclear security and safety.

Despite serious challenges, the NPT remains at the heart of the global non-proliferation regime, and is an essential instrument of our collective security. It is crystal-clear that the review process would be strengthened if the States parties could deepen their solidarity on the Treaty's fundamental purposes, while demonstrating flexibility and compromise on the means to achieve their goals. If we are to ensure that the 2015 NPT Review Conference genuinely fulfils all our aspirations, we should strive to act together.

I should like to assure all members that I intend to continue in the same spirit and manner as my

predecessor and see my role as facilitator and honest broker. I shall remain at all times available to any delegation or group wishing to meet with me and my team.

Let me express the hope for a very successful third session of the NPT Review Conference. The circumstances of today are quite different from those that existed six months ago and recent developments, as well as ongoing discussions, have the potential to set the stage for a positive and fruitful end of the review cycle. I wish Ambassador Enrique Román-Morey great success and I assure him of my delegation's full support in discharging his important task.

**Mr. Moktefi** (Algeria) (*spoke in Arabic*): Allow me first to express our pleasure at participating in this debate on nuclear weapons under your chairmanship, Sir.

My delegation associates itself with the statements delivered by the representative of Iran, on behalf of the Movement of Non-Aligned Countries, and by the representative of Bahrain, on behalf of the Arab Group (see A/C.1/68/PV.10).

Algeria reaffirms that nuclear disarmament remains its highest priority and expresses its serious concern over the danger to humankind posed by the existence of nuclear weapons and of their possible use or threat of use.

Algeria calls upon the nuclear-weapon States fully to comply with their legal obligations to achieve the total elimination of their nuclear weapons without further delay. In that regard, my delegation reiterates the need to ensure that those States implement the principles of transparency, irreversibility and verifiability in all measures related to the fulfilment of their nuclear-disarmament obligations. The fulfilment of those obligations should not be made conditional on confidence-building measures or other disarmament efforts.

Convinced that the total elimination of nuclear weapons is the only absolute guarantee against their use or threat of use, Algeria supports the road map proposed by the Non-Aligned Movement during the General Assembly High-level Meeting on Nuclear Disarmament (see A/68/PV.11), held last month, which calls mainly for the urgent commencement of negotiations in the Conference on Disarmament of a comprehensive convention on nuclear weapons to



prohibit their possession, development, production, acquisition, testing, stockpiling, transfer, use or threat of use, and provide for their destruction.

Pending the total elimination of nuclear weapons, it is necessary to conclude a universal, unconditional and legally binding instrument on security assurances. All non-nuclear-weapon States should be effectively assured by the nuclear-weapon States against the use or threat of use of nuclear weapons.

My delegation would like to take this opportunity to reiterate its commitment to the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons (NPT), as well as to stress the need for it to be universalized, as it is the cornerstone of the nuclear-disarmament and non-proliferation regime. The delegation of Algeria would also like to reassert that we deal equally with the three pillars — disarmament, non-proliferation and the promotion of the peaceful use of nuclear energy.

Any selective approach to the Nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty is likely to empty this instrument of its substance. There must also be a balance between the three pillars, as they are all of equal importance. Algeria underlines that efforts aiming at nuclear non-proliferation should run parallel to simultaneous efforts aiming at nuclear disarmament. We emphasize that proliferation concerns are best addressed through multilaterally negotiated agreements.

A majority of the international community has chosen to use atomic energy for exclusively civilian applications, in accordance with article IV of the Nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty. Nuclear energy represents a strategic choice for many developing countries, and serves their economic development and meets their energy needs. Therefore, my delegation reaffirms the legitimate right of those States to develop research, produce and use nuclear energy for peaceful purposes under the non-proliferation regime.

Concern has been expressed at the slow progress towards implementing the 2010 NPT Action Plan, as expressed by a number of delegations during the second session of the Preparatory Committee for the 2015 NPT Review Conference. Algeria calls on all parties to the Treaty to implement the Action Plan, which was adopted by consensus.

According to the terms of the NPT, nuclear-weapon States in particular have to fully comply with their special obligations. My delegation is also concerned at the lack of progress towards the full implementation of

the 13 measures for the Treaty's article VI disarmament obligations, agreed at the 2000 NPT Review Conference and endorsed again in the Action Plan at the 2010 NPT Review Conference.

Algeria considers that the establishment of nuclear-weapon-free zones is an important measure towards achieving nuclear disarmament and nuclear non-proliferation objectives. The entry into force of the African Nuclear-Weapon-Free Zone Treaty — the Treaty of Pelindaba — represents an important contribution in that regard. Algeria calls on nuclear-weapon States that have not yet done so to sign and ratify the Treaty.

The Middle East should follow the example of the Pelindaba Treaty and other existing nuclear-weapon-free zone treaties. Algeria therefore expresses its disappointment that the conference on the establishment of a Middle East zone free of nuclear weapons and all other weapons of mass destruction has not been convened.

The implementation of the 1995 resolution on the Middle East is an integral part of the 2010 NPT Review Conference. Therefore, my delegation expresses its deep concern over the delay in the implementation of the 1995 resolution, which remains valid until its objectives are achieved. Algeria urges the Secretary-General and the three sponsors of the 1995 resolution on the Middle East to hold consultations with the States of the region and to exert their utmost efforts with a view to convening the conference. We believe that all States of the Middle East should participate in such a conference to ensure its success.

My delegation wishes to stress the significance of achieving universal adherence to the Comprehensive Nuclear-Test-Ban Treaty. That would be an important achievement in the context of nuclear disarmament and non-proliferation. In that regard, my delegation associates itself with the final declaration of the Conference on Facilitating the Entry into Force of the Comprehensive Nuclear-Test-Ban Treaty, held in New York on 27 September, and encourages all annex 2 States to sign and ratify that Treaty without further delay.

My delegation welcomes the convening of the Oslo Conference on the Humanitarian Impact of Nuclear Weapons, held in March, and we associate ourselves with the joint statement to be delivered by the representative of New Zealand on behalf of a group of

Member States, on the humanitarian consequences of nuclear weapons.

**Mr. Diamana** (Solomon Islands): Let me join others in congratulating you, Sir, and the Bureau on your elections and to assure you of my delegation's support during your term in office.

My delegation associates itself with the statement to be made by New Zealand on behalf of other like-minded countries.

As a peace-loving country, Solomon Islands joins the world in seeking a world free of nuclear weapons. We welcomed the convening of the General Assembly High-level Meeting on Nuclear Disarmament, held on 26 September (see A/68/PV.11)

The purpose of the United Nations is to preserve international peace and security. My delegation reaffirms its call to eliminate nuclear weapons and all weapons of mass destruction. My region is a nuclear-weapon-free zone under the 1985 South Pacific Nuclear Free Zone Treaty — the Rarotonga Treaty. The Treaty calls for no manufacture, no stationing and no testing of nuclear weapons in the South Pacific. My delegation welcomes other regions that have similarly established nuclear-free zones. We have demonstrated our desire for peace and look forward to a world without nuclear weapons.

My delegation speaks passionately on the issue because three members with absolute powers within the United Nations tested nuclear weapons in the Pacific, both atmospheric and underground from the late 1940s right up to 1996. Nuclear tests have seen the relocation of populations in the Pacific, and those populations continue to suffer from health effects, including birth defects. Nuclear testing has also contaminated the environment. The cost to current and future generations in the Pacific affected by nuclear testing is not known, as no medical and environmental data was compiled by those responsible.

There is knowledge of the depth and strength of the destruction and the devastating impact of the nuclear weapons used during the Second World War on Hiroshima and Nagasaki. The appalling humanitarian consequences have prompted many United Nations resolutions to free humankind from nuclear weapons and other weapons of mass destruction.

My delegation welcomes the various nuclear international frameworks — the Treaty on the

Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons, the Comprehensive Nuclear-Test-Ban Treaty, the Convention on the Prohibition of the Development, Production, Stockpiling and Use of Chemical Weapons and on Their Destruction, and the Convention on the Prohibition of the Development, Production and Stockpiling of Bacteriological (Biological) and Toxin Weapons and on Their Destruction — which need to be respected. We regret that some States possessing nuclear weapons remain outside those international disarmament frameworks. That weakens multilateralism. The universal acceptance of those frameworks is the only way forward. We note with concern, however, that there are gaps in the nuclear disarmament instruments that do not provide for concrete mechanisms to address the catastrophic humanitarian, genetic, social and environmental consequences of nuclear weapons.

We note with concern that even the peaceful use of nuclear energy in the event of disasters poses humanitarian, genetic and environmental impacts that many of us in the Pacific do not have the capacity or technological capability to measure and respond to. We are following with interest the Fukushima nuclear disaster.

We must replace traditional military power with dialogue and cooperation. We agree that nuclear weapons do not provide security for people, but are a threat to humankind. Nuclear weapons remain a security threat enhancer. We regret that disarmament talks have not resulted in real outcomes. Military alliances and changing military postures globally, including in the Pacific, make non-nuclear-weapon States nervous. We hope that the multilateral mechanisms put in place will build trust and move to global total nuclear disarmament and the elimination of nuclear weapons.

While we commend the efforts of two leading nuclear-weapon States to reduce their nuclear arsenals, we reaffirm that the International Atomic Energy Agency is the sole competent authority to verify and account for these commendable efforts.

My delegation remains convinced that the advent of a world free of nuclear weapons will be possible only through nuclear disarmament and the total elimination of nuclear weapons as the absolute guarantee against the use or threat of use of nuclear weapons and other weapons of mass destruction.

*The meeting rose at 1 p.m.*