Thank you very much, Mr. Chair.

Costa Rica welcomes your efforts and those of Ambassador Benno Laggner and of your distinguished teams for introducing this new working document. Let me offer some specific comments on the text.

My delegation is grateful for the deletion of the qualifications of the pace of disarmament commitments in paragraphs 8 and 21. Paragraph eight, however, included the phrase “as perceived by some States,” which we request be deleted.

Furthermore, we noticed that the wording of the final sentence of preambular paragraph eight was changed in terms of the credibility of the three pillars of the Treaty, and not of the Treaty per se. We find that this wording is creative, but insufficient for this sentence. We ask to return to the previous formulation that stated "undermines confidence in the Treaty", as the credibility of the Treaty itself is at stake.

We also work on the wording on preambular paragraph 21. First, it eliminated the reference to there being "many hundreds" of nuclear weapons in high alert, which must be reinserted. Moreover, the last sentence should be redrafted in full, so that says, “In that context, the Conference expresses deep concern at the catastrophic humanitarian consequences of any use of nuclear weapons, which, in the interest of the very survival of humanity, should never be used again under any circumstance.”

In preambular paragraph 12, we request to change the word "promote" for "ensure" the participation of women and men in the nuclear disarmament and non-proliferation. We need more, many more women involved in nuclear disarmament and non-proliferation, and we must ensure that it is so. We also request reintroduce the phrase "at all levels."

In PP24, we ask that the phrase "indefinite extension of the possession of nuclear weapons" be replaced with "indefinite possession of nuclear weapons," since the current wording suggests that in its first 25 years, the Treaty allowed the possession of nuclear weapons, which is incorrect.

In preambular paragraph 25, we insist on the need to change the word "importance" and replace it with "need". In addition, this paragraph eliminated all references to “through negotiations of a mechanism with clearly defined benchmarks, timelines and a strong system of verification”. This Conference should require the establishment of clear goals and deadlines and a strong international verification system to achieve nuclear disarmament. This language should be reinserted in the next version.

As for PP31, we regret the omission of the reference to new information on the humanitarian consequences, and ask to reintroduce as it appeared in the original version.

On the operational part, we highlight the important advances in this section that we must maintain and strengthen.

We are grateful for the rewording of operative paragraph 1 and note, with great concern, the omission of the phrase "under any circumstances". No circumstances justify the use of nuclear weapons. The only weapon that should be used is international law.
In operative paragraph 4, we note the inclusion of strategic and non-strategic nuclear weapons in this text, which is an important addition we had requested previously.

However, the level of demand to States possessing nuclear weapons remains low. We see that in operative paragraphs 4, 5 and , the words “encourages” and “calls upon” continue to be used, when we had requested that this Review Conference urge nuclear disarmament. Compliance with the contractual obligations of the NPT is not an option. It is an obligation in which there is a great sense of urgency.

In operative paragraph 8, regarding risks, we request to add "human error" to the last sentence, so that it reads "and by the potential vulnerability of command and control systems to human error and to cyber threats".

Operative paragraph 14 deleted the call to the eight states to ratify the CTBT, and we must reinsert it, because this Review Conference should call for the CTBT to enter into force.

Operative paragraph 20 requested to change the word "endorse" with "recognize". My delegation is not, nor will be, able to endorse the step-by-step approach. However, we can agree for it to say “the Conference recognizes that some states support the accelerated pursuit of various intermediate practical building blocks that can be carried out simultaneously.”

However, as was well indicated by the distinguished representative of New Zealand on behalf of the NAC, we are concerned about the way in which the document ends, as it supports the accelerated achievement of the "building blocks" as the path leading to nuclear disarmament and forgets to refer to the need to negotiate a legal framework for the prohibition and elimination of nuclear weapons.

Therefore, we request to add "while, at the same time, a legal framework that establishes the prohibition and elimination of nuclear weapons is pursued."

Thank you very much.