Thank you very much, Mr. Chair

We appreciate your tireless efforts to present us with this document.

Costa Rica appreciates that the comments made by my delegation have been reflected in the preambular paragraphs 8, 13, 24 and 25 and operative paragraph 14. These paragraphs should remain in their entirety in the text.

In the case of preambular paragraph 13, on ensuring the participation of women and men, we suggest that this paragraph reflect the language of Resolution 69/61.

PP17, again, lowers the bar on the demand on nuclear weapon States to fulfill their nuclear disarmament obligations. From “urges” we have moved to “reaffirms.” This is unacceptable. This Review Conference should urge concrete actions and stop patting nuclear weapon States on the back. And I say this because the word “urge” is only used twice throughout the entire text.

PP 18 is also unacceptable and should be removed. Five years after the adoption of the 2010 Action Plan, it appears that the greatest achievements of this Review Conference are to legitimize the step-by-step approach, to mistakenly reinterpret Article VI of the Treaty and to request “reductions” when Article VI is clear in the goal of total elimination of nuclear weapons. The only option to keep PP18 is to use SSOD1 language in its entirety.

Mr. Chair, Costa Rica cannot support the current wording of the new preambular paragraph 24. The text has introduced, -at this stage of negotiations- the concept of “nuclear conflagration,” which completely changes the meaning of this paragraph. What happened to the phrase “use of nuclear weapons under any circumstances”? Who deleted it? Where did this proposal come from, which was not heard viva voce in this room? How does speaking of nuclear conflagration favor this Review Conference? In does not. We present new specific language on this issue that we hope will be taken into account, as follows:

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 PP30 and 32, we are greatly disappointed that this Review Conference does not welcome the humanitarian initiative and the Austrian Pledge, limiting itself to merely noting them. The three humanitarian conferences are the greatest achievement of the last five years in this topic and must be duly reflected in the final text. We demand that the word “notes” be changed to “welcomes.”

In paragraph 32, we require that you specify where and when the 33 Heads of State and Government of Latin America and the Caribbean endorsed the Austrian Pledge. The Austrian Pledge was endorsed at the Third CELAC Summit, at the level of Heads of State and Government in Belén, Costa Rica, in January of 2015. Just as we refer rather explicitly to the cities where P5 meetings have been held, and also to the cities where the humanitarian conferences have been held, my country and my region wish to have this explicit reference in the text. We would greatly appreciate it if this were so.
On the operative side, we note some progress and insist on some changes, in order to strengthen the document.

In operative paragraph 1, we must emphasize our concern over the omission of the phrase "under any circumstances". We are emphatic that there is no circumstance whatsoever that could justify the use of nuclear weapons and we believe that this must be reflected in the final document.

Operative paragraph 3 reinserted the reference to "international stability, peace and security and based on the principle of undiminished and increased security for all." This sentence should be deleted, as it suggests that there must be conditions for initiating nuclear disarmament, when in fact the nuclear disarmament is conducive to creating those conditions. Additionally, in this operative paragraph, we believe that we must return to the wording of the previous versions in terms of time and verification, so that it reads “negotiations of a mechanism with clearly defined benchmarks, timelines, and a strong system of verification."

In operative paragraph 7, we consider that nuclear weapon States must be required to perform specific actions, within a specified timeframe, and we believe that the phrase "with a view" must be eliminated and that the specific timeframe of the next review cycle must be added at the end of the sentence. Therefore, we suggest the following wording: "to reduce and eliminate the role and significance of nuclear weapons therein during the next review cycle." This is essential because the biggest obstacle to disarmament, and greatest incentive for proliferation, is the fact that nuclear deterrence continues to be part of security doctrines.

In operative paragraphs 8 and 11, there is reference to unintentional use with the words "unintentional" and “unintended”. We believe the word "intentional" must be added, as the risk of intentional use must also be taken into account.

Operative paragraph 12 neglects to include the non-nuclear weapon-States that have nuclear weapons in their security doctrines, so that, inter alia, they must (i) report the number, type and status of nuclear weapons their territory; (ii) cease any involvement in nuclear planning or targetting; (iii) put an end to the practice of hosting nuclear weapons their territory during the next review cycle; (iv) eliminate nuclear weapons from their security doctrines during the next review cycle. Moreover, we believe that the conference should call on all States that do not possess nuclear weapons to prohibit any transit of nuclear weapons through their airspace or territorial waters.

With regard to operative paragraph 19, we believe that the imperative to pursue negotiations on effective measures is not properly articulated. This paragraph should be maintained and strengthened, particularly the mention of legal provisions for the achievement and maintenance of a nuclear weapons-free world.

Furthermore, the last sentence of paragraph 19 must be eliminated, or at least moved to another part of the document in a different section.

Finally, Mr President, to reach a commitment to arrive to an outcome document cannot mean the perpetuation of the status quo. The 1995, 2000 and 2010 Review Conferences were a commitment. This Review Conference must be a genuine turning point.

Thank you.