

**Statement on 2<sup>nd</sup> June 2005 By President of the Conference  
On Disarmament, Ambassador Joseph U. Ayalogu (Nigeria)  
On the outcome of His Bilateral Consultations**

Distinguished Delegates,

In my opening statement, I committed myself to continue and build on the momentum set by my predecessors since the beginning of the year. I indicated that however, if there were no positive responses to the "Food-For-Thought" non-paper in two weeks, I would focus the search light for the programme of work based on the A5 proposal. In that regard, I said I would explore possibilities of agreeing on a work programme based on the A5 proposal while not disconnecting from the "Food-For-Thought" non-paper. The dual tract was intended to help identify and narrow down divergent views with the hope of building consensus.

During my consultations with the Regional Coordinators, I detected the eagerness and willingness by all groups to resume substantive work. The East European Group indicated its flexibility to work with either the A5 or the "Food-For-Thought" non-paper. China said it was prepared to join consensus and work on the basis of the A5. The G21 had made a formal statement in the plenary, stating it would join consensus based on the A5 proposal. The Group added that the "Food-For-Thought" was a departure from the A5 proposal. This left me with the Western Group to consult and find out their position on the two proposals. I promised on 31 March 2005 to keep the Conference informed of the outcome of my consultations.

Distinguished Delegates,

Based on the outcome of bilateral consultations held by my predecessor and my consultations with the Regional Coordinators, I decided to conduct further bilateral consultations with some delegations, with more focus but not limited to delegations in the Western Group. I consulted with 22 delegations and I wish to share with you my observations.

- (i) Most delegations were enthusiastic and eager for the CD to address the four core issues. They however, expressed fears that it might be practically difficult or impossible to take up the four core issues simultaneously. There were therefore suggestions that consideration be given to scheduling, which should form part of an agreement on a work programme to assure all delegations that issues they considered priority were not being sidelined;
- (ii) The A5 proposal still enjoys the support of most of the delegations I consulted, although many expressed concern that it might not achieve consensus because of a tiny number of delegations, who are not in a position to join consensus. Since the A5 is unable to achieve consensus, they remain flexible and would be able to work with the "Food-for-Thought", which is generally regarded a watered down version of the A5; With the readiness of Eastern European Group and G21 to join consensus on the basis of A5, the proposal still enjoys the support of about 60 delegations.
- (iii) A few number of delegations indicated that they were not in a position to join consensus on either the A5 or the "Food-For-Thought" non-paper at this stage. They would however, be prepared to commence work only on FMCT provided the mandate is simply put to negotiate an FMCT "without pre-condition", implying that anything including stockpiles and verifications could come up during the negotiations but not explicitly spelt out in the mandate;
- (iv) Those who are unable to join consensus on either the A5 or "Food-For-Thought" explained that they have difficulties with the mandates on FMCT and NSA;
- (v) A few delegations would prefer the CD to take up new and additional issues;

- (vi) There were also suggestions that another paper, which would marry the A5 and "Food-for-Thought" be developed to accommodate the concerns of all delegations.
- (vii) There were suggestions that we await the outcome of the 2005 NPT Review Conference as decisions relating to nuclear disarmament, fissile materials and negative security assurances might impact on the work of the CD. In this regard, any proposal to be made after the Review Conference should be done collectively by the next four or five succeeding Presidents to ensure continuity in the direction of the discussions.
- (viii) Suggestions, were also made that the CD should schedule an informal discussion to exchange views and ideas on the report of the High-Level Panel on Threats, Challenges and Change" and UN Secretary report entitled "In Larger Freedom", with focus on the work of the CD.

#### Distinguished Delegates,

The foregoing were the outcome of my consultations before I left Geneva to attend the 2005 NPT Review Conference in New York. Before departing for the NPT Review Conference I had hoped that the gaps between the positions of delegations would be somewhat narrowed as a result of negotiations on the key issues during the conference so that a proposal reflecting these developments could be tabled for your consideration after the NPT. I must, however, report that the NPT Review Conference appeared to have further widened the gap between the positions held by delegations. The Conference in itself was a complete failure, as prime time was devoted to procedural issues, leaving very little time for negotiations on substantive issues within the Committees and at the end there was no outcome document. However, in statements by several delegations, the CD was urged to overcome its impasse and address

the security challenges before it, by agreeing on a work programme and establishing subsidiary bodies on the core issues. But these exhorting statements could not be said to make the work of the CD any easier as they were not matched by enough political will, that is, in the right direction to enable us in the CD reach a consensus.

The NPT Review Conference of 2005 having ended the way it did-dismally, the question arises what should the CD do in order to continue to perform its functions and remain relevant? This question deserves serious consideration by all of us representing the International Community and charged with the responsibility of negotiating disarmament agreements. I therefore want to urge the CD members, not to be frustrated or deterred by the failure of the 2005 NPT Review conference but to seize this opportunity to be more committed and yet flexible enough to enable us break the jinx and reach a consensus on a work programme. Between now and the end of my tenure I intend to continue consultations this time with a view to identifying any window of opportunity we can see to turn the outcome of the NPT Review Conference into positive and dynamic steps for the CD. I remain open to suggestions and proposals from you my distinguished colleagues.

Thank you.