

2015 Session of the Conference on Disarmament Statement delivered by the Delegation of Mexico

Geneva, Switzerland, August 17, 2015

Mr. President,

Let me first recognize you, on behalf of my delegation, for all your hard work.

At the outset of the closure of the activities of the Third Informal Working Group (IWG) on a programme of work and regarding its report, let me reiterate the position of my delegation regarding the reestablishment of the IWG, a position that was confirmed after assessing the work and outcome of the IWG, notwithstanding the dedication of its co-chair.

It is Mexico's opinion that the reestablishment of an informal working group to produce a programme of work (IWG) in 2015 constituted a simulation to pretend that the Conference is working, by that I mean fulfilling its mandate, when it is not.

It is evident that, for the third time, the IWG did not even fulfill its own mandate which is "to produce a programme of work robust in substance and progressive over time in implementation." The 2015 IWG concluded once again that consensus could not be reached to take forward a Programme of Work in relation to any of the four core issues, or any other CD agenda item. Therefore, the three exercises held during 2013, 2014 and 2015 did not leave us closer to the adoption of a programme of work than we were in 2013, before any of the three IWG's were established. Consequently, trying to use its establishment and useless outcomes to argue that the CD is substantively working is nothing but a simulation.

Let the record of this plenary meeting show and the annual report of the 2015 reflect that one delegation considers the informal working group to produce a programme of work an exercise of simulation of substantive work.

Mr. President,

Please allow me also to recall the following facts, which were stated by my country during its efforts to adopt a programme of work during its Presidency early this year:

1. The mandate of the Conference has already been expressed by the SSOD1 and the CD itself, there is absolutely no need for redefining it. Taking up substantive work at the CD means to negotiate.
2. Negotiating is not the same as reaching an agreement, and an agreement is not the same as an outcome. We believe that the CD can start negotiations, without reaching an agreement immediately. Reaching an agreement is a privilege of a negotiation. It is not the negotiation itself.
3. The CD was not designed to reach agreement every time, that is to say, reaching agreement is not the mandate of the CD, negotiating is.
4. It is essential that the CD starts negotiating again without preconditions or prejudging the outcome of the negotiations.
5. Not all the agreements are equally convenient for the parties or equally comfortable to them.
6. No mechanism imposes any obligations on a sovereign State not part to it. If a country does not agree or does not find convenient to join a legally binding instrument, because of their national interests, they are free to remain outside of it and its obligations.

By saying so, my delegation cannot find a legitimate justification for this forum not being able to agree on a programme of work in almost 20 years, or for multilateral negotiations on disarmament issues to wait until it is ready to do so. During 2015, the CD has showed, once again and in spite of the tireless efforts of its presidents, its inability to recover its relevance as the multilateral disarmament negotiating forum.

I thank you.